

§3 PILGRIM ACCOMMODATION AT HELLENIC SANCTUARIES

When religious festivals or sacred mysteries were being celebrated, large numbers of pilgrims could be expected to flock to the site of these events, to become initiated, seek a cure, ask for an oracle, attend athletic competitions in honour of a god, or for some other religious purpose. Despite this, there is very little evidence to suggest that the authorities in charge of such religious occasions made any particular arrangements for seeing that pilgrims were adequately housed. Pilgrims attending religious celebrations in large urban centres would have found that the competition for available accommodation was intense, and many may have found that their use of such accommodation was precluded by the market forces of supply and demand. Other centres away from the main concentrations of population did not have the facilities to provide shelter in the form of permanent dwellings for the influx of pilgrims who visited the sacred sites in question.

The institution of the *theorodokia* in itself seems to preclude the notion that accommodation was generally provided by the host state for ordinary pilgrims, since the *theorodokoi* were responsible for providing accommodation for the *theoroi* who were attending religious celebrations. Private individuals, therefore, rather than the polis itself, provided accommodation for *theoroi*, and if important delegations were dealt with by this method, clearly the polis was not prepared to take measures to provide accommodation for the ordinary pilgrim. Scholars have noted that while a sanctuary conducting mystery celebrations would have had buildings for the performance of secret rites, and *Asklepieia* places in which the ill could seek a cure, most sacred precincts simply had the sacred building itself.¹ Indeed at healing sanctuaries even accommodation for those who were ill would not necessarily be provided. Pausanias notes that in his own time a building was constructed at Epidauros in which women could give birth and people could die, but that previously women gave birth and people died of their sicknesses in the open air. Accordingly it is clear that it was not the case that special provisions were made for such people at all healing sites.²

It has been stated by some modern authors that permanent accommodation was not provided by the Greeks within sacred precincts as a result of religious

¹ Nock, Roberts, Skeat *HTR* 29 (1936) 77.

² Paus. 2.27.6; see ch. 4 n. 145, with text; note the case of the healing shrine of Oropos, discussed below n. 53, with text.

sensibilities.³ This is true enough; the sanctuary was set aside for the deity,⁴ though some sacred sites did provide limited accommodation for select pilgrims at the sacred site, outside of the *temenos* itself, but this is not sufficient explanation in itself as to why pilgrims had to rely on tents for accommodation. Several references are made to the use of tents by pilgrims and “tent” is the generally accepted translation of *skene*.⁵ These tents need not be assumed, however, to have been flimsy affairs: they were probably well built using stout poles for the support of the tanned hides which comprised the walls and roof of the tent. Sleeping in temples did not normally occur and was considered a profane act. The Boeotians in 424 complained that Athenian troops were living in the sacred shrine at Delion, and were doing there “all the things that men do in a profane place”. They argued that an invader had to respect the temples of the invaded and leave them alone, while the Athenians countered that they had not harmed the shrine and that the temples of the vanquished became the property of the conqueror.⁶ It is unusual to find the Spartan king Agesilaos pitching his tent in the shrine of Poseidon at Isthmia in 390, and this is perhaps to be explained by the fact the shrine was under the jurisdiction of his enemies the Argives, who had been preparing to celebrate the Isthmian games, but were frightened off by his approach with his army.⁷ However, Agesilaos often camped in shrines, which was generally not allowed, and which was certainly not an option open to everyone, while another Spartan king, Pleistoanax, built his house partially inside the sanctuary of Zeus for his period of exile, due to fear of his enemies.⁸ Consideration must be given to the fact that the primary motivation of pilgrims was religious and personal: pilgrims did not need any other inducement to attend religious festivities in other states, with the result

³ Deschamps, Cousin *BCH* 11 (1887) 382; Chapot *DA* 5 (1911) 117. On accommodation in antiquity but not pilgrim accommodation, see Firebaugh *Inns of Greece and Rome*.

⁴ See Burkert *Greek Religion* 85-86.

⁵ It should be noted that Burkert, *Greek Religion* 107, describes such a translation as “misleading”. However, τοῖς σκηνοῦσιν (Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9) is translated as “those encamped in tents” in *Greek Religion* 67. Nilsson takes the word *skene* to mean “Zelte oder Buden” (*Griechische Feste* 341; cf. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 828). “Tents” thus seems to be a reasonable translation; for *skenomata*; cf. below n. 25, with text.

⁶ Thuc. 4.97.2-98.8; 4.97.3: Ἀθηναίους δὲ Δῆλιον τειχίσαντας ἐνοικεῖν, καὶ ὅσα ἄνθρωποι ἐν βεβήλῳ δρῶσι πάντα γίνεσθαι αὐτόθι; cf. Parker *Miasma* 162. This important case is overlooked by Goolman, Holladay *CQ* 36 (1986) 151-60.

⁷ Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.2: κατασκηνήσας δὲ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, αὐτὸς τε τῷ θεῷ ἔθηκε καὶ περίμενευ (cf. ch. 2 nn. 56-59, with text).

⁸ Xen. *Ages.* 5.7: when Agesilaos was not in Sparta he either stayed ἐν ἱερῷ or in a public place, in order that his actions all be public and he could not be accused of any scandal; Thuc. 5.16.3 for Pleistoanax, and see further ch. 6 nn. 63-68, with text; cf. the case of Pausanias, Thuc. 1.134.1-3.

that states conducting these events would have felt no obligation to provide accommodation in order to attract participants.

Practical considerations explain why religious centres, despite attracting large numbers of pilgrims, would not attempt to provide accommodation for such pilgrims, even if the main function of the site was a religious one. For example, the Panhellenic Olympic games were the only Panhellenic celebrations that occurred at this site, and thus every four years the site would be crowded with pilgrims. Since on no other occasion would Olympia attract visitors on this or even on a greatly reduced scale, the building and provision of permanent dwellings was not feasible, unless exorbitant rents were charged at festival times. It is perhaps significant in this regard that the *katagogion* at Plataea, which was built to accommodate official delegations to the Panhellenic Eleutheria, was constructed in 426 from materials salvaged from the sacked city.⁹ Sacred sites often owned property, comprising not only land but also houses, but these were let out for long periods of time, and thus would not have been available for the use of pilgrims. This was even the case at such sites as Delos, which could expect pilgrims on a regular, rather than periodic, basis.¹⁰

Pilgrims attending festivals of sacred mysteries in populated centres may have been able to find accommodation in inns, hotels and other lodging houses, while a type of private board might also have been available. The *demos* of the Athenians, stated the writer of the text commonly referred to as the “Old Oligarch”, derived many benefits from the fact that the allies were obliged to have many of their law-suits tried at Athens which included the profit to be made on hiring out rooms by those who had extra space in their houses.¹¹ The influx of pilgrims at festival sites would have provided similar opportunities for the exploitation of those in need of lodging by those with the requisite facilities.

It is, of course, possible that some pilgrims could have been housed by relatives or friends at the sacred site, if this site were located in a major population centre. But the concept that travellers can stay with friends or relatives in places some distance from their own homes is a relatively modern one. It is unlikely that ordinary people in

⁹ The Plataean *katagogion* is discussed below nn. 54-59, with text; see Thuc. 3.68.3 as evidence that it was built of salvaged material. For the Eleutheria, see Plut. *Arist.* 21.1-6; cf. ch. 1 n. 142, with text.

¹⁰ See the references and bibliographical details assembled by Kraynak *Hostelries* 30-34 (her chapter on sanctuary-owned “hostelries”), to which now add Hennig *Chiron* 15 (1985) 165-186; cf. ch. 4 n. 119, with text. While the main religious activity was the Delia (for which see ch. 7 nn. 2-24, with text) it seems that pilgrims could be expected at Delos on a fairly regular basis, with the Delians making a living from the pilgrim trade: Athen. 172f-73a; see ch. 4 n. 119; ch. 7 n. 22, with text).

¹¹ [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.17-18.

the Hellenic world would have had such connections outside their own polis, given both the nature of the polis and the lack of opportunities for them to make such associations. A pilgrim may have had a metic relative in another state, and if so could have sought shelter with him, but this must have been a rare occurrence.

The evidence for the widespread use of tents as a means of temporary accommodation comes from various sites, some of which were healing centres, others mystery cult centres, venues for Panhellenic games, or seats of oracles. All these shared the feature of being popular sites (some more so than others), attracting large numbers of pilgrims. The best evidence for tents comes from the inscribed cult regulations of the sacred mysteries of Andania, in the Peloponnese, which were annual in nature, but even so this did not make the erection of permanent accommodation for pilgrims feasible. Amongst its wealth of detail on cult regulations, this first century BC inscription has a separate section devoted to the tents, *skennai*, of pilgrim-initiates,¹² suggesting that these were the main if not the only means of shelter for the pilgrims. Furthermore, the tents of pilgrim-initiates at Andania were under the jurisdiction of the sacred men, *hieroi*, in charge of many aspects of the mysteries, and the fact that there were enough tents to require some sort of regulation also suggests the importance of tents as a means of shelter. This Andanian inscription records a stipulation on the size of the tents, and pilgrims attending the sacred site would have had problems if the tent which they had brought with them exceeded thirty feet (nine metres) in length on any one side; thirty feet maximum per side was to be the precise measurement, and it was forbidden for curtains and screens to be placed around the tents, and tents were not to be pitched within the area marked off by the *hieroi*.¹³ The size of the tents allowed, up to nine hundred square feet, might seem generous, but on the other hand, tents were presumably shared by many people, and few would have been of such a size. The restriction on the size of tents might have been sumptuary in nature, as were other restrictions in this inscription,¹⁴ but could also indicate that space was at a premium: the picture conjured up is of large numbers of pilgrims jostling for space on the sacred plain of Andania.

It is perhaps possible that the restriction on tents aimed at blurring the socio-economic differences between initiates, because they were all equal in the eyes of the god. This idea, however, is not supported by the regulation in the same inscription which forbade initiates from keeping couches or silver plate to the value of more than

¹² LSCG 65.34-39.

¹³ LSCG 65.34-36: σκανᾶν· σκανᾶν δὲ μὴ ἐπιτρεπόντω οἱ ἱεροὶ μῆθένα ἔχειν ἐν / τετραγώνῳ μείζω ποδῶν τριάκοντα, μῆδὲ περιτιθέμεν ταῖς σκαναῖς μῆτε δέρρεις μῆτε αὐλείας, μῆδὲ ἐν ᾧ ἂν τόπωι περιστεμ/ματώσωντι οἱ ἱεροὶ μῆθένα τῶν μὴ ὄντων ἱερῶν ἔχειν σκανᾶν.

¹⁴ See ch. 4 nn. 22, 26, with text.

three hundred drachmas in their tents.¹⁵ While this might have been intended as sumptuary legislation, the fact that the permissible amount of property allowed was three hundred drachmas, a generous sum, and the emphasis placed in the inscription on keeping order and on good behaviour, could mean that these restrictions on the amount of personal property to be kept in the tents were a precaution against theft and associated problems.¹⁶ The difficulties of organising a large group of people must have been onerous enough without encouraging thieves and other disreputable elements, who we can imagine would have been attracted by the prospect of wealth stored in the tents of such large groups, and penalties were laid down for having more than the permissible amount.¹⁷

This restriction on the possession of property is interesting on another account, for it implies that it was considered feasible by those formulating the regulations that some of the pilgrims staying in the tents would have had more than three hundred drachmas of personal wealth with them. This is clearly an important factor in considering the socio-economic background of pilgrims, and though some of the initiates staying in tents must therefore have been wealthy accommodation in a tent was nevertheless considered suitable for them. The tents were large enough to have been comfortable, though this naturally would have depended on the number of individuals it accommodated. That tents were an accepted mode of accommodation at Andania and elsewhere explains why there was never any provision of permanent dwellings on a large scale (a necessary qualification since some sites did provide accommodation for a select few pilgrims). Pilgrims were thus prepared to make do with temporary shelter, though not to do without the luxuries of home completely, if it was assumed that some of them would bring silver plate in excess of three hundred drachmas and sumptuous portable accommodation, as well as a number of personal slaves.¹⁸

Andania was presumably a less popular pilgrim destination than other sites, such as Delphi and Olympia, but the necessity for tents prevailed at larger cult centres as well. In a fragment of a play by the comic poet Heniokhos, mention is made of a theoric *skene* at Olympia and, also in this connection, of representatives of states under Athenian control who had come to Olympia in order to honour Zeus for

¹⁵ *LSCG* 65.38. Compare with this the high value of the clothes which women were allowed to wear at the ceremony, ch. 4 nn. 22, 26, with text.

¹⁶ *LSCG* 65.41-45, .75-84, .112-114. For theft at festival sites, see also ch. 4 n. 82, with text.

¹⁷ *LSCG* 65.38-39.

¹⁸ Valuables: *LSCG* 65.38-39; slaves are mentioned several times: .76, .79, .80-84, .102, .105, .109; .102 seems to be the only reference which need not indicate slaves brought along by pilgrims.

liberating them from the payment of *phoros*.¹⁹ It is possible, therefore, that these *theoroi* were portrayed as using this tent while at Olympia.

Other evidence also shows clearly that tents were a normal means of accommodation at Olympia. Certainly competitors at the Olympic games stayed in tents: Alkibiades, for example, when he competed, had a tent provided by the Ephesians which was twice the size of the tent of the Athenian *theoria*.²⁰ Lysias whipped up the Olympic crowd in 388/7 against the tyrant Dionysios of Syracuse, with the result that the *skenai* of the tyrant's *theoria* were destroyed.²¹ Plutarch records that Themistokles reacted angrily to the richness of the decoration of the *skene* of the tyrant Hiero in the fifth century, who had sent horses, chariots, and drivers to participate in the Olympic games, and advised the Hellenes to tear it down.²² Lysias is not stated to have been provoked by the lavishness of Dionysios' *theoria* but the sources do note the lavishness of the tents of these *theoroi*, interwoven with gold and decorated with expensive and coloured cloth, which were despoiled by the rioting crowd.²³

Xenophon's reference to destruction of *skenomata* by the Arkadians, when at war with the Eleans in 364, should not be taken as evidence that tents were used at Olympia. The Arkadians had seized Olympia, and prepared to celebrate the games, whereupon the Eleans invaded Olympia in order to regain control of the site, and defeated the Arkadians in battle, but withdrew having encountered difficulties in dislodging the Arkadians from the sacred area itself.²⁴ The Arkadians and their allies, fearful of the outcome of the following day's battle, then cut down the "well

¹⁹ Heniokh. fr. 5 (Kassel, Austin *PCG* 6.556-557). Bill *TAPA* 32 (1901) 204 rejects the usual interpretation, and briefly argues that the reference in the play to *σκηνην θεωρικην* is to "theatrical scene", though this does not seem to be the natural interpretation of the lines. The reference to *phoros* (line 11) led Meineke *FCG* 3.563 to suggest a date when there would have been allies under Athenian domination between the Peloponnesian and Social Wars, but Kock *CAF* 2.434 preferred "belli Chremonidei finis". Edmonds *FAC* 1.917 n. b opts for a Peloponnesian War dating, taking the context to refer to the abolition of the *phoros* in 411. Most recently, Kassel, Austin 557 believe the date to be *incertum*, but do note that contributions under the Second Athenian Confederacy were termed *syntaxeis* rather than *phoroi*.

²⁰ Andok. 4.30; Athen. 534d; Plut. *Alk.* 12.1. Alkibiades' participation at these Olympics is also mentioned at Thuc. 6.16.2 and Isok. 16.32-35; Isok. 16.34 refers to the ostentation of his expenditure: "...his expenditure on the sacrifices and the other expenses concerning the festival was so unstinting and magnificent that the public funds of all the others appeared to be less than his private wealth". Cf. Hatzfeld *Alcibiade* 130; Benson *Alcibiades* 106; Ellis *Alcibiades* 51.

²¹ Diod. 14.109.1-3; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 29-30; *Lys.* 33; Plut. *Mor.* 836d; see also ch. 2 n. 71, with text.

²² Plut. *Them.* 25.1; see also ch. 2 n. 72, with text.

²³ Diod. 14.109.1; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 29

²⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.14-31.

constructed *skenomata*” and built a stockade. Clearly these *skenomata* were sturdy and substantial, and cannot have been tents.²⁵

Aelian records that Plato, while at Olympia, stayed in a tent, and shared it with strangers.²⁶ It is possible that the latter detail was added by Aelian, or his source, in order to provide a dramatic setting for the story and the dialogue which follow, but given the various pieces of evidence concerning Olympia the lack of archaeological remains of dwellings at this site would seem to be explained by the use of tents by those staying there. Pilgrims may have travelled to Olympia and other sacred sites without their own tents, in the hope that they might be able to share with other campers who had room to spare. This sharing may have been paid for, with those who had tents renting out space to those who had no tent of their own.

There is also evidence pertaining to tents at the Isthmian games, and this reflection of Olympic practices suggests that they were used for shelter at all the Panhellenic festivals, despite the fact that evidence for these other festivals is lacking. In a passage from Aristophanes’ *Peace* one of the characters secures a place in advance of the festival for his tent at the Isthmian games by marking out a circle in which to erect it.²⁷ The scholiasts state that this eagerness to obtain a tent site as quickly as possible was due to the narrowness of the Isthmian site, which made camping sites difficult to obtain, and obliged spectators to mark out their tent pitches in advance; there were a limited number of advantageous spots for a tent. Accommodation would have been available at the Isthmian games for some, due to the festival’s proximity to Corinth, but the necessity for erecting tents at Isthmia and the competition for sites involved indicates, however, that lodging was difficult to obtain and was limited in extent. Archaeological evidence suggests that there was accommodation provided by the authorities, which would have offered limited lodging for elite visitors.²⁸ There are no theorodokoi lists for the Isthmian games, but it

²⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.32 (cf. ch. 2 nn. 60-67, with text). Xen. *Hell.* 5.3.19, *Anab.* 2.2.17 mention *skenomata* in contexts where it is indeterminate whether tents or more substantial dwellings are meant, but *skenomata* at *Anab.* 7.4.16 equate with *stegna* at 7.4.12, and with *oikiai* at 7.4.14. The quarters, *stegna*, of Xenophon and his men were in a village (7.4.12), and this is contrasted with the camping arrangements of Seuthes on the plain (ἐσκήνων) and of the other Greeks in the mountains (κατεσκήνησαν) (*Anab.* 7.4.11). The *skenomata* were clearly not *skenai*. Cf. Dillon *ZPE* 83 (1990) 81.

²⁶ Ael. *Var. Hist.* 4.9.

²⁷ Ar. *Peace* 879-80, with Schol. 879. For the joke contained in these lines, and the pun on “Isthmia”, see the scholiasts on line 879, and Sommerstein *Aristophanes’ Peace* 175. The joke and pun are meaningless unless they are parodying an actual occurrence: that pilgrims to the games marked out a site for their tents at the Isthmia, a narrow site.

²⁸ Kraynak *Hostelries* 108-16; and note *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 182-83, discussed below n. 32, with text.

seems safe to assume that there were theorodokoi at Corinth whose role it was to provide accommodation for theoroi attending the Isthmian festival, and this, in the homes of the theorodokoi, would presumably have been in the city itself, a few kilometres from the site of the Isthmian festival. For these theoroi, accommodation away from the actual site of the games would not have been a disadvantage. Their wealthy hosts may have had horses or other transport which they could use; in fact, wealthier pilgrims may have had their own means of transport with them, and the couches mentioned in the regulations for the Andanian mysteries could only have been transported to the site of the mysteries by four-footed animals.²⁹ But for pilgrims who came on foot, and for whom residence at an inconvenient distance from the festival would have been a disadvantage, it was an important consideration to secure a tent-site as soon as possible upon arrival at Isthmia, and the same may have applied to other sacred sites. At Nemea also there was a *xenon* which would have provided accommodation for the more important visitors, but the building is much smaller than the Leonidaion or Epidaurian *katagorgia*.³⁰

There is little evidence for accommodation for the participants, musicians, poets and athletes at Panhellenic festivals, though Alkibiades had a tent at Olympia when he was there, and this was presumably when he was competing in chariot races.³¹ In the second century AD the Roman governor of Achaia granted permission to an individual, Priscus, to purchase the ruins of an old stoa and to convert it into a complex of fifty rooms. But the permission came with the *proviso* that the rooms be given over, in perpetuity, for the use of athletes at the Isthmian games, free of charge; the *agonothetai* in charge of the contests were to allocate the rooms to the athletes.³² This example indicates that, at least in the second century, there was a concern on the part of the authorities that athletes be properly housed. Whether this concern was a feature of the classical period is uncertain, but the case of Alkibiades implies that during that period athletes probably stayed in tents.

Syloson, son of Kalliteles, *strategos* of the Samians, at the time when the Samians were fighting the Aeolians and consequently had not celebrated the customary festival in the shrine of the goddess Hera, argued that they had a better chance of winning if they did celebrate the festival. The Samians were convinced,

²⁹ *LSCG* 65.38-39.

³⁰ Kraynak *Hostelries* 122-47, esp. 143-47, with references; Miller *Nemea* 91; see figs. 3.1, 3.2.

³¹ See above n. 20, with text.

³² *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 182-83 (the editor, Broneer, also provides a translation); cf. Robert *Hellenica* 1 (1940) 43-53; Harris *Greek Athletes* 158. For the provision, see lines 11-13: οὕτως μέντοι ὥστε τοὺς γεινομένους / οἴκους τοῖς ἀθληταῖς προῖκα τῷ καιρῷ τῶν ἀγῶνων σχολάζειν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.

went to the shrine, and erected *skenui*,³³ and this has been taken as a reference to tents used for accommodation.³⁴ However, it could be argued that the army was operating in the field and having tents made use of these, rather than returning to the polis and staying in their homes there. Alternatively, this might be an example of tents erected for the purposes of sacrifice, as the reference does not state specifically that the tents were for accommodation. Accordingly it is a matter of doubt whether the tents were used for accommodation, and whether or not the Samians ordinarily in time of peace as opposed to war made use of them when celebrating the festival in honour of the goddess.

Xenophon established a temple of Artemis at Skillous near Olympia, and he annually offered sacrifice to the goddess in which all the citizens, and the men and women living around, took part. The “goddess” provided food for those encamped in tents,³⁵ and clearly those who had come in from the surrounding neighbourhood, and who lived too far away to retire at the end of the day to the polis, erected tents for their stay. A letter of Antigonos to the people of Teos in the last decade of the fourth century also contains a reference to tents at a festival; whoever is sent to the Panionia from Lebedos is to camp with the Teian delegates as a consequence of the *synoikismos* between the two cities.³⁶ There is also some late evidence which could be considered here, illustrating a continuity of practice. An inscription dated to AD 164-166 records that the priest of the temple of Zeus Panamaros at Stratonikeia erected (“made”) tents for the citizens, the *xenoi* and the slaves “at the place for the lodging of men”,³⁷ and here the reference to *xenoi*, as opposed to citizens, seems to indicate the presence of pilgrims.

There were restrictions, at least at some sacred sites, on where tents could be erected. A decree of the Delphic Amphiktyons records a regulation that no-one other than King Attalos might pitch tents in the stoa of Attalos, which presumably he had in any case himself erected; a fine was provided for cases of flouting the regulation.³⁸ The Delphic Amphiktyons honoured one individual and fellow Amphiktyon, Mentor

³³ Polyain. *Strat.* 6.45.

³⁴ Frickenhaus *RE* 3a (1929) 472, in his collection of evidence on the use of tents for accommodation during festival periods.

³⁵ Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9; cf. Nilsson *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 828; Burkert *Greek Religion* 67; ch. 7 n. 101, with text.

³⁶ *RC* 3.2-4; cf. Nilsson *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 828 with n. 7; ch. 7 n. 35, with text. This text is also translated by Bagnall, Derow *Greek Historical Documents* 13-17.

³⁷ *I. Stratonikeia* 203.16-21, note 20-21: ποιήσας δὲ καὶ σκηνὰς ἐς τὸν τόπον / [π]ρὸς καταγωγὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³⁸ *LSCG Suppl.* 43.3-7; cf. Nilsson *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 828. *LSCG* 78.21, an Amphiktyonic decree concerning the Pythia, has a reference to houses but in a fragmentary context.

of Naupaktos, with the hereditary privileges of *prodikia*, *asphaleia*, *asylia*, *ateleia* and the right of the “first tent”.³⁹ The first four are all known to be important privileges and to apply to Delphi, and while the nature of the privilege of the “first tent” is not made clear, its inclusion along with these other important privileges indicates that it is also important, and as these other privileges are to be exercised in connection with Delphi, the right of the tent must similarly be so. Mentor thus has been granted the right to the best position for pitching his tent when he comes to Delphi: when the Amphiktyonic council meet at Delphi the members will stay in tents, but in future Mentor, a fellow Amphiktyon, will have the best site. Thus the Amphiktyons made use of tents as a means of accommodation while at Delphi, rather than staying with citizens of the town. Not all officials visiting Delphi, however, were accommodated in tents as two Delphic inscriptions deal with the case of ambassadors at Delphi who stayed with a citizen, and who complained to the Delphic authorities that the accommodation they were given was poorer than in previous years, and it is possible to argue that these ambassadors were *theoroi* attending the Pythia, and that their host was a *theorodokos*.⁴⁰

At Andania no-one other than the sacred men, *hieroi*, of the cult was to pitch a tent within the area marked off by them; no other restriction on the actual placing of the tents is indicated.⁴¹ The late inscription from Stratonikeia, which mentions festival tents erected in the place set aside for lodging, has been compared with the Andanian provision and the suggestion has been made that this also probably refers to some restriction on the places where tents could be erected.⁴²

There is also some evidence which provides information of an inconclusive nature. The building known as the Leonidaion at Olympia is sometimes described as being reserved for visiting officials and dignitaries,⁴³ but by this it should not be understood that this building housed all the *theoroi* attending the Olympic festival. Pausanias, the only ancient authority on the structure, simply mentions that it was built at the expense of an individual named Leonidas, and that, in Pausanias' time, it was used as the residence of the Roman governor of Greece.⁴⁴ The building is fairly large (74.82 x 81.8 m.),⁴⁵ but the number of the rooms is not great,⁴⁶ and it should

³⁹ *SIG*³ 422.9-11.

⁴⁰ *FD* 3.1.357-58; Dillon *ZPE* 83 (1990) 64-76; cf. ch. 1 n. 91, with text.

⁴¹ *LSCG* 65.35-36; cf. Nilsson *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 828-829; idem *Griechische Feste* 341.

⁴² Deschamps, Cousin *BCH* 15 (1891) 175 (cf. *BCH* 11 (1887) 379-381).

⁴³ Paus. 5.15.1-3; see Stillwell *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* s.v. Olympia, 649; Swaddling *Ancient Olympic Games* 23. See also fig. 3.1.

⁴⁴ Paus. 5.15.2.

⁴⁵ Stillwell *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* s.v. Olympia 649.

not be supposed that it held a great many occupants. Kraynak on the basis of the passage where Aeschines claims to have shared a room with two others while on the Second Embassy to Philip, suggests that it was normal for envoys to share rooms and that the small rooms of the Leonidaion could have held two, and the large rooms four to six, people. If this were the case over one hundred people could have stayed at the Leonidaion at any one time. The evidence of Aeschines, however, may not be applicable to the Leonidaion; in fact, the passage may even be a rhetorical invention. The rooms of the Leonidaion vary in size, so that it is just as possible that all the rooms held only one person, or the larger ones only two or three. This would mean a smaller number of guests, and that those staying there would have done so in greater comfort than if larger numbers were lodged there.⁴⁷ Although some *theoroi* from important states may have been invited to stay the majority of *theoroi* had, apparently, to find their own accommodation.⁴⁸ Prior to the Roman period it is impossible to define strictly who made use of the Leonidaion, and the vague appellation “dignitaries” must be employed. Presumably the Eleans made the decision as to who could stay in this building, but how they did so, and the criteria of choice which they employed, must remain conjectural, though perhaps it was a matter of custom as to who could make use of the building. It seems that the Athenian *theoria* was one of those that did not have the privilege of accommodation in the Leonidaion.⁴⁹ The same unresolved questions concerning who stayed in the *katagogia* and on what criteria also hold true concerning other sacred sites.

Other *katagogia* have been identified at Epidauros and Oropos, while a *katagogion* at Plataea is attested by Thucydides. The building at Epidauros is in front of the theatre and to the left as one faces the orchestra, and is square, and fairly large, with the rooms clustering around four square courtyards.⁵⁰ It compared favourably in size with the *katagogion* (the Leonidaion) at Olympia, and had more rooms.⁵¹ Clearly Epidauros could claim a reputation rivalling that of Olympia, and the size of the *katagogion* is a reflection of the importance of this site. The building would have

⁴⁶ See the plan in Mallwitz *AA* (1971) 154+.

⁴⁷ Aesch. 2.126; Kraynak *Hostelries* 55. That there was not a second storey, see Mallwitz *Olympia* 251; cf. Kraynak 53.

⁴⁸ For the date of the construction of the Leonidaion, see Mallwitz *Olympia* 252; Kraynak *Hostelries* 54.

⁴⁹ Andok. 4.30.

⁵⁰ For the *katagogion*, see Burford *Temple Builders* 84-85; Kraynak *Hostelries* 63-73, and for literature, 180-81 n. 149; see fig. 3.2 for plan, fig. 8.3 a-b for site plans of Epidauros. Dates for the building range from the late fourth century to the early third century, Kraynak 70-71.

⁵¹ The Leonidaion: 74.82 x 81.8 m.; the Epidaurian *katagogion*: 76.30 m.² (Kraynak *Hostelries* 51, 64). The Epidaurian *katagogion* had more rooms than the Leonidaion, so it could presumably accommodate more visitors than the Leonidaion (compare fig. 3.1 with 3.2).

housed dignitaries attending the penteteric Epidaurian festival, and, in addition, presumably important people who visited Epidauros in search of a cure would have made use of the building.⁵² A striking feature of Oropos is the long healing chamber in which the sick of Attica and Boeotia could incubate. Running parallel to the building is a stream, the other side of which is occupied by the remains of two complexes, probably dating to the third century BC, which have been identified, but not conclusively, as dwelling places for the pilgrims.⁵³

Just as other festival sites had *katagogia*, the same is true of Plataea. With building materials salvaged from the polis, which they had completely razed in 426, the Spartans built a *katagogion* in the vicinity of the sanctuary of Hera, as well as a stone temple dedicated to the goddess.⁵⁴ Clearly, worship was to be continued at Plataea, and the emphasis on Hera presumably indicates that some form of religious event, perhaps even a festival (which may have been a continuation of a Plataean ceremony) was to occur at this site.⁵⁵ Furthermore, celebration of the festival of the Eleutheria was presumably to continue.⁵⁶ Finley notes that temples and cities commonly "... maintained lodging houses at shrines that attracted large numbers of visitors...."⁵⁷ But the implication of the erection of the *katagogion* at Plataea is that no such official accommodation existed there. Yet this polis was the centre of the Eleutherian festival, as well as the Pan-Boeotian Daidala, which must have attracted visitors from other, particularly Boeotian, states, especially as some form of celebration in honour of Hera and not simply a local event appears to be indicated. The site where the Eleutheria was held, following the destruction of the polis, was without habitation like Olympia, so these visitors must either have found accommodation in the polis itself before it was destroyed, or have resided in tents, since it was the destruction of the city itself which led to the construction of the *katagogion*.⁵⁸ Important visitors coming to Plataea before its destruction would have been hosted by Plataean *theorodokoi*, but since this could no longer be the case,

⁵² See *IG IV* 1² 122, iama 31 for a royal dignitary, Andromakha of Epeiros, at Epidauros; cf. ch. 8 n. 146, with text.

⁵³ For details, see Kraynak *Hostelries* 117-22; at 121-22 Kraynak questions the identification of one of the buildings, the so-called "summer" *katagogion*, as a lodging place; for plan, see fig. 3.3.

⁵⁴ Thuc. 3.68.3; cf. Nilsson *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 829.

⁵⁵ Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 2.358.

⁵⁶ As with the Leonidaion, who made the decision about who was eligible for accommodation in the hostel is unknown. This may have been the responsibility of the Boeotian confederacy as Thebes is quite close to Plataea.

⁵⁷ In his introductory notes to Warner *Thucydides* 235 n. 32.

⁵⁸ Cf. Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 2.358; for the Great Daidala, see ch. 7 nn. 103-25, with text.

permanent accommodation may have been preferred for important dignitaries, and the Spartan-built *katagogion* met this need.⁵⁹

Whether this *katagogion* would have accommodated all the pilgrims coming to the site is a point which is not clear, for with all the Plataeans either in exile, or massacred, the numbers who celebrated the Eleutherian festival might well have been affected. Previously held and organised by the Plataeans, it could have been celebrated on a much reduced scale after the demise of the polis – indeed it would be surprising if this were not the case. Foreign attendance may have fallen off significantly, although this *katagogion* had a length of two hundred feet, and, unlike the Leonidaion, an upper story, clearly implying a large clientele.⁶⁰ The Plataean *katagogion* may also have been reserved for the most important visitors, as it was large, but not enormous. It seems that religious sites away from the centres of population were sometimes provided with a hostel, but that any such hostel would fail to accommodate pilgrims in large numbers.

Tents were erected at some religious ceremonies not only for the accommodation of pilgrims but also in some cases as places in which worshippers could participate in ritual meals, though this use of tents should not be confused with the use of tents by pilgrims for accommodation.⁶¹ Michel has claimed that *theoroi* attending religious celebrations were accommodated in public dwellings provided by the polis which was hosting the celebration,⁶² but the evidence which he cites in every case refers not to sleeping quarters but to *hestiatoria* banqueting halls. The people of Tenos had built huge *hestiatoria* in order to cope with the influx of pilgrims taking part in the festival of Poseidon.⁶³ These halls are not described as places of rest, and while it is possible that pilgrims found shelter in them at night, it would have been a far from satisfactory arrangement from a practical point of view. Similarly, while it is known that the Eleians had a *hestiatorion* in which they entertained the Olympic victors, this *hestiatorion* was actually in the Prytaneion.⁶⁴ The tyrant Periander may have arranged entertainment in the *hestiatorion* for those who had attended the sacrifice to

⁵⁹ Sokolowski, in his commentary on the Andrian decree (*LSCG Suppl.* 51, p. 104), suggests, incorrectly, that this *katagogion* was a *hestiatorion*.

⁶⁰ Thuc. 3.68.3.

⁶¹ See Nilsson *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 828; idem *Griechische Feste* 188-189; Burkert *Greek Religion* 107 with 390 nn. 80 and 234. Burkert 390 gives H. Schäfer, *Die Laubhütte* (Leipzig: 1939) as a reference, but unfortunately *non vidi*.

⁶² Michel *DA* 5 (1919) 211 with n. 1, citing Strabo 10.5.11 (487), Paus. 5.15.12, Plut. *Mor.* 146d and Hdt. 4.35.4.

⁶³ Strabo 10.5.11 (487). Ziebarth *Gasthäuser* 342, mentions this passage as an example of a *hestiatorion* ("Speisehaus"), as well as Hdt. 4.35.4 (on 341), which is discussed below n. 66, with text.

⁶⁴ Paus. 5.15.12; Michel is therefore mistaken in citing this passage.

Aphrodite,⁶⁵ but this indicates nothing about the shelter for *theoroi*, nor does the fact that the Keians had a *hestiatorion*.⁶⁶ Accordingly, none of these four cases provides information about accommodation for either *theoroi* or other pilgrims.

Some evidence might seem to indicate that pilgrims may have lodged in temples while visiting a sacred site. In 431 some Athenians, abandoning the countryside, took up residence in temples and the shrines of the heroes, except for the Acropolis and the Eleusinion.⁶⁷ At a later stage in the war more space was created for those who had come in from the country, but Thucydides is not clear on whether the Athenians discontinued residency of the temples, though it does seem likely that this was the case.⁶⁸ However, at the time of the plague, Thucydides states that the temples in which they had taken up residence were full of the dead bodies of those who had died in them; this was presumably in 431, when war broke out, but he could well mean that these people had moved in because of their illness at the time of the plague.⁶⁹ Thus the apportionment of space which Thucydides describes in his narrative on this year as having taken place “later” may in fact have taken place after the plague and because of it. It would be surprising if the temples were inhabited for the duration of the war, and the number of the deaths in the temples may have acted as a catalyst for ending residency in them if people at that stage had not left of their own accord, because of the corpses, or been killed by the plague. Residency in the temples may have been officially discouraged or the prohibition applying to the Acropolis and Eleusinion may have been extended. Aversion to death within the sacred precincts may well have motivated the Athenians to end residency in temples,⁷⁰ but in any case it would never have been a normal state of affairs for people to use temples for their accommodation. At the time of the mutilation of the *Hermes*, the Athenians became suspicious of a plot to overthrow the democracy, and when it was discovered that a small band of Spartans had marched up as far as the Isthmos, the threat was taken so seriously that some of the Athenians, armed, spent that night in the temple of Theseus.⁷¹ These two cases indicate clearly that inhabitation of temples was unusual, being restricted to war and emergency situations.

Sacred buildings, often referred to as *abata*, were used as incubation centres, and people slept in them seeking a cure. But while there is epigraphic evidence for

⁶⁵ Plut. *Mor.* 146d.

⁶⁶ Hdt. 4.35.4.

⁶⁷ Thuc. 2.17.1 (cf. 1.143.5, 144.4), 2.13.2, 2.14.1-2.

⁶⁸ Thuc. 2.17.2.

⁶⁹ Thuc. 2.52.3.

⁷⁰ For aversion to death, see Parker *Miasma* 32-73, esp. 33 with n. 5; cf. 164 n. 115; note also Burkert *Greek Religion* 79, 87.

⁷¹ Thuc. 6.27.3, 28.2, 60.1, 4, 61.1-2

these incubation procedures, none of the extant inscriptions make it clear if those involved in these procedures were allowed to dwell in the *abata* themselves, keeping their personal effects and the like in them. The existence of separate dwellings at Oropos in addition to the incubation centre (referred to not as an *abaton* but simply as a *hieron*),⁷² would seem to indicate that they were not. Practical considerations indicate why temples could not be used for dwelling places: they were primarily places of worship, and to have pilgrims lodging in them could interfere with the religious activities of the faithful. Temple cleanliness would also have been a consideration, as would the storage of personal effects. Anti-social behaviour in a sacred building could also lead to problems. The people of Knidos passed a decree forbidding men and women from sleeping in the sanctuary of Bakkhos, this decree being prompted by damage done to the shrine by Bakkhoi who had spent the night in the temple, presumably in a state of inebriation.⁷³ Damage to sacred property would be avoided by restrictions on sleeping in temples, and a decree from Amorgos orders the *neokoros* (temple attendant) of the shrine of Hera to ensure that no foreigner, *xenos*, comes and stays in the shrine.⁷⁴ This provision was aimed at preventing transients and the like from sleeping in the temple, and accordingly excluded the possibility that any local person would sleep there.

Worshippers therefore could not sleep in the temple itself, though buildings might be provided within the temple precincts for this purpose. At the temple of Asklepios at Tithorea there were dwellings for both the suppliants of the god and his servants. By way of contrast, the shrine of Isis, about forty stades from Asklepios' temple at Tithorea, was the holiest Greek shrine of the Greeks to the Egyptian goddess, and the Tithoreans thought that no-one should dwell near it. No-one was allowed to enter the shrine unless Isis summoned them through a dream, and even then the dreamer would need to find accommodation outside the area considered to be too holy for dwellings.⁷⁵

A Samian decree setting out regulations to protect the sacred grove of Hera forbade camping amongst the trees of the grove as a measure to protect the trees;⁷⁶

⁷² *LSCG* 69.2-3; presumably the *abaton* at Epidauros also was only for incubation, though, if so, this may have caused inconvenience for the sick; see figs. 3.3, 8.3a-b.

⁷³ *LSAM* 55; cf. ch. 4 nn. 15, 81, with text; note that Sokolowski's list of "documents analogues" (p. 142) refers not to other cases of the same sort but to other types of prohibitions; cf. Dillon *ZPE* 83 (1990) 87.

⁷⁴ *LSCG* 101, translated in Rice, Stambaugh *Sources* 124.

⁷⁵ Asklepios' sanctuary: Paus. 10.32.12; cf. 10.34.7: dwellings in the temple precinct of Athena for the priests; Isis' sanctuary: 10.32.13 (cf. Hamilton *Incubation* 95).

⁷⁶ *LSCG Suppl.* 81.7-8; cf. ch. 4, esp. nn. 90-94, with text.

sleeping in the shrine of Zeus at Magnesia was also forbidden.⁷⁷ Visitors to these shrines could thus not camp in the sanctuary grounds. This provision also helps to suggest why at Andania a special place would be set aside for tents, since woodland at sacred sites would attract campers for purposes of shelter from the sun, and possibly because firewood would be more accessible. Perhaps at Andania it was necessary to set aside a special place for camping; for these reasons, though of course control of the pilgrims would have been easier if they were kept together, which might be sufficient explanation as to why the tents were restricted to one area.

In conclusion, it can be stated that temples could be places of shelter during times of crisis, as during the Peloponnesian War, and that the ill would be allowed to spend the night in certain sacred buildings, such as *abata*, though not actually in temples, in the hope of a cure. But pilgrims attending festivals would not have been allowed to lodge in temples for the duration of their stay at a sacred site and would generally have been expected to provide their own accommodation. Official delegations, *theoriai*, visiting festival sites, would also have stayed in tents on occasions, like the Athenian *theoria* at Olympia. In addition, at certain sites *theoriai* might have been able to stay in *katazogia* when these existed and space was available, or would have been hosted, according to custom, by wealthy individuals, *theorodokoi*.⁷⁸ Pilgrims of the Hellenic world, in general, found their own shelter, and it appears that at sacred sites it was the lot of the “faithful”, whether travelling on their own or with an entourage of slaves, and possessions, to be responsible for their own accommodation, the most popular solution being the portable *skene*.

⁷⁷ SIG³ 685.81-82: μηθεὶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Δικταίου μήτε ἐννέμηι μήτε ἐναυλοστατῆι μήτε σπεύρηι μήτε Ξυλεύηι. In general, note Sokolowski *TAPA* 91 (1960) 378.

⁷⁸ See ch 1 n. 90, with text.

§4 RELIGIOUS AND SECULAR REGULATIONS AT PILGRIMAGE SITES

The mechanics of pilgrimage, including the means by which sacred truces were established and festivals announced so that pilgrims could attend events in safety, the arrangements made for official pilgrims at sanctuaries, issues such as the safety of pilgrims, and where they were to stay once they were at the sacred site, were essential factors in the successful organisation of religious celebrations. But pilgrimage was, above all else, a religious activity. It was for religious reasons that people undertook pilgrimages to sacred sites and some of these sites will be examined, in subsequent chapters, specifically Eleusis, Delphi, Epidauros, and the groups involved in ethnic pilgrimages, with an examination of the different experiences which pilgrims underwent at these particular places. At Hellenic pilgrimage sites, there were, of course, certain paramount religious and secular concerns felt by the authorities to be important and a number of restrictions were placed upon worshippers, many of these restrictions being primarily of a religious nature and related to cult observances. These included prohibitions and restrictions on clothing, food, entry into the shrine, language, sexual activity, and contact with impurity, termed *miasma* by the Greeks. An understanding of these regulations is necessary for an appreciation of the nature of the religious experience which the pilgrim met with at sacred sites.

Religion, as an act of mediation between mortals and immortals, is a term embracing the various acts of worship by which humans attempt to establish a link between themselves and the divine. Acts of worship entail contact with the divine, wherein the human meets the supernatural. This is an extraordinary communication, and, as such, it is distinct and separated from the normal events of everyday life. Acts of worship commence with a recognition that the worshipper, in initiating contact with the divine, is engaged in a special activity, a non-mundane process; as a result, the impure must become pure.¹ Worship commences, in all religions, with ritual acts which set the act of worship apart from routine activity: these acts can be termed “acts of entry”. The Greeks did not have such a term,² but the fact that they had such rites occurring before the sacrifice itself validates its use. The converse of the acts of entry are the “acts of exit” which take place when contact with the divine has been completed. Once again, there is no Greek term, but there is a clear consciousness

¹ Hubert, Mauss *Sacrifice* 20-32; Burkert *Greek Religion* 75-79; Parker *Miasma*, esp. 18-31.

² *Katarkhesthai*, *κατάρχεσθαι* (as used, for example, at Hom. *Od.* 3.445, Hdt. 4.103, Andok. 1.126) refers to the beginning of the act of sacrifice, not to acts of entry.

shown in Greek religious behaviour that special rites had to be observed after the sacrifice, before the return to the profane world.³

A Greek worshipper therefore did not enter into or terminate worship without special ceremony. Movement from the profane to the sacred and back to the profane state was not automatic: rather it was subject to ritual control. Worshippers carried out acts which enabled them to pass safely into and out of contact with the divine, back into the non-divine reality of daily experience, and thus there were rituals which initiated communication with the divine, the act of worship with the divine, and finally the observances concluding the contact with the sacred. Analysing the religious restrictions placed upon the pilgrim worshipper at religious sites is largely an exercise in dealing with the formalities concerned with these rites of entry and acts of exit.

Evidence in this regard can be drawn from several sites. Such a comparative phenomenology of cult practices within the Greek world provides a sound overview of what was required of pilgrim worshippers in a religious sense. Individual sanctuaries had various ordinances governing the behaviour of worshippers while they were at the temple, and although these do not always refer specifically to pilgrims, the fact that they are prescriptions covering all worshippers at a shrine means that any pilgrim attending would have been bound by these. Of course on some occasions pilgrims are specifically mentioned, or the regulations come from sites known to have attracted them: for example, regulations governing the method of worship at sites such as Eleusis, Oropos, Andania, Epidauros, Delphi, and other cult centres can be taken as applying to pilgrims, for these were the main body of worshippers at these sites.

Obviously, the most important prerequisite for a pilgrim at any sacred place was the ability to enter the sacred site. Various sanctuaries in the Hellenic world restricted access to the temple itself, though there appears to be little or no evidence that regulations excluding certain categories of worshippers ever discriminated specifically against pilgrims.⁴ Rather, restrictions on access to temples applied equally to the local worshipper and to the visitor in most cases. No evidence yet to hand indicates that pilgrims were actively discouraged from visiting sacred sites by the states in which these sites were located. For example, a decree of the people of Arkesine of Amorgos, which orders the *neokoros*, custodian, of the shrine of Hera to ensure that no *xenos*, foreigner, came and stayed in the shrine, does not aim at excluding pilgrims from attending it but is more probably a precaution intended to stop transients from

³ It is also interesting to note that Sanskrit texts do have a term for this - *prayaniyeshthi*, the entry into the sacrifice - and also mention rites of exit: *udayaniyeshthi*; see Hubert, Mauss *Sacrifice* 112 n. 52.

⁴ Hewitt *TAPA* 40 (1909) 83-91.

sleeping there.⁵ The Spartan king Kleomenes was refused entry to the temple of Hera at Argos, on the grounds that it was unholy for strangers to sacrifice there, and reacted by having the priest dragged away and flogged, before proceeding to make his sacrifice. In a similar incident, Kleomenes was told by the priestess of Athena's temple on the Athenian acropolis that he could not enter the temple, as no Dorians were permitted to do so.⁶ These would appear to be cases where a pilgrim who came to a temple was discriminated against, but on the other hand the antipathy of the Argives and Athenians for the Spartans may have provoked these responses on political grounds against Kleomenes, rather than being solitary examples of religious restrictions against pilgrims.

Access to some temples was only permitted to the public on certain days of the year with only the priest or priestess being allowed unlimited access. Some temples were not open every day of the year. At some sites, however, entry could be restricted to a particular group, and this provision usually worked in favour of the pilgrim. At the village Akharaka (between Tralleis and Nysa in Asia Minor), the Ploutonion, which comprised a precinct of Ploutos and Kore and a cave in the hill above, the Kharonion, was the centre of a healing cult based on dream interpretation. The priests of the shrine would sleep in the cave and would apply their interpretation of their dreams to the illnesses of individuals who had come to the site in search of healing, and stayed in the village. Sometimes the priests would take the invalids into the cave and leave them there. Only the priests and the ill were allowed at the site: "to all others the place is forbidden and deadly."⁷ The pilgrim in search of a cure was of course given special treatment, because the cult centre was designed for the ill.

In the case of cults involving mystery celebrations, the worshipper could only enter the sanctuary if she or he was initiated in the cult of the sanctuary or was

⁵ *LSCG* 101.3-4: μή ἐξεῖναι κατα/[λ]ύεσθαι εἰς τὸ Ἡραῖ[ον] ξένωι μηδενί. The *neokoros* would be fined ten drachmae a day if he did not keep *xenoi* out of the shrine (5-7). For not sleeping in temples see ch. 3, esp. 1 n. 6-8, with text. On Mykonos, after the *synoikismos* which took place in about 200 BC, strangers (*xenoi*) were excluded from one particular day of cult activity, a provision presumably aimed at strengthening the ties amongst those involved in the *synoikismos* or perhaps reflecting an established exclusivity of the cult activity; the festivities would be an exclusive gathering of the citizens (*LSCG* 96.26).

⁶ Hdt. 6.81 (Argos): ὁ ἱρεὺς ἀπηγόρευε, φὰς οὐκ ὄσιον εἶναι ξείνω αὐτόθι θύειν; Hdt. 5.72.3 (Athens). Griffiths *Was Kleomenes Mad?* 58-60 discusses the incident at the Heraion and argues that Kleomenes' behaviour at the shrine fits into a pattern of "typical tyrant behaviour [which] might account for the allegation" (58); cf. also, on his impiety, Immerwahr *Form and Thought* 192-93; Hart *Herodotus* 83. 128-29, 132. See Paus. 5.2.1-5 for the myths explaining why the Eleians chose to bar themselves from the Isthmian festival; cf. ch. 7 n. 127, with text.

⁷ Strabo 14.1.44 (649-50): τοῖς δ' ἱλλοῖς ἄδυστός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ὀλέθριος. For cures through dreams, see ch. 8, esp. 1 n. 90-100, 204 (for Akharaka), with text.

undergoing initiation, and Eleusis was such a case.⁸ A similar restriction occurred in the Boeotian shrine of Demeter and Kore, and Pausanias records the unfortunate fate of several Persians who, uninitiated, entered the Boeotian shrine during the Second Persian War: they went mad and some drowned themselves in the sea while others threw themselves from precipices to their deaths.⁹ The historicity of such stories is of little importance, particularly when recorded by Pausanias some six hundred years after the events were supposed to have occurred. Rather, the stories were intended to serve as a warning to the uninitiated worshipper not to enter the shrine. Equally as inconvenient as the shrine which was totally inaccessible to the uninitiated was the shrine which opened only once a year. Pausanias records that the temple of Dionysos the Deliverer in Boeotia was open only on certain consecutive days, once a year, and it is clear that he visited the shrine when it was closed.¹⁰ At another place he was luckier: the sanctuary of the Mother Dindymene near the river Dirke in Boeotia, where Pindar had dedicated the image of Dindymene, was opened only one day a year, and Pausanias had the good fortune to be there on that day.¹¹

In a few cases, but by no means all, the worshippers might be denied entry to a shrine because a priest or priestess needed to be present during the act of worship, but regulations requiring the presence of priests and priestesses need not necessarily have been religious in origin, for it seems that in Greece at most shrines anyone could undertake sacrifice, as long as the ritual rules were observed.¹² An insight about how regulations restricting the access of worshippers to temples came into being can be seen from a decree from Arkesine, on the island of Amorgos. The decree concerns the priestess of Demeter at Arkesine, who came before the prytany of the *boule* and made a report about public sacrifices at the shrine, also complaining about women who were making use of the shrine. The *boule* and the *demos* subsequently passed a decree on this:¹³ female worshippers were no longer to be allowed into the shrine unless the priestess was present. Clearly the women, in the absence of the priestess, had committed some wrong, either of a religious or perhaps of a secular nature, and in

⁸ See ch. 5 nn. 12, 19, with text; esp. Ael. fr. 58.8 (cited by Mylonas *Eleusis* 226 with n. 10); Livy 31.14.7-9.

⁹ Paus. 9.25.9.

¹⁰ Paus. 9.16.6.

¹¹ Paus. 9.25.3.

¹² Burkert *Greek Religion* 95; see esp. Hdt. 1.132.3; note *LSCG* 69.25-29.

¹³ *LSCG* 102. Some of the inscription is lost, so the precise contents are uncertain, but Sokolowski *LSCG* 102 p. 196 suggests that the women might have been committing or had committed some offence in the shrine.

future were to be denied access to the shrine without the priestess accompanying them.¹⁴

A similar type of situation can be seen in the decree of the Knidians, who resolved to forbid anyone sleeping for the future in the temple of Dionysos, the reason for this being that a group of Bakkhoi had slept there recently. Clearly the Bakkhoi had done something in the temple which was not acceptable to the community - perhaps damage to the shrine while they were in a state of *enthousiasmos* - and the community resolved to forbid sleeping in the temple.¹⁵ If the information concerning the prohibition on sleeping had come in a different form, for example, as a general prohibition mentioned by Pausanias without reference to an historical event, the temptation to look for a religious reason for the prohibition would have been strong. However, the decree indicates that a practical concern was at the heart of the prohibition, and this was probably also the case with the decree of Arkesine concerning the women whose entry to the shrine was restricted.

It is probable that these two cases were similar to many others, and possibly restrictions regarding access to temples arose because of the unacceptable behaviour of worshippers, and concerns raised by the priests about their activities in the shrine. However, there was a prohibition on the participation of slaves at the annual festival at Plataea, due to the fact that the men who died there during the Second Persian War did so on behalf of freedom. Slaves, who had been taken along for servile tasks by their masters who had made the pilgrimage in order to honour at the festival those who had died in the war, would not be allowed to attend.¹⁶ This contrasts with the Eleusinian and Andanian mysteries, into which slaves could be and were initiated.¹⁷ Access to sanctuaries, however, was restricted in more ways than simply through a prohibition on entry, for prior to the act of worship, there were specific rites, acts of entry, which the pilgrims had to undertake before they could participate in the central act of worship.

Mystery celebrations attended by pilgrims sometimes had special regulations concerning clothing which the pilgrim initiate would have to observe. Wreaths were *de rigueur* at most sacred sites; for example, these could be automatically provided at a price by the priest of Asklepios at Epidauros.¹⁸ The Andanian mysteries provide a good example of the clothing regulations which pilgrims who participated were required to observe. The cult inscription has a lengthy section of fourteen lines on the

¹⁴ Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 196.

¹⁵ *LSAM* 55; cf. below n. 81, ch. 3 n. 73, with text.

¹⁶ Plut. *Arist.* 21.4.

¹⁷ For Andania, see below nn. 22, 26; for Eleusis, see ch. 5 nn. 52, 143, with text.

¹⁸ *LSCG Suppl.* 22; cf. ch. 8 n. 73, with text.

type of clothing which those taking part in the cult ceremonies were to wear,¹⁹ for example, the first among the initiated must wear a *stlengis*, a tiara, which when instructed to do so by the sacred men they take off and replace with a wreath of laurel.²⁰ Even the sacred men, *hieroi*, and women, *hierai*, the mysteries' female supervisors, had also to observe certain proprieties of clothing, the sacred men wearing a garland, and the sacred women a white felt cap.²¹ The sacred women were required to wear a *kalasiris*, a long garment of Egyptian origin with a fringe at the bottom, or an *hypodyma*, tunic, and a cloak worth not more than two minas, and their daughters a *kalasiris*, or cloak worth not more than a hundred drachmas, while the female slaves wore the same as the daughters but their cloaks were not to exceed fifty drachmas in value. In the procession the sacred women had to wear a *hypodyma* and a woollen cloak, with stripes not more than half a finger wide, and their female children a *kalasiris* and a garment that was not diaphanous.²² The sacred women were to have wicker seats with either pillows, *potikephalaia*, or a white round cushion, with neither decoration nor a purple design.²³ There does not seem to be any other reference to the clothing of the sacred men, a contrast with the details given for the sacred women. Presumably the sacred women and their daughters played a greater part in the ritual of the cult, and it was most important that their dress be as correct as possible; alternatively it could be that women were considered to be more given to extravagance in dress than men, so that their clothing had to be more closely prescribed. The only clothing regulation for males being initiated was that they were to be dressed in white clothing and go barefoot.²⁴ All the women, both the female initiates and the sacred women, were to wear a garment which was neither transparent (and thus respectable), with stripes not more than half a finger wide.²⁵ The secular

¹⁹ *LSCG* 65.13-26. For clothing requirements in Hellenic cults, see Mills *ZPE* 55 (1984) 255-65; Culham *ZPE* 64 (1986) 235-45. For the Andanian Mysteries, see Sauppe *Mysterieninschrift aus Andania*; Newton *Essays on Art and Archaeology* 177-84; Kern *Religion der Griechen* 3.188-90. *LSCG* 65 is translated in Meyer *Ancient Mysteries* 51-59, with a translation also of Paus. 4.33.3-6, at 50-51, brief comments on both at 49-52; there is also a partial translation of *LSCG* 65 in Grant *Hellenistic Religions* 31-32.

²⁰ *LSCG* 65.14-15.

²¹ *LSCG* 65.13.

²² *LSCG* 65.19-22.

²³ *LSCG* 65.23-24.

²⁴ *LSCG* 65.15-16; cf. the regulations for white clothing at Asklepiad cults, ch. 8 n. 52, with text.

²⁵ *LSCG* 65.16: αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες μὴ διαφανῆ μηδὲ τὰ σαμεῖα ἐν τοῖς εἰματίοις πλατύτερα ἡμιδακτύλου. The prohibition on stripes is interesting, and suggests that wide stripes were considered to be in some way "showy" and not suitable for the attitude and correct demeanour of an initiate.

women being initiated were to wear a linen *khiton* or garment worth not more than one hundred drachmas, while their daughters were to wear a *kalasiris*, or a *sindonites*, and a cloak, not worth more than one mina, while the same provisions applied to female slaves, except that in their case the value was limited to fifty drachmas.²⁶ It is significant that female slaves and female children could apparently be initiated, and that the cult regulations strongly emphasise unostentation and decency of dress. The nature of the legislation with regard to its restriction on the value of the clothes may be aimed at a levelling of social distinctions, but the actual cost of the clothes, as high as two minas (one hundred and twenty drachmas) for a cloak, strongly suggests that many of the women come from an upper socio-economic level,²⁷ and that the emphasis is more on the decent appearance of the female initiates than on the amount of money they spend on their dress.

All of the women, both sacred and secular, were to be unadorned; gold ornaments, rouge, white make-up, hair bands and braided hair were forbidden,²⁸ and their shoes could only be of felt or the leather of sacrificial victims.²⁹ As with other aspects of this cult, provisions were made for those who did not conform to the cult regulations. Those wearing clothing or anything else forbidden were to be punished, with this punishment devoted to the gods,³⁰ so presumably some monetary fine is being alluded to here. No provision is made for those men who did not dress as required, but the same regulation possibly applied, though it can be noted that the inscription concentrates on female initiates implying that they were the major proportion of the participants, and that the simplicity of the dress required of them did not give much scope for any infraction of these regulations.

Other pilgrimage sites had regulations for clothing, and those of the mysteries of Despoina, at Lykosoura (in an isolated mountain valley some fourteen kilometres from

²⁶ LSCG 65.16-19. A *sindonites* was of fine cloth, usually of linen. Philostr. *Apoll.* 8.7 (5): the Egyptians, as well as the Indians, Pythagoreans (and Apollonios of Tyre), regarded linen as particularly pure, since it was not made of material which was animal in origin. It is significant that Egyptian influence is probably to be assumed in the choice of these two garments at Andania.

²⁷ For regulations in this cult limiting ostentation in the matter of tents and their contents, see ch. 3 nn. 12-18, with text.

²⁸ LSCG 65.22; compare the regulations of the mysteries at Lykosoura, discussed below nn. 31-38, with text.

²⁹ LSCG 65.22-23. This is an interesting provision, especially the regulations concerning mens' footwear. It is unlikely that the sacrificial victims from whose hides the shoes were to be made were sacrificed at an initial rite of participation, and then turned into shoes, as the tanning and felting of hides would presumably have taken some time to accomplish. Compare a regulation of the shrine of Elektrona at Ialysos, Rhodes, which prohibits the wearing of anything made of pigskin: *SIG*³ 338.25-27; cf. Hewitt *TAPA* 40 (1909) 84 with n. 3.

³⁰ LSCG 65.24.

Megalopolis) had clothing requirements similar to those of Andania. Despite its remote setting, it seems almost certain that these mysteries would have attracted pilgrims, and Pausanias provides information about the temple, mentioning that in his time the Arkadians performed the mysteries and the sacrifices, and that this goddess was worshipped more than any other by the Arkadians.³¹ The context of this remark in his description, and the fact that he does not mention any other mysteries of the goddess in Arkadia, implies that the cult is to be imagined as drawing its clientele from all over Arkadia, and that therefore pilgrims at least from other parts of that region, and presumably from other parts of the Hellenic world as well, must have come to participate in the mysteries. The regulations governing clothing were as follows: gold could not be worn into the temple, unless it was to be dedicated,³² the wearing of a purple garment was forbidden,³³ as were bright coloured or black ones,³⁴ no shoes were allowed,³⁵ nor could rings be worn.³⁶ If any of these things were worn into the shrine, they were to become the property of the shrine.³⁷ Just as braided hair was forbidden for women at Andania, so a woman with braided hair could not enter the shrine of Despoina, and men were to enter bare-headed.³⁸

Pausanias records that the worshipper who wished to consult the oracle of Trophonios in Boeotia, after undergoing purification rites, dressed in a linen garment which was tied with ribbons and wore boots of that region, and then descended into a

³¹ Paus. 8.37.8. For Lykosoura, see esp. Cavvadias *Fouilles de Lycosoura*, esp. 16; Jost *Sanctuaires* 172-78, 326-37, with a French translation of *LSCG* 68 at 330, and on Paus., see 172, 332.

³² *LSCG* 68.4-5; cf. the Andanian requirement, *LSCG* 65.22. For this inscription, see also Guarducci *Epigrafia Greca* 4.20-23; Horsley *New Documents* 4.108-09 (for clothing, 109).

³³ *LSCG* 68.5; cf. the wearing of only white for men at Andania, *LSCG* 65.15-16. For purple compare the provision at *LSCG* 65.23-24: the sacred women are to have “wicker seats” with “*potikephalaia*” or white round cushions, without purple or design. Presumably purple is avoided as a colour of royalty and thus of ostentation, or perhaps because of its association with Hades. But cf. Plut. *Arist.* 21.4, where the archon of the Plataeans, who at ordinary times was only allowed to wear white cloth, at the celebration held every year to honour the dead at Plataea wore a purple *khiton*, perhaps because this was a festival in honour of the dead.

³⁴ *LSCG* 68.6.

³⁵ Compare the bare feet of the male initiates at Andania, *LSCG* 65.15 (cf. *SIG*³ 338.25-27), for which see above n. 24, with text; for the special shoes of the women in the Andanian mysteries (*LSCG* 65.23), see above; see also the footwear of visitors to the oracle of Trophonios, below n. 39 with text.

³⁶ *LSCG* 68.7.

³⁷ *LSCG* 68.7-9; cf. *LSCG* 65.25-26.

³⁸ *LSCG* 68.9-10.

chasm in the earth.³⁹ Pausanias had himself consulted the oracle, but provides no information as to why this particular form of dress was necessary.⁴⁰ No-one who had made the descent to consult Trophonios had been killed, according to Pausanias, except for one of the bodyguards of Demetrios, son of Antigonos, who did not carry out any of the rituals prescribed for those who wished to consult the god, but went in hope of stealing silver and gold. As punishment, the body of the man was cast out lifeless from the cave, but not at the point where the consultants usually emerged, that is, not at the sacred mouth of the cave.⁴¹ It is quite possible that this occurred, for the cave would have been very dark with many subterranean passages, and it is clear that the consultants did not make their way out of the cave unassisted, but needed the guidance of the priests. It is probable that the bodyguard became lost, and died in the cave, but the story as related indicates the very real importance of observing correct ritual procedures. Pausanias describes some of the difficulties involved in descending into the subterranean shrine, for after lying on his back on the ground, while holding his offerings, the worshipper had to descend feet first into a cavernous hole, and the return also had to be made through the same crevice, with, once again, feet first, a unique act of exit.⁴² Possibly there was a practical need for special boots, stouter than ordinary walking shoes, for those who were to undergo this experience successfully, and this explains the need for the boots, made locally by a cobbler with this express purpose in mind, but this does not explain the cultic significance of the tunic and ribbons and as in the Andanian mysteries no reason is given for the special clothing.

Clothing was clearly an important aspect of ritual worship, not only from the authorities' point of view but also from that of the person participating in a festival, and in this context it is interesting to note that it was customary for initiates at the Eleusinian Mysteries to dedicate the clothing, in which they had been initiated, to the gods.⁴³ These regulations on clothing lead to a consideration of the extent to which the regulations regarding pilgrims were publicised outside of the pilgrimage site; it is possible, for example, that pilgrims knew before reaching Andania that there were special clothing requirements. There would have been word of mouth reports of those

³⁹ Paus. 9.39.5-9: χιτῶνα ἐνδεδικώς λινοῦν καὶ ταινίαις τὸν χιτῶνα ἐπιξωσθεὶς καὶ ὑποδυσάμενος ἐπιχωρίας κρηπίδας (9.35.8); for bathing in the river prior to the consultation, see 9.39.7; cf. cl. 8 nn. 46-48, with text.

⁴⁰ Paus. 9.39.14. For the cult of Trophonios, see esp. Hamilton *Incubation* 88-93; Clark *TAPA* 99 (1968) 63-75; Schachter *AJP* 105 (1984) 258-70; Levin *ANRW* 2, 18.2 (1989) 1637-42. This was the oracle which Xouthos consulted on his way to Apollo's oracle: Eur. *Ion* 300; cf. ch. 6 nn. 73, 137, with text.

⁴¹ Paus. 9.39.12.

⁴² Paus. 9.39.11.

⁴³ *FGH* 326 Melanthios F 4 (Schol. *Ar. Wealth* 845); cf. ch. 5 n. 72.

in their locality who had already been initiated, and whom the pilgrim, before setting out, may have been able to consult. The presence of young girls indicates that children were brought by their parents to be initiated, and some of these parents might already have been initiated into the cult and would have been aware of these rules about clothing.

But what of the pilgrim who arrived unaware that these regulations did apply? The provisions for a market in this same inscription tend to suggest that it was possible for those who came unprepared to purchase the requisite clothing in the locality,⁴⁴ and entrepreneurs would have been prepared for this possibility. Furthermore there is the provision concerning shoes, which had to be made of felt or the hide of an animal which had been sacrificed.⁴⁵ Whether it had to be sacrificed in this cult is not made clear, but even if not, it is probable that there would have been at least some pilgrims who would not have been prepared for this requirement. Indeed, a local market would have been essential had the regulation intended that only leather from locally sacrificed animals was to be used for these purposes, and the provision of a market place in which “everything might be sold”, like, presumably, the local boots which were necessary to consult the oracle of Trophonios, would be of use here.⁴⁶

The symbolism of clothing, its colour and design, is a limitless topic, but it can be noted that special clothing is a feature of Greek worship, the donning of specified clothes, and the setting aside of what was normally worn, being a way of moving from the profane world into a sacred setting.⁴⁷ Clothing helped to mark off an event as extraordinary and also heightened the sense of anticipation in the preliminaries to a sacred ceremony. For the pilgrim it was an important part of the “pilgrimage experience”, and so much so, that the clothes in which an individual was initiated could be consecrated as a votive dedication, as at Eleusis.

The fact that in many cults the pilgrim worshippers would be required to wear white clothing placed an emphasis on the ritual purity of the worshipper. To enter into a state of communication with the divine was to encounter what was pure, *hagnos*, and the worshipper had thus to be pure as well. Many of the rites of entry were therefore concerned with attaining a proper state of purity. In daily life a person

⁴⁴ *LSCG* 65.99-103.

⁴⁵ *LSCG* 65.23; see above n. 29, with text. Of course, since most leather would have come from sacrificed animals, most animals having been killed in a sacrificial context, this may not have been a very unusual situation.

⁴⁶ *LSCG* 65.99: οἱ ἱεροὶ τόπον ἀποδειξάντω ἐν ᾧ πραθήσεται πάντα.

⁴⁷ A good example from another culture comes from Hebrew practice: when Yahweh was about to make himself manifest on Mount Sinai, his worshippers washed their clothes (and remained chaste): *Exod.* 19.10ff; *Numb.* 11.18-25; cf. Hubert, *Mauss Sacrifice* 22.

would be in a profane state, encountering the impure in various ways, so the requisite rituals ensured that the worshipper entered into the necessary state in which freedom from impurity existed. Impurity was to be avoided by the worshipper, and took several forms, many of them associated with physical states of being. At many sanctuaries there were precise regulations which set out the types of *miasma* which were to be avoided if one wished to take part in a particular act of cult worship. Most striking of these were the restrictions placed on the primary activities of the body. These were regarded as unclean, since as part of the profane they were set apart from the divine. Therefore bodily functions, such as eating, sexual activity, birth, death, and the passing of excrement, were in various ways restricted.

One inscription records that any visitors to the temple of Athena at Pergamon,⁴⁸ either residents of the polis or anyone else, had to observe certain procedures in order to ensure that they were pure before entering the shrine.⁴⁹ The reference to citizens and others seems to indicate that it is envisaged that others besides the citizen residents of the town are to call in at the shrine, and presumably this means not only non-citizen residents but also pilgrims, as the Nikephoria was a penteteric, Panhellenic celebration. Pilgrims at the shrine, then, like other visitors, would be expected to observe the following restrictions. On the day of the visit to the shrine, the resident or the pilgrim had to refrain from sexual intercourse with his wife, and the wife from her husband, while extra-marital sex required a full day's abstinence before the day of the visit.⁵⁰ Contact with a death or with a woman in childbirth could not take place on the day before or the day of the visit,⁵¹ and contact with a funeral procession and burial was not permitted on the same day, but if worshippers nevertheless wished to enter the shrine, they could gain purification by making use of the "holy-water".⁵²

The bodily functions of female worshippers were also of concern to authorities in some shrines. The mysteries of Despoina at Lykosoura prohibited pregnant women

⁴⁸ SIG³ 982.3-9, translated by Grant *Hellenistic Religions* 6.

⁴⁹ SIG³ 982.3-4: ἀγνεύετῶσαν ἰεὲ καὶ εἰσίστῶσαν εἰς τὸν τῆς θεο[ῦ ναόν] / οἳ τε πολῖται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πῖντες.

⁵⁰ SIG³ 982.4-6. The admission of the possibility of this extra-marital intercourse is interesting, as is the longer period of purification involved in such cases. The possibility of homosexual relationships does not seem to have been envisaged or regulated against. The cult regulations of a private religious association at Philadelphia, Lydia, prescribe that members, in order to be pure, must have sexual relations only with their own spouse: SIG³ 985.25-51, translated in Grant *Hellenistic Religions* 28-30; see below, nn. 55-59; for regulations at Asklepieia, see ch. 8 n. 54, cf. n. 57, with text.

⁵¹ SIG³ 982.6-7.

⁵² SIG³ 982.7-9. On the use of holy water for purification, see Burkert *Greek Religion* 79; Parker *Miasma* 226-27, 371; cf. below, nn 110, 113, with text.

and nursing mothers from participation.⁵³ Here the association of birth with blood will have been responsible: both birth and the afterbirth were probably a great source of disquiet for the Greek male. The nursing mother after childbirth still had the taint of blood upon her, and the pregnant woman would be about to undergo this experience. The lingering effects of *miasma* (in the case of the nursing mother) and the anticipation of *miasma* (in the case of the pregnant woman), were enough to exclude women in this category from the body of pilgrim worshippers. Menstruation is a strange omission from cult rules, which do not reflect any concern about menstruating women, who were therefore presumably free to take part in sacred ceremonies even while menstruating.⁵⁴

The necessity for sexual purity manifested itself in the sleeping arrangements of those taking part in incubatory rites, rites in which one slept in a sacred place hoping to have a nocturnal encounter with the divine. At the healing shrine of Amphiaraos at Oropos, a well known pilgrimage site, there was the provision that those who came to sleep in the *koimeterion* seeking a cure were to be sexually segregated: the women were to sleep on one side of the altar, and the men were to sleep on the other.⁵⁵ Intercourse in temples, as is obvious from these various regulations, was forbidden and as usual, didactic tales warned of the fate of those who fornicated in the temples.⁵⁶ Sexual abstinence as a preliminary to worship is easy to explain. Semen itself, as a bodily emission and as an ejaculation of physical matter, was considered unclean, and thus a profane substance, to remain apart from the divine.⁵⁷ Presumably it was the sexual act, with its connotations of childbirth, involving blood, which induced *miasma* and led to the restrictions placed on sexual activity. This was

⁵³ *LSCG* 68.11-13; cf. Parker *Miasma* 49.

⁵⁴ See the discussion of Parker *Miasma* 100-03, 353-54. For regulations concerning menstruation in non-Greek cults in Greece, note Parker *Miasma* 101-02; Horsley *New Documents* 4.109-10. An injunction against masturbation and wet dreams in the sacred place possibly occurs, depending on interpretation, in the Cyrene cathartic law *LSCG Suppl.* 115 (discussed Parker *Miasma* 342); note that in the abaton at Epidauros a nocturnal emission caused by a vision of a beautiful boy was the means by which one man was cured: *IG IV²* 1, 121 iama 14; see ch. 8 nn. 121, 123, with text.

⁵⁵ *LSCG* 69.43-47: ἐν δὲ τοῦ κοιμητηρίου/ι καθεύδειν χωρὶς μὲν τοὺς ἄνδρας χωρὶς / δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας, τοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας ἐν τοῦ πρὸς ἡ/ὄς τοῦ βωμοῦ, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας ἐν τοῦ πρὸς ἡεῖπέρης. Cf. below n. 122; ch. 3 n. 72, with text.

⁵⁶ For example, Hdt. 9.116-20; Paus. 8.5.12; cf. Parker *Miasma* 74 with n. 3 for further references; see also Hdt. 2.64.1, who states that the Greeks and the Egyptians have the same scruples in this respect and that the Egyptians were the first to observe such proprieties: καὶ τὸ μὴ μίσγεσθαι γυναῖξιν ἐν ἱεροῖσι μηδὲ ἀλόυτους ἀπὸ γυναικῶν ἐς ἱερὰ εἰσέναι οὗτοί εἰσι οἱ πρῶτοι θρησκευσάντες.

⁵⁷ Note the comments of Parker *Miasma* 76-77.

probably not a case of foregoing something in order to offer up the deprivation as a sacrifice to the god, for there is no evidence that sexual abstinence had a “Lental” connotation, though it is significant to note that extra-marital sex was less acceptable in this context. Rather, the lack of sexual activity would ensure an avoidance of *miasma*. Moreover, it would produce a heightened state of expectation for the cult experience, while after the ceremonies the climax of the sexual act would serve as a positive reminder of the return to the world of the profane.⁵⁸

Sexual abstinence, and avoidance of contact with the pollution of childbirth and death, were preoccupations which are attested in other areas of religion.⁵⁹ Burkert notes that the Greek sanctuary “...is properly constituted only through the demarcation which sets it apart from the profane ...”⁶⁰ Not only was this the case, but the absence of contact with the impure was also integral to the purity of the worshipper, and *miasma* “catalysts”, for example, intercourse, birth and death, were to be avoided by the worshipper.⁶¹

Pilgrims might also have to avoid certain foodstuffs. At Pergamon, pilgrims visiting the shrine of Asklepios in search of a cure were required to observe one day’s abstinence from goat cheese and goat meat.⁶² This can be explained by the fact that goats were not sacrificed to Asklepios, except at Cyrene, and this exception is noted with interest by Pausanias.⁶³ At Eleusis, the worshipper had to avoid red mullet,⁶⁴ in the cult of Trophonios several fish were banned,⁶⁵ and in the cult of Amphiaraios, worshippers had to abstain from food for a day, and from wine for three days as the

⁵⁸ Cf. Burkert *Mystery Cults* 108.

⁵⁹ See Burkert *Greek Religion* 79 with 378 n. 45, 387 n. 45; cf. Grant *Hellenistic Religions* 26. Hesych. s.v. ἀγνεύειν: καθαρύειν, ἀπό τε ἀφροδισίων καὶ ἀπὸ νεκροῦ.

⁶⁰ Burkert *Greek Religion* 87, who notes the purification of the island of Delos by Peisistratos in the sixth century and again during the Peloponnesian War, and that no births or deaths were allowed on the island, Thuc. 3.104.1-2 (cf. 1.134.1-3: the Spartan king Pausanias); Paus. 2.27.1; see below n. 147 and ch. 7 n. 2, with text. The aversion to death in sacred matters is also illustrated by the Messenian regulation that if the child of a priest or priestess died before his parents, the priest or priestess had to resign his or her office: Paus. 4.12.6. Burkert *Greek Religion* 79 with 378 n. 45 referring to *LSCG* 154B notes that when the sanctuary at Kos had been “polluted by a dead body”, the priestess had to purify the shrine.

⁶¹ Cf. Burkert *Greek Religion* 87. Women, who went to Epidauros seeking to give birth, left the abaton before they gave birth: *IG IV*² 121, iamata 1-2; see ch. 8 nn. 103, 144, 190, with text; Paus. 2.27.1 notes that births (and deaths) could not take place within the boundaries of the Asklepieion, see below n. 145.

⁶² *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, pp. 168-69, no. 161 12-13; cf. ch. 8 n. 54, with text.

⁶³ See ch. 8 n. 76, with text.

⁶⁴ *Ael. Nat. An.* 9.51; *FGH* 326 Melanthios F 2 (Athen. 325c); cf. ch. 5 n. 89, with text.

⁶⁵ Kratinos fr. 236 (Athen. 325c) (Kassel, Austin *PCG* 4.241).

message of the god was considered to be obscured by alcohol.⁶⁶ In the healing cult at Akharaka, the sick would be left in the healing caves for several days without food.⁶⁷

The linguistic skills of the worshipper would also be taken into account. The Hellenic world was surrounded by *barbaroi*, who were excluded from some of the pilgrimage sites and their religious activities. Oracular sites falling into this category were those of the deity Trophonios at Lebadeia and the Amphiaraion at Thebes. The experiences of Mys, a Karian, according to the account of Herodotos, highlight the difficulties faced by non-Greek pilgrims. Mys had been instructed by Mardonios, the Persian commander, while wintering in Thessaly, to consult those oracles “which he was able to consult”. Mys visited Lebadeia where he had to pay a man to enter the cave of Trophonios. This is presumably because, as a non-Greek, he was not able to do so on his own account. The oracle at Abai in Phokis, and that of Apollo Ismenias at Thebes, a temple at which oracles were sought by means of sacrifices, seem to have been consulted personally by Mys, for Herodotos does not record that in these places he had to resort to a substitute.⁶⁸

Herodotos records that Mys also paid someone to spend the night in the temple of Amphiaraos, where oracles were supplied through the medium of dreams. But this person can not have been a Theban, for Thebans were not allowed to consult this oracle. Through the medium of the priestess, according to Herodotos, Amphiaraos had once given the Thebans two choices as to the favour he would give them: they could consult him as a prophet, or as an ally in war. The Thebans chose the latter; thus no Theban was allowed to sleep at night in the temple for the purposes of obtaining a dream oracle. There is an apparent inconsistency in this story, that the god spoke to those consulting the oracle through the medium of the dream, whereas he offered the choice through the medium of the priestess, that is, by speaking through her, but this does not seem to worry Herodotos; it can be assumed that there was a priestess of the temple in Herodotos’ time, and presumably, on this one occasion, Amphiaraos was thought to have spoken through her.⁶⁹

Mys also consulted the oracle of Apollo Ptoios at Akraiphia in Boeotia; here he was accompanied by three Thebans who were to take down the words of the oracle as given by the prophet. In fact, the prophet astonished the three Thebans by delivering his oracles in Carian, and Mys himself had to snatch their tablet from them and write

⁶⁶ Philostr. *Apoll.* 2.37; for wine, see further below nn. 79-82, with text.

⁶⁷ Strabo 14.1.44 (650); cf. n. 7 above, with text.

⁶⁸ Hdt. 8.133-134.2. The wording of the Greek would suggest that the Amphiaraion was actually at Thebes, but some scholars have suggested the Amphiaraion at Oropos; see Schachter *Cults of Boiotia* 1.22 with n. 2 for references to modern scholarship on this point; more recently, Symeonoglou *Oracles of Thebes* 157 argues that this oracle was at Thebes.

⁶⁹ Hdt. 8.134.1-2.

down the oracle himself.⁷⁰ Thus it is possible that at the oracles where the god appeared to the consultant, as in the cult of Trophonios and Amphiaraos, the foreigner was forbidden, but not where the god manifested himself through the medium of a prophet. This difference was in the nature of oracular inspiration: the active, where the god appeared to the consultant, and the passive, where the god made his will known through a prophet, while the inquirer stood by. When the god himself appeared, it was only to Hellenes; non-Hellenes were prohibited from those shrines where the god made a direct appearance.⁷¹ Delphi can also be cited as an example: it was the priestess who was the mouthpiece of the god, and consultants came from all over the Hellenic and non-Hellenic world.

The most famous example of exclusion based on linguistic ability is that of the Eleusinian Mysteries, from which the non-Greek speaker was debarred, *barbaroi* being totally excluded. The mysteries involved an explanation of the benefactions which Demeter had conferred on mankind and these, recounted by the hierophant, had to be understood for the worshipper to be initiated: it was not only the sense and content of the words that was important but the fact that they also had to be heard at first-hand. A story is preserved of one individual, who had a dream that he was initiated, but was not considered to be so, as he had not clearly heard the words spoken by the hierophant.⁷² It might also have been that the common language was an important aspect of the religious solidarity of the group gathering, and Herodotos tells us that what gives the Greeks their ethnicity is in fact their common religion, and their common language.⁷³ However, in the Roman period, Romans could be initiated: according to Suetonius the emperor Nero during his tour of the province in AD 60 decided not to be initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries, knowing that at the beginning of the ceremonies a herald warned the impious and the wicked were driven off by the proclamation of a herald, presumably considering that his act of matricide excluded him on these grounds.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Hdt. 8.135.1-3; Paus. 9.23.6; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 412a, with Bernardakis *Plutarchi Moralia* 3.74 *app. crit.* 17; Pohlenz, Sieveking *Plutarchi Moralia* 3.64 *app. crit.* 8. See ch. 6 n. 119, with text.

⁷¹ Cf. Petropoulou *GRBS* 22 (1981) 51-52. In this case the god is obviously multi-ethnic and multilingual, to the surprise of the Thebans.

⁷² Sopat. *Rhet. Gr.* 8.110 (Waltz) (cited by Mylonas *Eleusis* 272 with n. 194; Burkert *Homo Necans* 250 with n. 10); see also ch. 5 nn. 6, 43, 107, with text.

⁷³ Hdt. 8.144.2: τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, ἐὸν ὄμαιμόν τε καὶ ὀμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματα τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἡθεὰ τε ὀμότροπα.

⁷⁴ Suet. *Nero* 34.8: Peregrinatione qui Iem Graeciae et Eleusinis sacris, quorum initiatione impii et scelerati voce praecoris summoentur interesse non ausus est; cf. Mylonas *Mysteries* 247-48, Bradley *Suetonius' Life of Nero* 206.

Several of the requirements placed on pilgrims thus had a religious motivation, such as dietary restrictions, sexual abstinence, and the general need for purity on the part of the worshipper, and they were an important part of the cult ritual in which pilgrims would be involved. Other regulations and restrictions were of a non-religious type, and these concerned the behaviour of pilgrims at the site, and included important prescriptions determining the way in which pilgrims were expected to behave at the sanctuary and to interact with its natural environment.

The behaviour of worshippers at sanctuaries was, of course, a matter of importance, not only for the authorities of the sanctuary but also, in the case of official pilgrimages, *theoriai*, for the states sending pilgrims and officials to a particular site. It is perhaps significant that the only specific recorded examples of individuals guilty of misconduct at a festival involved athletes; nevertheless regulations make provision for misbehaviour by ordinary pilgrims which certainly must have occasionally occurred. The island of Andros was accustomed to send a *theoria* to Delphi, and while the purpose of the *theoria* is not clear from the evidence, the number of individuals taking part in the *theoria*, and the fact that there was an inscription dealing with it, would suggest that it was connected with the celebration of the Pythian festival.⁷⁵ The inscription contains regulations governing the behaviour of those Andrians participating in the *theoria*. Provision was made for the *boule* to appoint five men from among the number of those travelling to Delphi; these five had to take an oath, and were to be responsible for those behaving in a disorderly way, being instructed to fine those misbehaving, at the rate of five drachmas a day,⁷⁶ which presumably means for each day of the pilgrim's misconduct. The five men were to record the relevant names and submit these to the Andrian *boule* on their return from the festival.⁷⁷ This provision seems to indicate that there might have been the possibility of further punishment, perhaps in the form of a formal prosecution, and clearly pilgrims who went on the Andrian *theoria* had to accept the authority of the state, represented by the five men who had been sworn to monitor the conduct of the *theoria*.

Here the state holds the pilgrims accountable to itself for their behaviour, and this attitude on the part of the authorities is understandable. The pilgrims from Andros were representing their island, and misbehaviour at the sacred site could generate bad publicity for the state. Moreover the desire that the *theoria* should go smoothly

⁷⁵ *LSCG Suppl.* 38AB.

⁷⁶ *LSCG Suppl.* 38B.4-15: βολὲ δὲ τῶν / πλεόντων ἐς Δελ/φῶ[ς] ἠελέσθο
πέν/τ' ἄνδρας καὶ ὄρκο/σάτο· σῆτον δὲ μὲ / φερόντο ταύτες ὄν/εκα τῆς
ἀρχῆς· οἱ δ' ἐ κύριοι ἔστων /ε/μιῶσαι τὸν ἀκοσμ/έοντα μεχρὶ πέν/τε
δραχ[μέ]ον ἐκάσ/τες ἡμέρες.

⁷⁷ *LSCG Suppl.* 38B.15-17.

indicated the seriousness with which participation in this Delphic celebration, as at other festivals, was regarded. The decree does not detail just what disorderly behaviour might have entailed: drunkenness, lechery, vandalism, and failure to observe the regulations set down by the authorities at Delphi are all possible forms of inappropriate conduct. While there are other examples of regulations governing the behaviour of the pilgrims at the sacred site, such as those from Andania and Oropos, the Andrian decree is important in that it represents an attempt by a state to ensure the good behaviour of its citizens while on pilgrimage abroad.

Penalties for misconduct were also imposed by the host nation, and the Athenians made provision for punishing those who were disorderly at the Eleusinian Mysteries and they could be fined or taken to court by the *epimeletai* of the mysteries. The latter presumably occurred when the offence was greater than could be punished with a fine.⁷⁸ With thousands annually attending the mysteries, there would always have been the possibility that individuals who were present might infringe the regulations governing the behaviour of worshippers at the mysteries. It was, of course, of the greatest importance that the mysteries proceeded smoothly. Just as at the shrine of Amphiaraos at Lebadeia pilgrims abstained from wine for three days before consulting the oracle,⁷⁹ a similar practice seems to have occurred at Eleusis, though for different reasons. The pilgrims did not drink wine, for a part of the ceremonies, in imitation of Demeter, who in her anguish over the missing Persephone, was said to have abstained from wine.⁸⁰ The fact that the pilgrims abstained for part of the festival would have been of assistance in ensuring that behaviour was kept within acceptable grounds, unlike that which occurred at the Bakkhic shrine at Knidos,⁸¹ but presumably the solemn nature of the rite itself would have ensured their good conduct. At Delphi, the removal of wine stored in the stadium for the gods incurred the penalty of five drachmas, and the culprit had also to sacrifice to the god who had been deprived of wine.⁸² The fact that the regulation was needed implies that an incident or incidents involving the theft of the gods' wine had occurred, and also indicates that pilfering was a matter of concern for authorities at festival sites.

The fourth century decree regulating the Amphiaraion at Oropos empowers the priest to judge strangers or citizens who committed misdemeanours in the shrine, if the matter did not exceed three drachmas, but incidents involving more money were to

⁷⁸ *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68, side A, lines 31-33 (cf. 34-35); cf. *Hesp.* 10 (1941) p. 67, line 28; ch. 5 n. 141, with text.

⁷⁹ Lebadeia: Philostr. *Apoll.* 2.37.

⁸⁰ For restrictions on wine at Eleusis: see ch. 5 n. 88, with text.

⁸¹ Knidos: *LSAM* 55; cf. above n. 15, ch. 3 n. 73, with text.

⁸² Delphi: *CID* 3; see Fontenrose *Cult. of Apollo* 129 with 139 n. 23.

come within the competence of the courts. Action was to be taken immediately: the summons was to take place on the very day of the incident, and if the wrongdoer did not come to an agreement, the trial would be held on the very next day. Locals would make use of the shrine, but so too would people from surrounding Boeotia and Attica. Presumably the prompt action on wrongdoing relates to the fact that the clientele was not all local: *xenoi* mistreated or misbehaving would need to be dealt with straight away for the sake of convenience, while summary justice would also have acted as a deterrent to wrongdoing.⁸³

There were thus various regulations which dealt with the orderly conduct of the worshipper at a shrine. But in addition to these concerns there were others, and many regulations dealt with the worshipper in the context of the natural environment of the sanctuary. Large numbers of worshippers could be expected at major shrines and the environment of the sacred site would need to be protected. Nothing destroys the natural environment to greater effect than large numbers of humans; population pressures on a small area can be disastrous. The temple authorities had a clear awareness of the effect that large numbers of worshippers could have, and numerous regulations dealt with protection for the environment. Human pressures at sanctuaries would have taken the form of traffic, the provision of accommodation, and the demand for wood for cooking and bathing purposes, as well as arrangements for the animals accompanying the pilgrims, whether for transport or sacrifice, and for the waste products which the presence of so many humans and animals would have entailed. The pressure arising from the need for accommodation for worshippers would have been severe. At Andania, not only was the size of the tents to be pitched by pilgrims at the site limited, but camping in the sacred area was also forbidden and sleeping in temples, unless for incubatory procedures, was also not allowed.⁸⁴ Population groups were thus kept at arm's length from unnecessarily close contact with the sanctuary itself.

Even at non-festival times, the pasturing of herds of domestic animals in sanctuaries was forbidden. As well as the legalistic implications, such animals would also have had an adverse effect on the sanctuary environment, removing grasses which, if the number of animals was great enough, could leave the soil open to erosion and degradation, such as soil compaction. That the number of animals was realised to be significant is indicated by the fact that some of the regulations provide fines for pasturing based on the number of animals in the offending flock. Sheep and

⁸³ *LSCG* 69.13-20, see esp. 13-16 δικάζει/ν δὲ τὸν ἱερέα, ἄν τις ἰδέει ἀδικηθεῖ ἢ τῶν ξέ/νων ἢ τῶν δημοτέων ἐν τοῦ ἱεροῦ, μέχρι τριῶν / δραχμῶν.

⁸⁴ See ch. 3 nn. 6-8, 67, 69-71, 73-77, with text.

goats can also eat foliage directly off trees; and that leaves were of concern to the temple authorities is indicated by the provisions against the cutting or removal of branches from the trees in the sanctuary.⁸⁵ At Delphi, sacrificial animals brought along by worshippers to be sacrificed were to be kept penned in a special area outside of the sacred precinct.⁸⁶ Given the regulations from other sites forbidding the pasturing of animals in the sanctuary, arrangements similar to those at Delphi must have been usual at other sites.

Worshippers entered the shrine on foot. Vehicular access to the sanctuary was not allowed, and vehicles had to be left outside of the main sanctuary area, at Eleusis, for example, in an area called the *khorion*.⁸⁷ The Athenian Lykourgos in the late fourth century proposed a law that no woman should ride to Eleusis in a carriage, so that wealthy women going by carriage would not seem of more significance than poor women who had no transport. His own wife, however, was detected doing so, and Lykourgos was blackmailed one talent by sycophants who threatened to take the matter to court; when accused in the *ekklesia* of paying this bribe he stated in his defence “but I am found to be giving rather than receiving.”⁸⁸ Approaching on foot was not merely an act of humility on the part of the worshippers, but was an effort by the authorities to preserve the grounds of the temple. Vehicular traffic would lead to inevitable wheel ruts, and like pasturing animals would lead to the destruction of surface grass, and prohibiting wheeled traffic avoided the compacting of soil around tree bases and the despoliation of lawn grasses. The preservation of the ground cover was essential to the health of the trees, protecting them from dust and erosion.⁸⁹ The trees were the most important and most visible element of the environment of the sanctuary, and as such were protected from various types of activities such as chopping, hacking and defoliation.

The use of wood for bathing; and other purposes by worshippers also led to concern for the trees of the sacred site.⁹⁰ At Andania, those who made money by providing bathing facilities at the mysteries were to provide their own firewood for

⁸⁵ *LSCG* 37 (see Guarducci *Epigrafia Greca* 4.18-19). This may also have prevented worshippers from cutting their own wreaths from sanctuary trees.

⁸⁶ *LSCG* 79.20-31. At Ios, the beasts intended for sacrifice had to be branded; non-branded beasts in the sacred area would be confiscated: *LSCG* 105.

⁸⁷ *Hesp.* 10 (1941) p. 67, no. 31.39; cf. Sokolowski *TAPA* 91 (1960) 379.

⁸⁸ *Plut. Mor.* 842b: ἀλλ’ οὖν ἐγὼ μὲν δίδουσι οὐ λαμβάνων ἐώραμαι; the point being that most politicians are bribed whereas he was the briber. *Plut. Comp. Nik. & Crass.* 1.3 does not relate the remark to Eleusis, but simply records Lykourgos’ remark. *Ael. Var. Hist.* 13.24 states that the matter did go to court, and the wife convicted, so that a fine had to be paid.

⁸⁹ Sokolowski *TAPA* 91 (1960) 376-30.

⁹⁰ Note the regulations for bathing in the Andanian inscription, *LSCG* 65.106-11.

this purpose, and the trees of the sanctuary were not to be touched.⁹¹ The Andanian inscription has a section headed “Concerning those chopping (wood) in the sacred area”, which begins “no-one is to chop wood from the sacred place”.⁹² That cutting firewood from the trees at this sacred place was considered to be a particularly heinous offence is made apparent by the provision encouraging the practice of informing about this act, by giving the informant half the fine imposed on the one caught chopping wood in the sacred area.⁹³ no other regulation in the Andanian cult rules provides for the reward of informants. Its significance is obviously that if worshippers had been allowed to gather firewood indiscriminately in the sacred grove, there would soon have been no grove left, due to the demands of cooking and heating.⁹⁴ A concern that fire might break out at the sacred site is not documented, but at Amorgos, it was forbidden for fires to be lit in the sacred area itself.⁹⁵ Temples could burn down, that of Hera’s at Argos is an example,⁵⁶ and restriction of the campers at Andania to a special area, presumably away from the temple complex itself,⁹⁷ may have been at least partly motivated by this consideration.

There was therefore a clear concern that the sanctuary be protected from the presence of the worshippers. The many regulations to this effect indicate that the authorities considered that the sanctuaries were threatened by the pressures arising from large numbers of worshippers, and from the communities in which the sanctuaries were located, which caused concern for the amenities of the sanctuary at the official level. The fact that there were regulations to ensure that they did not harm

⁹¹ *LSCG* 65.108-09.; cf. bathing at Olympia: Epict. 1.6.26.

⁹² *LSCG* 65.78: περὶ τῶν κοπτόντων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· μηθεὶς κοπτέτω ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τόπον.

⁹³ *LSCG* 65.79-80; a slave is to be scourged, a free man fined.

⁹⁴ *LSCG* 37 (see n. 85 above, with text) also forbids the cutting of wood in the sanctuary of Apollo, and in addition the carrying out of fallen wood or branches (with leaves or not, or dry) out of the sanctuary; see also Callim. *Hymn Dem.* 36-60. Sokolowski *LSCG* 37, p. 72 collects other examples of the protection of trees in the sanctuary, some of which are briefly discussed by Jordan, Perlin *On the Protection of Sacred Groves* 153-59; note also Parker *Miasma* 165, 335; Meiggs *Trees and Timber* 378. On deforestation in ancient Greece, see Hughes, Thirgood *Ecologist* 12 (1982) 196-208; Hughes *JFA* 10 (1983) 427-445; Sallares *Ecology* 35-36, 496-97 n. 234.

⁹⁵ *LSCG* 100, translated in Rice, Starbough *Sources* 124.

⁹⁶ Thuc. 4. 133. 2-3. The Argives believed that the Spartan king Kleomenes was sent mad for burning down a grove sacred to Apollo, with several thousand Argives in it (Hdt. 6.75.3); cf. Thuc. 3.81.3.

⁹⁷ *LSCG* 65.36. The inscription refers to the area marked off by the sacred men, but it seems safe to assume that this also indicates that tents would not have been allowed into the sacred area. Cf. *LSCG Suppl.* 81.7-8, which forbids camping in the sanctuary of Hera on Samos to protect the trees of the sacred grove; *SIG³* 685.81-82, forbidding sleeping in the shrine of Zeus at Magnesia; cf. ch. 3 nn. 76-77, with text.

the natural environment of the sanctuary, implies that many worshippers at sites must have shown little regard for the sanctuary, and only regulations and fines stood between the worshippers and the degradation, through misuse, of its trees and grounds.

A decree of the *boule* of Khios of the fourth century BC sets out regulations for shrines on the island,⁹⁸ and deals with not simply one shrine but many, and concerns activities to be prohibited in the shrines. The tending of flocks, and the spreading of manure, as fertiliser, in the sanctuaries are both forbidden.⁹⁹ A fine of half a stater per beast was imposed on anyone caught tending beasts in the sacred groves,¹⁰⁰ while a fine was also provided for spreading manure: five staters in this case.¹⁰¹ Whoever saw someone tending a flock or spreading manure in the sanctuary was to report the matter to the religious authorities, *basileis*.¹⁰² The decree states that if anyone sees someone spreading manure in the sanctuary grounds but does not denounce the offender, he will be liable for a fine of five staters, the same as the penalty for the act of spreading.¹⁰³

This fine for failure to report the offence was designed as a positive inducement for bystanders to denounce the offender engaged in the prohibited activities; the fine operated almost on the principle of “guilt by association”. Regulations from other sanctuaries deal with *kopros*, but these refer to prohibitions on dumping excrement in sacred places. These regulations arose from the fact that there were problems with the disposal of excrement in many Greek urban areas; Pergamon prohibited the dumping of *kopros* and other rubbish in the streets,¹⁰⁴ and it seems as if members of the community saw sanctuaries as ideal places in which to dump their waste products which not unnaturally caused a pollution problem for the sanctuary. However, it seems that sanctuaries might provide lavatory facilities for the worshippers, for at the sanctuary of Hera at Tegea, the *demiourgos* was given the task of selling the accumulated *kopros*.¹⁰⁵ The build up of large amounts of *kopros*, possibly from many

⁹⁸ LSCG 116.

⁹⁹ LSCG 116.2-5: [ἐν τ]/οῖς ἄλσεσιν μ[ὴ ποιμ]/αίνεν μηδὲ κοπρε[όε]/ν.

¹⁰⁰ LSCG 116.5-14.

¹⁰¹ LSCG 116.14-17.

¹⁰² LSCG 116.6-9. On the βασιλείς, see LSCG 116 p. 211 referring to BSA 51 (1956) 165-66.

¹⁰³ LSCG 116.17-20: ἦν δὲ ὁ ἰ[δ]ῶν μὴ κατεῖπει, πέντ/ε στατηῆρας ὀφειλέτ/ω ἱερ[δ]ῶς τῶν θεῶν. For another example of rewards for informants, see above n. 93, with text.

¹⁰⁴ OGIS 483.60-65, .79-84; cf. Owens CQ 33 (1983) 44.

¹⁰⁵ LSCG 67.27-29. Cf. the regulation concerning *kopros* at LSCG 78.21: [ἐκ] τᾶς ἱερᾶς γᾶς κόπρον μὴ ἄγεν μηδεμίαν, which is probably to be interpreted in the light of the provision at LSCG 67.27-29.

worshippers rather than from animals, thus provided a saleable commodity. Just as the authorities in charge of sacred sites prohibited the dumping of *kopros* in sanctuaries, this was almost certainly the view at Tegea as well, but here the authorities turned the problem of how to dispose of the *kopros* into a profit making venture.

The dumping of excrement was not detrimental in the same sense that prohibited activities such as the grazing and the chopping down of trees were detrimental: that is, the dumping of *kopros* would not harm or destroy the natural environment of the sanctuary. Piles of excrement and the resulting effluvia would hardly have added to the sanctuary's appeal, even though the consequent risk of disease may not at that time have been a matter for great concern. It is also clear that excrement was considered "unclean" in a religious sense, and was "unholy", offensive to the gods; to defecate in streams and rivers, according to Hesiod, was inadvisable.¹⁰⁶ The sanctuaries where there were regulations against dumping *kopros* were not all Panhellenic, and smaller sanctuaries, such as those on Khios, suffered similar problems to those met with at the larger sites. But the provision at Delphi that no-one was to take *kopros* out of the sanctuary indicates that it was only to be taken out by the authorities, implying both that it was removed and sold and that it was easily collected in the sacred area, which suggests that facilities were provided, as they may have been at Tegea.¹⁰⁷ Larger sites may therefore have had their own ways of dealing with the problem to their own economic advantage. Given attitudes towards the dumping of *kopros*, it is almost certain that indiscriminate defecation by worshippers while within sanctuary grounds was not permitted. Pilgrims consulting the oracle, attending the Pythian festival or seeing the sights could not defecate indiscriminately in the shrine, and if they did so presumably would have been proceeded against by the authorities.

Regulations governed the use of water at many sites,¹⁰⁸ a necessary precaution, both because of the general shortage of water at many sites in Greece under normal conditions, and because a festival at a pilgrimage site would attract hundreds or thousands of pilgrims who would place severe strains on the water supply: Lucian, for example, comments on the scarcity of water at Olympia during the festival period stating that Herodes Atticus built a water system at Olympia which meant that visitors to the festival no longer died of thirst. The fact that Proteus the Cynic condemned the

¹⁰⁶ Hes. *Works and Days* 757-59, cf. 727-32 (for urination); cf. Parker *Miasma* 291, 294; West *Hesiod* 335-38.

¹⁰⁷ *LSCG* 78.21; cf. *LSCG* 67.27-30.

¹⁰⁸ See Panessa, G. *ASNP* 13 (1983) 359-87 for water distributed by sacred sites to local communities; cf. Argoud, G. "Installations hydrauliques de l'Amphiaraiion d'Oropos" in Fossey, J., Giroux, H. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities* (Amsterdam: 1985) 9-24 (both *non vidi*).

action, claiming that it made the Greeks effeminate, as they ought to endure the thirst brought on by dry Olympia, implies that such a deficiency was the norm at festival sites.¹⁰⁹ Water had ritual significance, being widely used for purification,¹¹⁰ and was also a practical necessity, for bathing and cooking. The Andanian inscription providing for the purity of the water supply is an example of regulations ensuring that the quality and quantity of this resource was maintained. The *agoranomos*, market supervisor, had charge of the water supply and had to ensure that at the time of the festival the sluices and conduits supplying water were undamaged and that no-one was hindered from having access to an adequate supply.¹¹¹ The penalties imposed for contravening this regulation were a scourging for slaves and a fine of twenty drachmas for a free man.¹¹² The same punishment applied for those who failed to observe the regulations concerning the provision of bathing facilities: it was also thought important at Andania that baths be freely available daily to pilgrims, and the *agoranomos* was instructed to make sure that dealers who provided baths, including the bathtub, lukewarm water and the necessary wood, should not charge more than two copper coins.¹¹³ With large numbers of pilgrims attending sacred sites, it can be assumed that many of these had provisions concerning water, and one of the main preoccupations of a site preparing to receive pilgrims would have been the provision of water, which, of course, pilgrims could not bring with them.

Other restrictions on the use of water could apply at certain sacred sites. At the shrine of Amphiaraios at Oropos there was a spring near the temple which was not used for purifications or other purposes. Whenever an individual had been cured by following the advice of the oracle, it was customary for him or her to throw gold and silver coins into the spring, because the god was reputed to have risen up through this spring, after his apotheosis.¹¹⁴ It is possible that what Pausanias records as a matter of custom might have also been ordained by legislation.

¹⁰⁹ Luc. *Peregrin.* 19: ὕδωρ ἐπήγαγεν τῇ Ὀλυμπίᾳ καὶ ἔπαυσε δίψην ἀπολλυμένων τοὺς πανηγυριστάς; cf. Epict. 1.6.26. The proximity of the Alpheios was presumably of no benefit. See Mallwitz *Olympia* 149-55 for details of Herodes' fountain. Diod. 18.8.5 writes of a crowd of 20,000 at Olympia; Finley *Ancient History* 38 believes this to be an exaggeration, with the crowd probably numbering in the low thousands only.

¹¹⁰ Burkert *Greek Religion* 86, with references at 377 n. 2, 382 n. 31; cf. above, n. 52; 6 nn. 24-25, with text.

¹¹¹ *LSCG* 65.103-106. For the fountain as a place of sacrifice, .84-89.

¹¹² *LSCG* 65.105-06, cf. .101-03.

¹¹³ *LSCG* 65.106-11. Note that pilgrims in their period of preparation before consulting the oracle of Trophonios at Lebadeia were to abstain from hot baths, and were only to bathe in the river Herkyna (Paus. 9.39.5); for ritual bathing, see ch. 8 nn. 46-48, with text.

¹¹⁴ Paus. 1.34.4: οὐτε θύοντες οὐδὲν ἐς αὐτὴν οὔτ' ἐπὶ καθαρσίῳις ἢ χέρνυβι χρῆσθαι νομίζοντες. For the fountain at Andania, see above n. 111, with text.

The main requirements of pilgrims would have been food, shelter and water. Pilgrims could bring their own shelter, in the form of tents, or share with someone on site.¹¹⁵ While pilgrims would presumably have brought some non-perishable food items with them, food supplies were taken care of officially by the provision of market places. At Andania, the dealers were punished if they failed to be honest, and to use the weights and measures agreed to by the *demos*, though the dealers were also protected. There was to be no charge for the space in the market place which they occupied, the *agoranomos* was to set no price limits, and there were to be no fixed times for the market; the entrepreneur was thus encouraged.¹¹⁶ Presumably traders were present at all major celebrations, and at the Isthmian festival, for example, Dio Chrysostom records that there were hawkers selling all possible items, along with other sources of entertainment such as jugglers, poets, fortune tellers, and Diogenes the Cynic.¹¹⁷ At Parion in the Troad in the second century BC the *agoranomos* for the Panathenaia, the main festival of the *koinon*, a group of eleven cities including Ilium and ten neighbours, was honoured, among other duties, for having taken care of the food supply during the festival. His responsibility may only have been towards competitors but may also have had a broader application, in the organisation and supply of enough food in the city for the many hundreds, or possibly thousands, of pilgrims who could have attended the festival from the neighbouring cities.¹¹⁸ At Delos, many of the inhabitants made a livelihood from pilgrims visiting the island.¹¹⁹

Women, of course, participated in pilgrimages, but it is impossible to know how prevalent this phenomenon was. The social background of the women involved is also difficult to determine, though in cases of pilgrimage which took place over a long distance, it should perhaps be assumed that only women from the higher socio-economic group were involved. Women almost certainly did not undertake pilgrimage by themselves but would have been either accompanying or being accompanied by male relatives or companions, who would have needed leisure to attend pilgrimage destinations, as well as the money to defray the expenses of the trip. The further

¹¹⁵ On tents, see ch. 3 nn. 5, 7, 12-3, 19-23, 26-27, 31, 34-39, 61, with text. The various festivals had markets and presumably pilgrims could buy tents.

¹¹⁶ *LSCG* 65.99-103. The dealers would be fined twenty drachmas, and slaves would be scourged, which was the same punishment as for those who harmed the water supply, or failed to observe the regulations about baths. Regulations at sites could have been of economic advantage to local traders; cf. above n. 44, with text.

¹¹⁷ Dio Chrys. 8.9: οὐκ ὀλίγων δὲ καπήλων διακαπηλεύοντων ὅτι τύχοιεν ἕκαστος. At the Isthmian festival, Diogenes the Cynic attracted the attention of a number of listeners, an exotic group, including those who had come to the festival from Ionia, Sicily, Italy, Libya, Massalia and Borysthenes (a city north of the Black Sea): 9.5.

¹¹⁸ *I. Iliion* 3; cf. nn. 153-54 below; ch. 7 n. 88, with text.

¹¹⁹ Athen. 172f-173a; see ch. 7 n. 22.

away the home of a pilgrim was from a pilgrimage destination, the greater the expense involved.

It is apparent that there were several centres to which females would be accustomed to make a pilgrimage. The detail devoted to female participants at the Andanian Mysteries, and in particular the restrictions on the clothing of women and their daughters is a clear indication that many of the pilgrims attending these rites were women, and that the authorities anticipated that they would constitute a fair proportion of the worshippers, and also that these women were likely to be from a higher economic class.¹²⁰ Similarly, at the mysteries of Despoina at Lykosoura, most of the regulations concern women, and in this case it is possible that the majority of the initiates might have been women.¹²¹ The fact that both of these were mysteries in honour of a goddess is, of course, a significant factor in the preponderance of female worshippers involved. Other cults, however, also attracted significant numbers of women, especially those involved in healing. At the shrine of Amphiaraos at Oropos, there was the provision that those who came to sleep in the temple seeking a cure were to be sexually segregated: the women were to sleep on one side of the altar, and the men were to sleep on the other side.¹²² This division of the incubatory centre into two parts seems to indicate that it was probably the case that men and women would be present at the shrine in more or less equal numbers, or at least that men would not so outnumber the women that the men would need more than half of the available sleeping space.

The healing centre of Epidaurous also attracted women, and of the cures which are recorded at the site, there are many cases where the suppliants were female: wives, mothers, and unmarried girls.¹²³ One of these women was a royal personage: Andromakha of Epeiros, wife of Arybbas; she travelled several hundred kilometres in search of the god Asklepios' help in falling pregnant. She slept in the abaton and dreamed that a handsome youth uncovered her, the god laid his hand on her, and in due time, a son was born to her from Arybbas.¹²⁴ Olympias, mother of Alexander III (the Great) of Macedon was an initiate of the Samothracian mysteries, before her marriage to Philip, so she had at some time made the journey from Epeiros to Samothrace.¹²⁵ Though these cases might have been unusual, they are nevertheless evidence that women could travel long distances on pilgrimages, and that these

¹²⁰ *LSCG* 65.15-28, specifically on their clothing.

¹²¹ *LSCG* 68. Women could be restricted access to some cults: see *LSCG Suppl.* p. 153.

¹²² *LSCG* 69.43-47; see above n. 55; cf. ch. 3 n. 72, with text.

¹²³ See ch. 8. n. 156, with text.

¹²⁴ *JG IV*² 1 121, iama 31; see ch. 8 n. 146 with text; Herzog *Wunderheilungen* 73 with references 73 n. 18.

¹²⁵ Plut. *Alex.* 2.2.

women went on pilgrimage in their own right. They may have been accompanied by their husbands, male relatives or other chaperons, but the religious experience was their own: it was they who dreamed that the god cured them. Clearly, this was also the case at Oropos. Women, then would go on pilgrimage in search of a cure, but more importantly, would travel considerable distances in order to do so, such as Andromakha.¹²⁶ Kreousa, in Euripides' *Ion*, accompanies her husband while he attends to the serious business of consulting the oracle. This does not mean that women could not consult the oracle, for *Ion* specifically asks her whether she has come with her husband or as a consultant.¹²⁷ It is clear that the oracle was frequently consulted not merely on political matters but also on questions of crops or childlessness, the latter being of particular relevance to women.¹²⁸ The chorus of women in the play ask if they may take off their shoes and go into the temple, but are told that it is not allowed; they must make a sacrifice of a *pelanos*, and of a beast, and then they may go into the temple to consult the oracle.¹²⁹ It is clear from this that women were not barred from consultation. Similarly, other women accompanied their husbands on such missions and the oracle was certainly consulted in an historical incident about the possibility of the petitioner having a child.¹³⁰ Women, in undertaking religious activities, were not bound by the restrictions which covered them in ordinary life and could be active pilgrims.

Little is known about a curious pilgrimage made by a group of Athenian women known as the Thyiades, but Pausanias states that they, in company with women from Delphi, went to Parnassos each year and celebrated secret rites, *orgia*, in honour of Dionysos. It is interesting to note that the Thyiades would hold dances along the road from Athens to Delphi, and Pausanias names one dance venue, namely, Panopeos;¹³¹ this place was described by Homer as *kallikhoros*, a place where there were fine

¹²⁶ See above n. 124, with text.

¹²⁷ Eur. *Ion*. 299: σὺν ἀνδρὶ δ' ἵκεις ἢ μόνη χρηστήρια; cf. 334-35. This seems to contradict Plut. *Mor.* 385c; see Fontenrose *Delphic Oracle* 217 n. 26 with references. The adjective *χρηστήριος* is used later in the play to describe the tripod: τρίποδα χρηστήριον (1320); cf. Hdt. 6.80, where it is used as an epithet of Apollo; see also ch. 6 nn. 100-01, with text.

¹²⁸ Eur. *Ion*. 303: καρποῦ δ' ὕπερ γῆς ἵκετ' ἢ παίδων πέρι;

¹²⁹ Eur. *Ion*. 220-229; εἰ μὲν ἐθύσατε πελανὸν πρὸ δόμων / καί τι πυθέσθαι χρήζετε φοίβου, / πάριτ' ἐς θυμέλας (226-28). For footwear in cults, see nn. 29, 35, 39, 45 above, with text.

¹³⁰ *FD* 3.1.560; see ch. 6 nn. 75, 138 with text.

¹³¹ Paus. 10.4.3; Plut. *Mor.* 365a; cf. Paus. 10.19.4, 10.32.7. The mythological etymology of the term *Thyiades* is explained at Paus. 10.6.3. See Marbach *RE* 6a (1935) 684-91; Burkert *Homo Necans* 124-25.

dancing grounds.¹³² This is an important pilgrimage in that it was not simply the activity at the destination which was important, but, in addition, there were specific cult acts to be performed along the way, and thus the journey to the site took on an importance in its own right. This is not generally the case with most of the other pilgrimages in which the religious aspect took over only at arrival at the shrine itself.

Pilgrimages to healing and mystery celebrations by women reflect the normal concerns which were shared by both sexes: illness, and concerns about one's relationship with the gods. But religious activities were, to an extent, differentiated by gender in ancient Greece. Women were excluded from political concerns, and thus would not consult oracles on these grounds, and while they could engage in athletic practice,¹³³ competitions were regarded, especially in the classical period, as primarily a male concern, perhaps because of the public display associated with the Panhellenic competitions. Yet, at around the time of the Olympic festival competitions especially for unmarried women were held, though they were debarred from competing in the Olympics against men.

The only female spectators permitted at the Olympic festival were *parthenoi*, virgins, and the priestess of Demeter, whose official seat during the festival was an altar of white marble opposite the *hellanodikai*. It does seem strange that *parthenoi* should attend the games when there were so many naked men running and competing in a wide variety of sports, although at Sparta there was clearly no prudishness attached to such display. By Elean law any other woman detected at an Olympic gathering was to be hurled from Mount Tropaion, even though maidens, *parthenoi*, and women, *gynaiques*, were admitted to the *prothesis* of the altar when the games were not in progress.¹³⁴ Pausanias states that no woman, *gyne*, had been caught

¹³² Hom. *Od.* 11. 581: διὰ καλλυζόρου Πανοπηῆος; Homer's epithet is mentioned by Paus. 10.4.2-3. Compare the specific cult acts which took place during the procession from Athens to Eleusis (ch. 5 nn. 63-84, with text), and from Miletos to Didyma (ch. 5 n. 63).

¹³³ Eur. *And.* 597-99; Paus. 3.13.7; Plato *Rep.* 452a-b, *Leg.* 7.804e, 8.833c; Plut. *Lyk.* 14.3, *Mor.* 227d; note Sappho fr. 73 (Edmonds); SIG³ 802 (Moretti *Iscrizione Agonistiche Greche* no. 63), see n. 144 below, with text; Moretti p. 168; cf. Harris *Greek Athletes* 181-83. The inscription at Moretti p. 168 (no separate number), which is the only epigraphic evidence comparable to SIG³ 802, reads: Νικηγόραν Νικόφιλος νικήσασαν δρόμῳ τῶν τῶν παρθένων δρόμου τῆς ἀνέθηκα λίθου Παρίου τὴν γλυκυτάτην ἀδελφῆν.

¹³⁴ Paus. 5.6.7, 5.13.10, 6.20.9. Harris *Greek Athletes* 183 thinks 6.20.9 (*parthenoi* not prohibited) is a corrupt passage, and that the negative should be dropped, but the three passages in question draw a distinction between *gynaiques* and *parthenoi*; cf. Kempe *LKE* 55 (1936) 281-82; on women at the Olympic festival, note also Burkert *Homo Necans* 102-03. For nudity in Greek athletics, see Crowther *Eranos* 80 (1982) 163-68; Mann *CR* 24 (1974) 177-78; Sturtevant *AJP* 33 (1912) 324-29; McDonnell *JHS* 111 (1991) 182-93; cf. for Italy, Crowther *CJ* 76 (1980-81) 119-23;

there, except Kallipateira, who was also known as Pherenike, who, because her husband had died, had undertaken to travel with her son Peisirodos, a fighter, to Olympia, disguised as his trainer. When Peisirodos won, Kallipateira, in her excitement, jumped over the fence separating the trainers from the competitors and in doing so revealed her person. Despite the fact that she had broken the law she was spared the penalty of being thrown from Mount Tupaion, out of respect for the fact that her father and brothers, and now her son, were Olympic victors. As a result a law was then passed about trainers that they, like the competitors, were to be naked, so that a similar incident might not reoccur.¹³⁵

According to Pausanias the sixteen women who every fourth year wove a robe for the goddess Hera at Olympia, were also responsible for conducting games, the Heraia, in her honour, which dated back to ancient times. There were races open to virgins, classified according to their age categories, who competed with their hair let down, with skirts just above the knees, and the right shoulder bare to the breast.¹³⁶ The races were conducted at the Olympic stadium, but with its length reduced by one-sixth, and there were rewards and privileges for the successful and a crown of olive and a portion of a cow sacrificed to Hera was awarded to the victors. In addition they were entitled to dedicate statues with their names on them.¹³⁷ While it is not known whether these games took place at the same time as the Olympics, it is possible that they were held either immediately before or directly after them,¹³⁸ as this would be the best arrangement for encouraging attendance. How well frequented the Heraia were is unknown, but it would have been convenient for spectators of the Olympics, and possibly the fathers of male competitors, to bring daughters with them in order to take part in these games at the same time

While actual participation in the Olympics was forbidden them, women could sponsor chariots at Olympia. The Spartan Kyniska, in the fourth century, daughter of Arkhidamos, was, according to Pausanias, the first woman to breed and own race-horses which won an Olympic chariot racing event. After her, many women,

Thuillier *MEFR* 87 (1975) 563-81. Paus 1.44.1-2 (cf. Thuc. 1.6.5-6) states that a naked man runs more swiftly than one who is clothed, contested by Arieti *CW* 68 (1975) 431-36.

¹³⁵ Paus. 5.6.7-8 (.8: τὸ ἔρυμα ἐν ᾧ τοὺς γυμναστὰς ἔχουσιν ἀπειλημμένους, τοῦτο ὑπερπηδῶσα ἡ Καλλιπάτειρα ἐγυμνώθη. φωραθείσης δὲ ὅτι εἴη γυνή). Despite the pleasing nature of the story, it is probably an aetiological myth explaining why the trainers went naked.

¹³⁶ See fig. 4.1.

¹³⁷ Paus. 5.16.2-4; for the sixteen women, see Paus. 5.16.2-8.

¹³⁸ Cf. Cornford *Origin of the Olympic Games* 229-31. For women in Greek athletics generally, see Harris *Greek Athletes* 179-86; Kebric *Greek People* 60-61; Scanlon *Virgineum Gymnasium* 185-216; and the bibliography collected by Crowther *CW* 79 (1985) 124-25.

particularly Spartans, won Olympic victories but Kyniska was the most famous,¹³⁹ and at Olympia there was a statue group of a chariot team and driver, with her portrait, by Apelles.¹⁴⁰ No statue bases for the female victors at Hera's games at Olympia survive,¹⁴¹ and in fact there is only one in existence which mentions women who competed successfully in athletic competitions. This dates to the first century AD and has an inscription which records victories for the daughters of one Hermesianax in competitions at the Pythian, Isthmian, Nemean, Sikyonian, Athenian Sebasteia, and Epidaurian festivals.¹⁴² Since Olympia is not mentioned it is possible that female competitors were never admitted to the Olympic festival itself.¹⁴³

"Hermesianax son of Dionysius, citizen of Caesarea Tralles and also of Corinth, erected these statues of his daughters who themselves also hold the same citizenships. Tryphosa won the stade at the Pythian Games held by the agonothetes Antigonos and Cleomachides, and the stade at the ensuing Isthmian games held by the agonothete Juventius Proclus, the first girl ever to do so. Hedeia won the race for war chariots at the Isthmian Games held by the agonothete Cornelius Pulcher, the stade at the Nemean Games held by the agonothete Antigonos, and the stade at the games in Sicyon held by the agonothete Menoetas; she won also the competition for girl harpists at the Sebasteia at Athens held by the agonothete Novius, son of Philinus. She was the first girl ever to be made a citizen of [name lost]. Dionysia won the [Event and name of the festival lost] held by the agonothete Antigonos, and the stade at the Asclepeia in sacred Epidaurus held by the agonothete Nicoteles. Dedicated to Pythian Apollo."¹⁴⁴

The reference to Tryphosa being the first girl to win the stade at the Isthmian games indicates that a race for girls had just been instituted, for it is inconceivable that any Panhellenic festival permitted females to compete against males. It could well be that the establishment of female competitions was a feature of the first century AD and the victory in both the athletic and the harp competitions by Hedeia is an indication that some girls showed versatility in their athletic and musical skills.

There is very little information about regulations and practices concerning pilgrims who died while they were on pilgrimage. The majority of deaths at sacred sites would have occurred at Epidauros and other healing sanctuaries throughout Greece and Asia Minor. There is, however, evidence concerning those who went to

¹³⁹ Paus. 3.8.1, 3.15.1.

¹⁴⁰ Paus. 6.1.6. She is praised at *Anth. Pal.* 13.16; see *IG V 1*, 235, a Doric capital with Kyniska's name at Sparta. For her victories in 396, 392, see Cartledge *Agesilaos* 29, 115, cf. 145, 149, 260; Harris *Greek Athletes* 180.

¹⁴¹ Harris *Greek Athletes* 180.

¹⁴² *SIG³ 802* (Moretti *Iscrizione Agonistiche Greche* no. 63)

¹⁴³ Kebric *Greek People* 60 states the probability as fact.

¹⁴⁴ *SIG³ 802* (Moretti *Iscrizione Agonistiche Greche* no. 63), tr. Harris *Greek Athletes* 180, also translated in Miller *Arete* 57-58. Lai genfeld *Griechische Athletinnen* 116-25 suggests that this inscription indicates that wealthy fathers organised competitions for girls in order to satisfy their ambitions for their daughters; cf. Fontenrose *Cult of Apollo* 135-36. *SIG³ 802.9-14*: 'Ηδέαι νεικήσασαν Ἰσθμια ... ἐνόπλι/ον ἄρματι, καὶ Νέμεα στάδιου ..., καὶ ἐν Σικυῶνι ...' ἐνεῖκα δὲ καὶ / πάδας κισθαρωδοῦς Ἀθήνησι Σεβάστεια.

healing sanctuaries and failed to receive a cure. All of the Epidaurian iamata are records of the successful cures of worshippers, either at the site, or on the way home. It is, however, clear from Pausanias that people did die at Epidauros,¹⁴⁵ and the iamata do not claim that everyone who visited the site was cured: rather they record only the cures, the successes rather than the failures, and it is significant that the heading of the inscription recording the iamata is “The Cures of Apollo and Asklepios”.¹⁴⁶ Terminally ill worshippers at Epidauros, who had failed in their search for a cure, according to Pausanias, would die out in the open air. Presumably, those who were on the point of dying would remove themselves, or be removed, from the abaton. This is not to say that unforeseen deaths did not occur in the abaton, merely that it was not considered appropriate that they happen. This practice of dying without shelter from the elements occurred for over seven hundred years before a Roman had the philanthropy to erect a building in which the dying could live out their last days in at least a degree of comfort.

There is no evidence of what happened to the bodies of the sick after they had died, but many pilgrims to Epidauros were presumably accompanied by relatives, friends or servants, and these presumably took care of the dead. Whether they were buried at Epidauros, or their bodies taken home is uncertain, but as there is no evidence for a cemetery at the site, it was probably the case that dead pilgrims were carried home. Burial of a deceased pilgrim presumably did not take place within the sacred site. No-one, for example, was allowed to be buried on Delos, so pilgrims to the Ionian celebrations who died there would not be buried there and those who were dying would be taken to the nearby island of Rheneia, as would women in childbirth.¹⁴⁷ While there is no record of a pilgrim actually expiring while on Delos,

¹⁴⁵ Paus. 2.27.6: only in his own day was a building erected for the use of those who were dying and in childbirth, and in this building people could die or give birth without the stain of sacrilege: ἐνταῦθα ἤδη καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τεκεῖν γυναῖκί ὄσιον (cf. 2.27.1); see above n. 61, ch. 8 nn. 189-90, with text. The building was erected by the senator Antoninus: this is sometimes thought to be a reference to the emperor Antoninus Pius, but Habicht *Pausanias' Guide* 10 with n. 53, cf. p. 177, argues strongly that this is not the case. That such a building was not erected until this time indicates that conditions at Panhellenic sanctuaries could be primitive. Presumably the *katagogia* at Epidauros and Oropos (figs. 3.2, 3.3) were reserved for visiting dignitaries; see ch. 3 nn. 50-53, with text.

¹⁴⁶ *JG* IV² 1, 121 line 1: [Ἱά]ματα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ. See ch. 8 nn. 4-5, with text.

¹⁴⁷ Thuc. 3.104.2; when the Athenians purified the island in 426/5 they even dug up all the tombs: Thuc. 3.104.2; Diod. 12.58.6-7. In 422 the Athenians expelled the Delians from the island (Thuc. 5.1), but in 421 the Athenians allowed them to return due to misfortunes in battle and a Delphic oracle (Thuc. 5.32.1). Cf. above n. 60, ch. 7 n. 2, with text. For a fourth century AD

the restriction on dying here is significant; meant primarily for the local inhabitants, it emphatically illustrates the aversion to death at sacred places. The ruling from the sanctuary on Kos, requiring that it be purified if anyone died in the temple,¹⁴⁸ acknowledges the realities of the human condition: people die unexpectedly, and in awkward situations, but it was still not acceptable on sacred soil. Aversion to death at sacred sites almost certainly means that a dead pilgrim would be removed from the sacred site itself, perhaps being buried in the cemetery of a nearby urban area, cremated and the ashes taken home, or perhaps the body carried home if the relatives were in favour of this choice, and if the distance involved not too great. When Kreousa attempted to murder Ion, her own unrecognised son, at Delphi, Apollo himself revealed the plot to avoid the consequent pollution and Kreousa was sentenced to a ritual punishment, being flung from a rock, for attempting to murder a temple servant within the sanctuary.¹⁴⁹

The greatest proportion of unexpected fatalities will have occurred in the Panhellenic games, where the contests involving physical contact could be violent. For participants in the Panhellenic festivals, there were clearly risks, and boxing, wrestling and the pankration occasionally proved fatal to contestants.¹⁵⁰ Deaths, however, could have occurred at other sites, or on the journey to and from the site under a wide range of circumstances: old age, childbirth, disease, shipwreck, and exhaustion could all have taken their toll. It might seem strange that there are no arrangements made for disposal of the dead in the lengthy Andanian cult inscription,¹⁵¹ though this is probably not an indication that deaths were not anticipated at the site, but that they would be an abnormal occurrence, to be dealt with as and when necessary. Although examples of the deaths of specific individual pilgrims and theoroi are lacking, it must be assumed that some of them became ill and died while on their pilgrimage. There is one case of a theoros who died at Alexandria while announcing a festival, as a Hydra vase from Alexandria bears the inscription “Sotion Kleonos, a Delphian theoros, (died) announcing the Soteria...”¹⁵² No further

incident, in which the pagan emperor Julian had the tomb of St. Babylas, at Antioch, exhumed, because it was within sight of a temple, see Theodoret 9, 216.

¹⁴⁸ See above n. 58.

¹⁴⁹ Eur. *Ion* 1118: ἐξηῦρεν ὁ θεός, οὐ μίανθῆναι θέλων, see also 1222-25.

¹⁵⁰ Brophy *AJP* 99 (1978) 363-90; Brophy & Brophy *AJP* 106 (1985) 171-98; Poliakhoff *AJP* 107 (1986) 400-02. Cf. Paus. 6.9.6-7, concerning Kleomedes of Astypalaia who went mad with grief after having been disqualified by the *hellenodikai* for killing an opponent in a boxing match.

¹⁵¹ *LSCG* 65.

¹⁵² Cook *Inscribed Hydra Vases* 26, no. 10 (*AJA* 1 (1885) no. 6, p. 22): θ' Σωτίων / Κλέωνος / Δελφός / θεωρός τὰ / Σωτήρια / ἐπανυγέλλων / διὰ Θεοδότου / ἀγοραστοῦ; cf. Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 88, 134-35. *Arch. Delt.* 23b (1967) 39 (*SEG* 25.244), fourth century BC, is a fragment of a *loutophoros*, with an inscription commemorating the positions which

information is available; what manner of death befell this theoros while he was at Alexandria announcing the Soteria is unknown.

Little evidence is available for what happened in those cases where pilgrims became unexpectedly ill at a sacred site. The inscription from Parion in the Troad regarding the celebration of the Panathenaia provides the information that a certain individual, appointed by the polis of Parion to act as *agoranomos* had, amongst other duties, arranged for a doctor to take care of those who fell ill during the festival.¹⁵³ The *synedrion* of the koinon, meeting at the Panathenaic celebration, decided to honour the Parians for making the appointment.¹⁵⁴ Who was eligible for treatment is only vaguely defined - “those ill” - and the implication might well be that this was a service provided only for those actually participating in the contests associated with the festival, but it is also possible that he was appointed to look after the pilgrims generally. There is a case where a physician on Kos was honoured in the third century for taking care of travellers to Kos who fell ill on the island while *kata theorian* or on private business,¹⁵⁵ and perhaps the *theoria* could be a reference to an official visit to the Koan Asklepieia.

Many regulations governed the activities of athletes, a specialised category of pilgrims, who although they were primarily interested in athletic competition were nevertheless attending a religious festival and taking part in all the religious ceremonies while they were at Panhellenic festivals, and were directly under the eyes of the presiding deity. Competitors attending the Olympic festival were trained for thirty days before the festival at Elis, and then marched towards Olympia, being told by the Eleians that if they had trained well they could continue to their destination, but those who had not were to depart, to go wherever they chose.¹⁵⁶ Furthermore, once at Olympia the athletes had to swear that they had followed the regulations for training

this individual held: Θεωρός Ἀμφικτύονος / Διομειεύς. It is possible that he was a theoros sent to announce the Pythian festival.

¹⁵³ *I. Ilion* 3.16-18 (c. 200 BC): [παρέσχευε] ἰατρὸν τὸν θεραπεύσοντα/[α τοὺς ἀσθε]νοῦντας ἐν τῇ παν[ηγύ]ρει], cf. .5-10 (position as *agoranomos*); cf. n. 118 above, ch. 7 n. 88, with text.

¹⁵⁴ *I. Ilion* 3.1-4, .18-21.

¹⁵⁵ *ZPE* 25 (1977) p. 266, lines 15-17: [τοὺς] μὲν κατὰ θεωρίαν / ἀποστα[λέντας ὑπὸ τοῦ] δήμου, τοὺς / δὲ καθ' ἰδίαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀφικ]ομένους.

¹⁵⁶ Philostr. *Apoll.* 5.43; John Chrys. *Inscript. Attar.* 1.59; Burkert *Homo Necans* 102 n. 43; Paus. 5.21.12-13 (the athlete Apollonios fined for arriving late for the training session, discussed below nn. 168-70, with text). For the *hellanodikai* who were in charge of the Olympics, see Paus. 5.9.4, 6.24.3; Philostr. *Apoll.* 6.10; Harp. *s.v.* ἑλληνοδίκαι; note Hdt. 2.160.1-4; cf. Glotz *DA* 3.1 (1900) 60-64; see nn. 166, 168 below.

for a ten month period,¹⁵⁷ and were also required to undergo sexual abstinence.¹⁵⁸ This will presumably not have been a purity requirement, as in other cults, but a practical consideration, not so much as to install discipline as to prevent dissipation of energy.¹⁵⁹ The diet of the athletes also came under scrutiny for reasons of physical fitness.¹⁶⁰

The expenses, including the costs of training, which such athletes incurred seem to have been high, and were presumably an important factor in determining whether a good athlete would undertake an athletic pilgrimage to a Panhellenic competition. Pindar notes that the costs involved at the Isthmian games had not daunted the hopes of the competitors,¹⁶¹ and presumably this was the case for the other athletic competitions as well. These expenses may to a large degree have been made up simply of sustenance, though competitors would need to be wealthy or, if poor, to have a sponsor, for the visit to athletic sites involved a period in which the athletes could not earn a living.¹⁶² Even while they were not participating in the games, they presumably spent a good deal of their time training. In a negative sense, fines to be paid by athletes for various misdemeanours would also have to be taken into account, and these would have been paid for from the pockets of the competitors themselves or their sponsors, and the fines could have been for a variety of reasons. At the Olympics there were many misdeeds for which competitors could incur fines, and the Eleans, through the official authorities, the *hellanodikai*, seem to have been fairly strict on a variety of matters to do with the games. The competitors along with their fathers, brothers and trainers had to swear an oath upon slices of boar's flesh that they would not commit any wrongs at the festival, which shows the seriousness with which misconduct was regarded.¹⁶³ While this information pertaining to fines relates to the Olympics, it is probable that there were also similar fines for competitors breaching rules at the other Panhellenic games

Pausanias describes how on the path to the stadium, there were several bronze statues of Zeus, called *Zanes*, which had been paid for from the fines inflicted on

¹⁵⁷ Paus. 5.24.9, 6.23.1-2; cf. 6.24.3

¹⁵⁸ Philostr. *Gymn.* 22 (not as precise as Burkert *Homo Necans* 61 n. 13, 102 n. 43 implies; cf. Plat. *Laws* 839e-840a; Aeschyl. *Theoroi* 29-31, with Lloyd *Aeschylus* 2.544 (for this play, see also ch.1 n. 140); Arieti *CW* 68 (1975) 431-36; Burkert *Homo Necans* 102.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Parker *Miasma* 84: "where abstinence is attested, as for athletes, it can perhaps be explained pragmatically."

¹⁶⁰ Paus. 6.7.10; Porph. *Pythag.* 15; Jambl. *Pythag.* 5.25; on athletic life in general: Arist. *Pol.* 8.4.1-2 (cf. Crowther *Phoenix* 42 (1988) 306-07); Renfrew *Food for Athletes* 174-76. Cf. the cults in which certain foodstuffs were prohibited for religious reasons, above nn. 62-67, with text.

¹⁶¹ Pind. *Isth.* 5.57-58; cf. Harris *Athletes* 37-38.

¹⁶² Harris *Athletes* 37-38.

¹⁶³ Paus. 5.24.9.

athletes who had broken Olympic regulations, and erected as a permanent sign of disgrace.¹⁶⁴ The first six of these related to the same crime, that of Eupolos of Thessaly, who at the 98th Olympics bribed the other three boxers, one of whom was a previous Olympic winner. Four of these six statues had couplets inscribed on their bases. One was particularly instructive: to win at Olympia entails being swift of foot and strong, victory is not a matter of money. Of the three others, one states it was erected “out of respect for religion” by the piety of the Eleians and to inspire fear in “crooked athletes”; another praises Elis especially for fining the briber and the bribed; the last cautions that the statues are to instruct Greece not to use bribery at the Olympics.¹⁶⁵

Other cases of fines imposed for bribery are mentioned by Pausanias who himself saw the *Zanes* erected with the records of the relevant incidents,¹⁶⁶ among which an interesting example is that of Kallippos of Athens, who bribed the other contestants in the pentathlon in 332. The Eleians fined both the briber and the bribed. The Athenians sent the orator Hypereides to persuade the Eleians to waive the fine, but the Eleians refused to change their minds, so the Athenians did not pay up, and resolutely boycotted the games. However, at Delphi the god finally stated that he would give no oracle to the Athenians on any matter until Kallippos and his antagonists had paid the fine: they also had to pay for the erection of six statues, and as in the case of Eupolos, inscriptions on the bases of the statues mentioned, along with other information, Apollo’s approval of the Elean decision, praises of the Eleians themselves, and the maxim that Olympic contests were about merit, *arete*, not money.¹⁶⁷

An Alexandrian boxer Apollonios nicknamed “Sprinkler” was fined in AD 93 because he was late for the official one month training period at Elis which all competitors at the Olympic games had to undergo.¹⁶⁸ He gave as his excuse that the

¹⁶⁴ Paus. 5.21.2. Levi Pausanius 2.59 n. 203 records that sixteen of the bases of these *Zanes* have been discovered; cf. Wiesner *RE* 18. (1942) 150; Gardiner *Athletics* 103.

¹⁶⁵ Paus. 5.21.4: φησὶν ὡς τὸ ἄγαλμα ἔστηκε τιμῇ τε τῇ ἐς τὸ θεῖον καὶ ὑπὸ εὐσεβείας τῆς Ἡλείων καὶ ἀθληταῖς παρανομοῦσιν εἶναι δέος; cf. Gardiner *Athletics* 103. Other statue bases of the *Zanes* have similar injunctions: Paus. 5.21.6-8.

¹⁶⁶ Paus. 5.21.8-9, 12-17; 6.3.7 records a case of *hellanodikai* who were fined for giving a false judgement.

¹⁶⁷ Paus. 5.21.5-7; Plut. *Mor.* 850b who records, *contra* Pausanias, that Hypereides won the case); Hyp. fr. 32.111 (Harp. s.v. ἑλλαντιδικαί) (Kenyon) records the title of the speech as Ὑπὲρ Καλλίππου πρὸς Ἡλείους (cf. fr. 32.112 (Harp. s.v. Ἐλευσίλια) (Kenyon)); cf. Parke *Greek Oracles* 119 with 118 n. 19.

¹⁶⁸ One month’s training at Elis: Phi. ostr. *Apoll.* 5.43; cf. Paus. 6.23.1; *SIG*³ 1073.19-21 (both specify the necessity but not the length of time). The athletes had to be in training for ten months, and were required to swear an oath to this effect: Paus. 5.24.9; cf. 6.24.3 for a similar injunction for

winds had held up the ship on which he was sailing, but was shown to be lying by another Alexandrian, Herakleides, the only boxer who had turned up on time, who proved that Apollonios had actually been competing and winning prizes in contests in Ionia.¹⁶⁹ The Eleans therefore waived the contest and gave the prize to Herakleides, whereupon Apollonios attacked and pumelled him, despite the fact that Herakleides was wearing the olive wreath of victory and sheltering with the *hellanodikai*. He paid the price for his misconduct, though technically he was not a competitor, having arrived late, but rather was fined for a criminal misdemeanour.¹⁷⁰ One athlete, a pankrationist from Alexandria, was fined in AD 25 because on the day he was meant to compete he ran away; Pausanias notes that this was the only occurrence of such an incident.¹⁷¹ Theagenes was fined in 480 because he entered the boxing competition in order that Euthymos, who had won the contest in 484, could not win the boxing; Theagenes was successful but could not enter the pankration contest, as he had intended to do, as he was exhausted from the fight. For his show of spite he was fined by the *hellanodikai*: one talent to Zeus and one to Euthymos. At the following Olympics Theagenes paid the god's fine, but in compensation to Euthymos refrained from entering the boxing, which Euthymos won in that year and at the next Olympics.¹⁷² One of the dangers which competitors could face was that of disqualification in a preliminary examination by the authorities in charge of an athletic event; at Olympia, athletes had to swear that they had been in training for ten months and failure to do so would presumably have provided grounds for disqualification. At Isthmia there appears to be evidence for this procedure in a lead tablet which records that a magistrate disqualified one of the competitors. The text reads: "I, Marius Tyrannos, disqualify Semakos."¹⁷³

Pilgrimage was an activity that involved expenditure of various kinds and there were a number of expenses which a pilgrim would expect to have to meet: the cost of

the *hellanodikai*: they lived for ten months in the *hellanodikaion* at Elis, where they were instructed about the contests.

¹⁶⁹ This incident seems to indicate that participation in the festival by athletes had fallen off considerably by this time.

¹⁷⁰ Paus. 5.21.12-14. The Asklepieia at Epidauros (a penteteric event) was held nine days after the Isthmian (biennial) festival (Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 3.147 (Edelstein *Asclepius* 1, T559, p. 312), so athletes were on a tight schedule; cf. ch. 8 n. 194.

¹⁷¹ Paus. 5.21.18.

¹⁷² Paus. 6.6.4-6.

¹⁷³ *Hesp.* 51 (1982) p. 65 (Roman Imperial): Μάριος Τύραννος / Σήμακου ἔκκρεΐνω, with commentary pp. 65-68.

¹⁷⁴ The main exception would seem to be the Eleusinian Mysteries; see ch. 5 nn. 144-45, with text.

¹⁷⁵ Sokolowski *HTR* 47 (1954) 153.

travel, sacrifice, consultation fees, and other items, as well as the expenses incurred by athletes. Naturally the first expense that was involved was that of journeying to a particular sacred site, which could be achieved by an overland route, by sea, or a combination of both. The main expense thereafter would have been for food and lodging, and perhaps feed for both transport and sacrificial animals if this was required. There were, of course, others as well, and the sanctuary had various charges which would be levied upon worshippers, according to its nature. All cults involved some type of sacrifice: if the beasts were provided by the sanctuary, then it sought reimbursement. Healing sanctuaries charged for sleeping in the abaton, oracular centres for the consultation of the oracle, and sites which involved initiation ceremonies charged for participation. The philosophy of levying such charges was simple. In the case of sacrificial animals, wood for the sacrifice, or wreaths for the pilgrims, it was a case of providing items which were required by the cult. Other charges were levied to provide funds for the upkeep of the shrine. The priests do not seem to have been paid;¹⁷⁴ their perquisites seem to have been limited to the skin and flesh of sacrificed animals.

The expenses of pilgrimage associated with arriving at a site were distinct from those expenses which arose out of actual participation in the cult itself. Part of the requirement for entry to a cult might be a financial payment, and failure to make this payment would result in the worshipper being denied access to the sanctuary. Consultation of Asklepios involved preliminary sacrifice and the payment of a consultation fee. Sokolowski many years ago briefly outlined some of the evidence concerning the costs involved to worshippers at pilgrimage sites. He had little to write about the healing sanctuaries, but noted that there was a fee at Oropos, where Amphiaraios effected cures, and also for the Asklepieion at Erythrai.¹⁷⁵ Recently, it has been claimed that Oropos was unique among healing sanctuaries in charging fees for those who wished to be healed.¹⁷⁶ but in fact, while the evidence is limited, this was not the case. The sacred law for the Pergamene Asklepieion relates that the procedure for incubation required preliminary sacrifice and a payment, to be placed in the cult treasury,¹⁷⁷ and the offertory box in the Asklepieion at Corinth will presumably have been for payment of incubatory fees.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ The main exception would seem to be the Eleusinian Mysteries; see ch. 5 nn. 144-45, with text.

¹⁷⁵ Sokolowski *HTR* 47 (1954) 153.

¹⁷⁶ Petropoulou *GRBS* 22 (1981) 54.

¹⁷⁷ *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, pp. 168-69, no. 161.8, prescribes a charge of three obols for incubation in the Pergamene *enkoimeterion*. On the question of fees, see Rouse *Greek Votive Offerings* 200. Sokolowski *HTR* 47 (1954) 153 notes that at Pergamon the charge was in the form of sacrifices

There is no evidence on this point from anywhere except Oropos, Erythrai and Pergamon, and possibly Corinth, but this should not be taken as an indication that there were no consultation fees at other centres. It is surprising that, despite the quantity of information relating to incubation, so little is known, even from a site such as Epidauros. It can however be noted that Asklepios was a deity who was very fond of receiving thanksgiving offerings for the cures which he had effected.¹⁷⁹ Two fourth century inscriptions from Oropos provide information about fees for pilgrims who sought cures there. One of the inscriptions stipulated a charge of one Boeotian drachma for consulting the healing deity Amphiaraos in the presence of the priest,¹⁸⁰ and another also mentions a fee prescribed for whoever sought a remedy.¹⁸¹ This second decree is almost certainly later than the first one; this is clear from the fact that in this second decree the price has been erased and a new price inscribed over it.¹⁸² The new cost was nine obols; the original price, which was erased, was probably six. This document, therefore, gives evidence that there was a fee for consultation and that it had been raised. Pilgrims also had to pay for the consultation of oracles, as for example in a decree of the fourth century from Lebadeia which provided for a fee of ten drachmas for whoever went down to consult the god.¹⁸³ At Eleusis, fees for initiation were charged.¹⁸⁴

Payment might also have been necessary for sacrificial items at the site. When the pilgrim did not have the relevant items for sacrificial procedure as required by the regulations of a sacred site, there is some evidence to suggest that the sacred site would make provision for such necessities. One inscription from Epidauros instructed the priest of Asklepios to provide grain, wood, and wreaths - essential

(SIG³ 1007), but he wrote before the discovery of *Alt. Perg.* 8.3, pp. 168-69, no. 161, which makes clear this payment. For Epidauros, see *LSCG Suppl.* 22; cf. *LSCG* 60. Cf. ch. 8 n. 63, with text.

¹⁷⁸ See fig. 4.2. De Waele *AJA* 37 (1933) 428 notes that 11 bronze coins, predating the Roman sack of Corinth in 146, were found in the box when he excavated it. *LSCG* 69.20-24, from the Amphiaraion at Oropos, mentions an offertory box into which the incubants were to place the fee, in the presence of the *neokoros* (see below n. 180-82, with text).

¹⁷⁹ See ch. 8 nn. 161-88, with text.

¹⁸⁰ *LSCG Suppl.* 35.3-6.

¹⁸¹ *LSCG* 69.20-24: ἐπαρ/χὴν δὲ διδοῦν τὸν μέλλοντα θεραπεύεσθαι ὑ/πὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ ἔλαττον ἐννέ' ὀβόλους δοκίμου ἀργ/υρίου καὶ ἐμβάλλειν εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν παρεόντος τοῦ νεωκόρου.

¹⁸² Petropoulou *GRBS* 22 (1981) 58 also cites the fact that *LSCG* 67 is a neat *stoichedon* text, whereas *LSCG Suppl.* 35 is "hardly so".

¹⁸³ *LSCG* 74. Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 150 lists inscriptions giving the cost of consultation.

¹⁸⁴ See ch. 5 nn. 144-45 with text.

items for sacrifice - to those who came for the sacrifice without these things and each item is costed.¹⁸⁵

This chapter has sought to bring together information on many different items relating to a number of cults, concentrating on the various religious and secular concerns which confronted pilgrims at sacred sites. There are several significant points that emerge: one is the role played by women and the degree to which they participate in such activities. Another is the socio-economic background of pilgrims generally. To a large degree, pilgrims seem to have come from the upper socio-economic groups. The authorities of festival sites which attracted large numbers of pilgrims were obviously prepared for the detrimental effect which pilgrims could have on their sanctuaries, and went to great lengths to regulate their conduct. In fact a large proportion of regulations can be termed secular, and not religious. It can also be noted that pilgrims did not simply arrive at a sacred site and commence their participation in the cult. They would need to arrive several days in advance of a celebration in many cases, bring with them a number of necessities, or the money to purchase them on site, and, if they were athletes, begin preparation many months in advance. This implies that most pilgrims were aware of what was needed at a particular site. At sacred sites, the behaviour of pilgrims was circumscribed by religious and secular regulations, which pilgrims would need to observe. If they did not, they risked incurring the wrath, not only of the gods, but of the secular authorities who controlled the pilgrimage sites and regulated their ceremonies.

¹⁸⁵ *LSCG Suppl.* 22; Sokolowski p. 57 provides analogous examples: *LGS* II 85 (*SIG*³ 1039); *LSAM* 12.10-17; 22; 23; 24A; *LSCG Suppl.* 7; 19.86-92; 108.