

**THEMATIC  
CONSIDERATIONS**

## INTRODUCTION

Pilgrims and pilgrimage were a characteristic feature of the Hellenic world at all periods of its history, and pilgrimage was at all times a normal and an unquestioned facet of Greek religious experience. Pilgrimage, a journey to a sacred site, not necessarily a Panhellenic one, outside of the worshipper's locality, was an activity which endured for over a millennium, and is attested from the time of Homer to the triumph of Christianity. One of the commonest features of medieval times was to be the existence of the religious pilgrimage, and one noticeable on a truly international scale, with the faithful of the middle ages setting out to the Holy Land, as well as to regional religious centres.<sup>1</sup> In classical times the Greek world, of course, was a pagan one in which a myriad of cults prospered, each for a particular reason. The inhabitants of this pagan world practised pilgrimage as a part of their beliefs long before Christianity also adopted this phenomenon as an expression of piety, and the discussion which follows examines aspects of the various pilgrimages which were undertaken in the Hellenic world, with particular emphasis on the experiences and point of view of the ordinary pilgrim. The period dealt with covers the eighth century BC through to the fourth century AD, with the main focus being, where possible, on the classical and Hellenistic periods.

The first four chapters of the discussion deal with the various thematic and organisational aspects of pilgrimage: the ways in which *theoroi* were chosen and invitations for pilgrims to attend a site were issued and the accompanying sacred truces negotiated and accepted; the degree to which pilgrims were safe as they went about their religious activity on their journeys to and from festival sites, in times of both peace and war, and the extent to which pilgrims were protected by *asylia*, that is the agreed inviolability of sacred sites celebrating a festival; the accommodation facilities which were provided for pilgrims on their arrival at sacred sites and the ways in which they would be housed during their stay; and the various secular and practical considerations which prevailed at shrines, especially the regulations laid down at different types of sanctuaries regarding the conduct of their visitors, including both the ritual practices prescribed by the cult of their worshippers and the behaviour required of these pilgrims throughout their stay. The examination of these topics is intended to provide an analysis of the nature of pilgrimage and its practical aspects amongst the Greeks generally.

---

<sup>1</sup> I have found Sumption *Pilgrimage: An Image of Medieval Religion* and Ousterhout *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* useful for comparative purposes.

In order to illustrate the experiences which pilgrims underwent, examples of each of the four main types of ancient pilgrimage have been selected, each demonstrating *par excellence* a different type of cult centre to which pilgrimages were made, and the cult activities of the pilgrims who participated there. A complete account of some of these sanctuaries, notably Eleusis and Delphi, would of course be in itself an immense task and is ruled out by spacial considerations:<sup>2</sup> here the intention is to provide primarily an overview of the sites and their cult ritual, with the focus of the discussion on the experiences undergone by their pilgrims. The pilgrimage destinations which are dealt with here comprise Eleusis, Delphi, ethnic cult centres (including the Panionion, Delos, the Troad koinon, and the Daidala), and Epidauros, and these sites illustrate the four main categories of pilgrimages available to Hellenic worshippers: initiation in mystery cults, consultation of an oracle, participation in ethnic and local festivals, and visits by the sick to healing sanctuaries. Delphi as a site further serves to introduce another aspect of Hellenic pilgrimage with a brief discussion of the Panhellenic Pythian contests; moreover, many of the restrictions which applied to athletes and spectators are discussed in the chapter on regulations, thus permitting the omission of Olympia as a separate site. Aspects of other centres such as Andania, Lykosoura, Oropos, Lebadeia, and Pergamon are dealt with, in connection with thematic issues. Many of these sites were not Panhellenic, but they nevertheless attracted worshippers from a wide area and not just from the local community, and as such provide valuable evidence for Hellenic pilgrimage and pilgrims.

The focus on the selected centres and the experiences undergone by their pilgrims is intended to present an assessment of the nature of Hellenic pilgrimage from the point of view of the pilgrims involved. Eleusis, for example, was a pilgrimage centre of great importance for nearly a millennium, and the mysteries were an annual event attracting participants from all over the Greek world, who came in the hope of enriching their everyday lives and enjoying a pleasant afterlife, rather than the shadowy existence which was the dour fate of the people of Homer.<sup>3</sup> Delphi was the seat of the god Apollo, and a popular destination for consultants, particularly during the classical and Hellenistic periods. Here the deity spoke through the medium of a priestess to deliver prophecies to all those in need of advice on questions of importance to themselves, which could range from political issues to matters of bad crops, marriage possibilities, and childlessness. Sanctuaries and festivals could also

---

<sup>2</sup> Note esp. the statement of Burkert *Homo Necans* 117 that "...it is impossible to do justice in a few pages to the Delphic phenomenon as a whole..." This comment can apply to any of the popular (Panhellenic) pilgrimage centres.

<sup>3</sup> Ar. *Frogs* 316-459; Hom. *Od.* 11 *passim*.

serve to reinforce ethnic and local ties and at the Panionion the Ionians of Asia Minor would gather together to worship Poseidon; a further Ionian festival took place on the island of Delos in honour of Apollo, and at regular intervals the people of the neighbouring islands (Ionians from throughout the Hellenic world, including the Athenians during the classical period) would gather to worship the god in sacrifice and celebrate athletic and musical competition. The Dorians of Asia Minor and the cities of the Troad koinon also had festivals restricted to their own groups, while Boeotians also had a pilgrimage of their own, the Great Daidala at Plataea, which involved all the major Boeotian cities.

The pilgrimage in search of a cure for a medical condition was perhaps even more popular than the pilgrimages mentioned above, and not restricted to any particular event or season. The Hellenic pilgrim could visit a number of sites in search of a remedy, the most important of which was the healing sanctuary at Epidauros, where Apollo and his son Asklepios provided cures: the Asklepieia at Kos and Pergamon, and the Amphiaraion at Oropos, were also important healing sanctuaries. Many testimonies are available from Epidauros, dated to the classical period, left by pilgrims who claimed that they had been healed by the god, which detail the pilgrims' experiences: the patients slept in a building known as the abaton, and prayed that the god Asklepios would appear in the night and heal them by means of a dream.

Pilgrimage - that is, paying a visit to a sacred site outside the boundaries of one's own physical environment - was clearly important as a cultural phenomenon amongst the Greeks. In this context, any journey undertaken for a specifically religious purpose, and which involved an overnight stay in the environs of the pilgrimage centre, can be considered a pilgrimage for the purposes of the discussion. A definition that would seek to grant pilgrimage status to sacred sites only if these occurred outside the territory of an individual's state will necessarily have exceptions. Significant here would be the procession from Athens to Eleusis, some twenty-two kilometres, a journey which would take a walker all day, which ensured that the Eleusinian Mysteries constituted a pilgrimage for not only the non-Athenians being initiated, but also for those Athenians involved. Despite the fact that each urban centre in the Hellenic world had its own particular holy places - temples and shrines, and features of the physical environment, such as groves, caves and mountains - some worshippers for a variety of reasons found that the religious experience offered by these places was insufficient. Accordingly, they would travel beyond their local boundaries and visit sanctuaries which, for one reason or another, transcended the sanctity of local cult areas. Just as the divine was considered to be more accessible in specially designated cult places, so too some places were more sanctified than others, and this concept, that communication with the divine was more efficacious at some

sites than others, was the fundamental assumption underlying pilgrimage: the primacy of a particular sacred topography is what motivated the pilgrim. As an example, it can be noted that many communities possessed Asklepieia. Despite this, however, the Asklepieion at Epidauros was popular throughout the Greek world, and individuals afflicted with sickness or disease from as far apart as Thessaly, Epeiros, Lampsakos, Knidos and Thasos made their way to Epidauros, considering that, for their needs, the curative skills of the god were greater there than at any more accessible site.

Pilgrimage was an act of worship which had always been an unquestioned part of Greek religious practice, and the dating of the foundation of the Olympic festival in 776, though traditional, suggests that pilgrimage was already an established activity at that time. The victor lists for the eighth century as found in the literature indicate widespread participation amongst the Greeks at this stage, though these lists are possibly anachronisms, in which the established Panhellenic nature of the festival has been projected into the past.<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, the Homeric poems apparently provide evidence that pilgrimage was established in or by the end of the eighth century: Odysseus, on his way to Troy, is said to have put in at Delos to worship at Apollo's altar,<sup>5</sup> and tells Eumaios that he had also consulted the oracle of Zeus at Dodona,<sup>6</sup> while the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* mentions the Panhellenic celebration at Delos, and Thucydides accepts the hymn as evidence for the existence of the festival in the distant past.<sup>7</sup> Homer, if the tradition may be accepted, is stated to have visited Delphi, which, though doubtless historically inaccurate, at least shows that the Greeks themselves had a belief in the great antiquity of their pilgrimage tradition.<sup>8</sup> Certainly, the "cosmopolitan range" of the dedications at the Panhellenic sanctuaries from the late eighth century onwards indicates a movement of individuals bearing gifts from their own states to cult centres in other areas,<sup>9</sup> though it is possible that consultations of the Delphic oracle, reputed to be from the eighth century, and from the seventh and sixth, can mostly be rejected as evidence for pilgrimage activity at those dates.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, the establishment of non-Olympic Panhellenic games, in the sixth century,<sup>11</sup> does testify to the fact that pilgrimage was an established practice in the Hellenic world in or before the sixth century, though it should be stressed that in the

---

<sup>4</sup> But see Lee *First Olympic Games* 110-18, arguing that the games were established by 776.

<sup>5</sup> Hom. *Od.* 6. 162-67.

<sup>6</sup> Hom. *Od.* 14.326; cf. 16.403-405, where Amphinomos' suggestion to the suitors that they consult the will of Zeus may be a further reference to the oracle at Dodona.

<sup>7</sup> Thuc. 3.104.4-6.

<sup>8</sup> Paus. 10.7.3, as did Hesiod, Paus. 10.7.3.

<sup>9</sup> Snodgrass *Archaic Greece* 57.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Fontenrose *Delphic Oracle* 268-312.

<sup>11</sup> Lee *The First Olympic Games* 113

archaic period individual pilgrimage will have been the rule, and organised official pilgrimages by theoroi, requiring a sophisticated political organisation, will have developed at a later date.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, official pilgrimage is definitely a feature of the Hellenic world in the fifth century.<sup>13</sup>

An archaic dating for the beginnings of Greek pilgrimage accordingly seems sound, and possibly from the eighth century before our era to four centuries after its commencement, that is, for well over one millenium, the ancient Greeks made pilgrimages to their holy places, an impressive example of the continuity of a particular religious practice. Throughout this period pilgrims would have been a characteristic of the Hellenic landscape. Travel *en masse* or of large groups of individuals was otherwise unknown, except for the movement of armies in times of war, and the only other regular travellers would have comprised merchants and traders. Pilgrims would thus have been a very noticeable feature of Hellenic life, and, even if pilgrims often tended to come from the higher socio-economic groups, pilgrimage was the only opportunity for the ordinary citizen, barring military service, to travel and visit other sites and cities. Generally these pilgrims would have inspired by their own needs and concerns, though some would have combined religion with entertainment, travelling to festivals as spectators of contests or to view processions and the pageant of festival activity. There is, however, little evidence to suggest that there was a pilgrimage circuit in existence. Athletes might make a *periodos* of the Panhellenic games, but there is no evidence that non-participants would also do so. There is a case in which one inquirer at Delphi was told to attend the Pythian games, and thus his pilgrimage to the oracular centre led to attendance at the festival.<sup>14</sup> Generally, however, pilgrimage centres would not have encouraged attendance at other pilgrimage activities unless, as in this case, that activity took place at the same site. The authorities at the healing centre of Epidauros, for example, would not have encouraged travel to the healing centre at Kos: this would have undermined their own credibility, and in general each site was visited with a specific and very personal purpose in mind by individuals motivated by the hope of initiation, oracular advice, or physical well-being.

Some aspects of this topic have been covered by previous scholars, notably the sites of Delphi and Eleusis, and I owe a great debt to Mylonas and Burkert. However, the discussion of material in these works has been either specialised, or too general, and the fact that the emphasis has been placed on the nature of ritual rather than the experiences of the participants means that a detailed treatment of Hellenic

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Snodgrass *Archaic Greece* 57.

<sup>13</sup> Hdt. 6.87-88; Thuc. 5.1.

<sup>14</sup> *FD* 3.1.560.

pilgrimage and its different features has long been overdue. This analysis is intended to give an overview of pilgrimage in the Hellenic world in general, and attempts to elucidate in depth the experiences of the Hellenic pilgrim in the context of Greek religious practices and cult ritual at the various types of pilgrimage sites which worshippers of all ranks and states might visit.

## §1 OFFICIAL PILGRIMAGE INVITATIONS AND SACRED TRUCES

In the ancient Greek world, pilgrims were reminded of the approach of a festival, and invited to attend it, by messengers sent out by the state which was organising a particular event, which would, by its nature, attract a large number of pilgrims. These messengers would also announce a “sacred truce”,<sup>1</sup> and their arrival announcing its terms, and the acceptance of these terms by other cities, signalled the beginning of a sacred truce in which neighbours would allow unhindered access through their territory for pilgrims who wished to attend the forthcoming festival. These truces did not affect any ongoing hostilities and warfare did not cease throughout the Hellenic world during the period of a sacred truce. Rather, the truces covered only the safety of the pilgrims travelling to and from the sacred site in question, and depended for their validity, of course, upon universal acceptance throughout the Hellenic world, for if one state refused to accept the truce, then the safety of pilgrims was threatened.<sup>2</sup> It was the task of these official announcers, usually known as *theoroi* but for certain festivals called *spondophoroi*, to seek widespread acceptance of the sacred truce, and those who announced a particular festival would be given lodgings and hospitality in the places which they visited by *theorodokoi*, “*theoroi* receivers”. The same term, *theorodokoi*, was used to describe the individuals who would host the officials, also known as *theoroi*, sent to particular festivals in order to represent their state.<sup>3</sup> The sacred truce was a *sine qua non* for any pilgrimage to be undertaken successfully, and this chapter discusses how it was announced and the role it played in the organisation of a festival.

Any discussion of pilgrimage and the celebration of Panhellenic festivals must begin with a consideration of the sacred truce, although little information regarding it is available. The sacred truces would necessarily have helped to ensure that pilgrims

---

<sup>1</sup> For sacred truces, see esp. Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 75-106; Broderson *Gym.* 98 (1991) 1-14.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Foucart *Mystères* 268.

<sup>3</sup> On the *theoria* and *theorodokia*, note esp. Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ passim*; Koller *Glotta* 36 (1958) 273-86; Bill *TAPA* 32 (1901) 196-204; Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 208-11; Ziehen *RE* 5a (1934) 2228-33, 2238-39, 2239-44; Cole *Theoi Megaloi* 53; for the *arkhitheoria*, Cauer *RE* 2 (1896) 552-53. Perlman *Theorodokia* xii is probably incorrect in citing Suda s.v. *θεωροδόκος: ὁ τῶν θεωρικῶν χρημάτων ἐπιμελούμενος*, as evidence for the *theorodokia*: the Suda is presumably referring to the *theoric fund* at Athens, from which monies were disbursed for subsidies for entrance fees to the public theatre. Bultrighini *Annuario* 3-5 (1941-43) 141-51 and Graham *Anc. World* 5 (1982) 103-21 deal with *theoroi* who were local officials (cf. Salviat *BCH* 107 (1983) 181-87, and, for Pergamon, Robert *REG* 40 (1927) 208-13).



enjoyed security whilst on the way to celebrate festivals at sacred sites; a guarantee of safety was an expected precondition of such journeys to a pilgrimage site.<sup>4</sup> A sacred truce comprised the period immediately before, during and after the sacred celebration, and it guaranteed the safety of all those travelling to and from the festival, as well as at the site itself. Pilgrims could even make their way freely through states where military activity was occurring. It is significant that a sacred truce did not mean that warfare ceased throughout the Greek world at the time of the festival; military activity continued to take place, but combatants were bound to respect the status and privileges of pilgrims.<sup>5</sup> Though the exact nature of sacred truces is not entirely clear, they were announced by officials called either *spondophoroi*, “truce-bearers”, in the case of the Eleusinian mysteries and the Olympic games, or *theoroi* in the case of other Panhellenic events.

The sacred truce established to allow the unhindered celebration of festivals was referred to as *ekkekheiria* or *spondai*.<sup>6</sup> The Eleusinian mysteries and the other major Panhellenic festivals, the Olympian, Isthmian, Nemean, and Pythian, were accompanied by a truce which enabled pilgrims to make their way safely to these festivals. A specific period seems to have been set aside for the sacred truce of each festival. The dates for the truce of the Eleusinian mysteries are well attested: fifty five days were allocated for the truce for both the Lesser and the Greater Mysteries,<sup>7</sup> and in these cases the terms *spondai* or *mysterioides spondai* are found, and the term *ekkekheiria* is apparently not used in connection with this festival.<sup>8</sup> The length and precise dates of the Olympic truce are uncertain. It was referred to both as *spondai Olympiakai*, but also as *ekkekheiria*,<sup>9</sup> and it was the duty of the Olympic *spondophoroi*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 197; Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 3.667.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 3.629; Cartledge *Greek Religious Festivals* 113; Harris *Athletes* 155-56.

<sup>6</sup> For the *ekkekheiria*, see Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 94, 97-98; Broderson *Gym.* 98 (1991) 10-12.

<sup>7</sup> Discussed below, n. 19, with text.

<sup>8</sup> The sacred Eleusinian truce is termed *σπονδαί* (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 6B.8, 19* ([σ]πονδαίς, σπονδῶν), 28, 38-39) or *αἱ μυστηριώτιδες σπονδαί* (*Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3.9, cf. 11 (*SEG* 15.90, *Tod GHI* 2.137, translated by Harding *Peloponnesian War* 73-74; see for this inscription, Mosley *Envoys and Diplomacy* 46, 88; Bosworth *AJAH* 1 (1976) 165; Cawkwell *REG* 73 (1960) 430-31; *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68, side A, line 20 (probable restoration at 26)); see also Aesch. 2.133-34; Aristeid. *Orat.* 19.258; Poll. *Oiom.* 1.36. *IG I<sup>3</sup> 6* is translated in Fornara *Archaic Times* 74-76.

<sup>9</sup> *Spondai Olympiakai*, see Aesch. 2.12: ἐν ταῖς σπονδαῖς ταῖς Ὀλυμπιακαῖς, with Dem. 19, *Hypoth.* 2, para 3 (for which see ch. 2 nn. 24-33, esp. n. 24, with text); Thuc. 5.49.1: ἐν ταῖς Ὀλυμπιακαῖς σπονδαῖς; and see further below. *Ekekheiria*: Thuc. 5.49.3; Paus. 5.4.5, 5.20.1 (cf. 5.26.2 the deity *Ekekheiria*); Flut. *Lyk.* 1.2; *FGH* 257 Phlegon F 1 (*Cod. Palat. Gr.* 398, p. 234 r); cf. Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 215.

to announce the *ekkekheiria* to those cities that wished to take part in the festival.<sup>10</sup> The mythical background for this truce is recorded, unlike those for other festivals, and the terms of the Olympic *ekkekheiria* were written on a discus which was reputedly that of Iphitos of Pisa, the individual who revived the Olympic games, and re-established the *ekkekheiria* for the Olympic festival, originally established by Herakles.<sup>11</sup> Thus, as with the Eleusinian spondophoroi, the Olympic officials also termed spondophoroi would travel to various cities announcing a truce by means of a formal message and, in this case, with wording which was traditional.

The dates for the other truces are also not attested.<sup>12</sup> The Pythian festival took place in Delphic Boukatios (equating approximately to Athenian Metageitnion, and to Gregorian August and September), and the announcers of the Pythia were sent out in the month Bysios, some five months prior to this, to announce the *ekkekheiria*.<sup>13</sup> There is evidence for an Isthmian truce, with Thucydides referring to Isthmian *spondai* for the celebration of 411 but the term *ekkekheiria* is not employed.<sup>14</sup> The Nemean festival apparently guaranteed the *asylia*, sanctity, and *asphaleia*, safety of contestants, which Aratos was accused of violating in the third century when he enslaved the competitors, which breached this *asylia* and *asphaleia*, and presumably these were guaranteed for the festival by an *ekkekheiria*.<sup>15</sup> A *hieromenia*, sacred month, is referred to for both the Pythian and Nemean festivals,<sup>16</sup> and it is possible

<sup>10</sup> FGH 257 Phlegon F 1 (*Cod. Palat. Gr.* 398, p. 234 r).

<sup>11</sup> The truce was inscribed on a discus to be seen at Olympia, and the Spartan lawgiver Lykourgos was associated with Iphitos in this: Plut. *Lyk.* 1.2; Paus. 5.4.5-6, 5.20.1; cf. Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 184-89, 195; for Herakles' establishment of the festival and *ekkekheiria*, see Paus. 5.4.5, 5.8.5, 8.26.3-4; Strabo 8.3.33 (358); FGH 257 Phlegon F 1 (*Cod. Palat. Gr.* 398, p. 234 r).

<sup>12</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 413d: Πυθικὰς ἐκεχειρίας σπεισάμενος (a general reference to the truce); SIG<sup>3</sup> 643.7-8; Thuc. 5.1: the secular truce of 422 in the Peloponnesian War continued until the Pythian festival (on the textual difficulty here, note Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 3.629); on FD 3.4, 75.6-7, see Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 86, 87 n. 42 (with lines quoted). *Ekekheiria* was, of course, a term not merely employed for religious festivals but also for political truces: e.g. Thuc. 4.119.3, 4.122.1, cf. 4.122.3, 5.1; see Brodersen *Cym.* 98 (1991) 12 n. 49 for a fuller list; cf. Pritchett *Greek State at War* 1.121 n. 27. Luc. *Icaromen.* 33 has an *ekkekheiria* of four months announced by Zeus for a festival.

<sup>13</sup> LSCG 78 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1126).44-49; cf. below n. 78.

<sup>14</sup> Thuc. 8.9.1: τὰς Ἰσθμιάδας τριονδίας; and 8.10.1 (cited below n. 131) states that the festival was proclaimed and the Athenians invited (ἐπηγγέλησαν), so there was clearly an *epangelia*, announcing the *spondai*, delivered by theoroi; cf. Paus. 5.2.1.

<sup>15</sup> Plut. *Arat.* 28.6, discussed ch. 2 nn. 75-76, with text.

<sup>16</sup> Pythia: LSCG 78 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1126).44; Nemea: Pind. *Nem.* 3.2; cf. Miller *Deutsch. Arch. Inst.* 90 (1975) 221 with n. 24. For the *hieromenia*, see Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 197; Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 75-106, esp. 83-86; Parker *Miasma* 154-60 with references; according to Parker the *hieromenia* "permitted the celebration of the Attic Eleusinia and the four Panhellenic athletic festivals even in

that the *ekkekheiria* was for the period of this holy month;<sup>17</sup> the original function of the *hieromenia* might well have been as the sacred period before and after a festival when a sacred truce was ordained. On the other hand, the sacred truce for both the Lesser and Greater Mysteries was 55 days in duration, and possibly the period of a sacred truce for the other Panhellenic festivals was commensurate with this.

The Pythian *ekkekheiria* was announced from the month of Bysios on, some five months before the ceremony: the Eleusinian spondophoroi, in order to announce a fifty five day truce, did not set out so far in advance, but about forty five days before the truce came into effect;<sup>18</sup> this seems to suggest that the Pythian *ekkekheiria* was also lengthy. In the fifth century, the Athenian sacred truce for the Lesser Mysteries ran from Gamelion 15, through Antæsterion to Elaphebolion 10, while the Great Mysteries began in Metageitnion 15 went through Boedromion (the month of the Greater Mysteries) and into Pyanepsion 10. A fourth century inscription has been restored to read that the truce for the Greater Mysteries began in Hekatombaion, the month before Metageitnion, that is, that the length of the truce had been extended by a month. However, the restoration is so extensive that no firm conclusion can be drawn from it,<sup>19</sup> and it is more than probable that religious conservatism dictated that the period would remain the same.

---

time of war" (155). But no *hieromenia* is attested for the Eleusinian mysteries (as distinct from the Eleusinia, for which, see ch. 5 n. 3), and in fact, whereas the Spartans were scrupulous in observing the Argive *hieromenia* (discussed below nn. 42-43, ch. 2 n. 61, with text), the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia prevented the Athenians from carrying out the Eleusinian procession: apparently the Spartans did not accept the *spondai* announced at Sparta by the spondophoroi (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.20-21; Plut. *Alk.* 34.3-7); cf. ch. 2 nn. 37-40, with text; for the Eleusinian procession: ch. 5 nn. 63-84, with text.

<sup>17</sup> Miller *Deut. Arch. Inst.* 90 (1975) 221 suggests this in connection with the Olympic festival, but spondophoroi would not in fact have set out in this period as it would have been too late for an announcement of the *ekkekheiria*.

<sup>18</sup> See below n. 63, with text.

<sup>19</sup> Fifth century dates: *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 6B.17-21, .36-47 (taking ἀπὸ διχομενίας of .21-22, .41-42 as the fifteenth); fourth century: *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68, side A, lines 16-17: [ἄρχεν δὲ τὸν χρόνον τῶν σπονδῶν ἐς τὰ Μυστήρια τὰ με/γ]άλα τῷ Ἑκατ[ομβαιῶνος ἀπό -- καὶ τὸν Μεταγειτνιῶνα καὶ τὸν Βοηδρομιῶνα καὶ --], with p. 277. In connection with a proposed earlier commencement date for the sacred truce of the Greater Mysteries, Clinton (*Hesp.* 49 (1980) p. 277 with n. 3 i) finds an explanation for the occasion in the third century when spondophoroi "apparently" announced the Panathenaia (Hekatombaion), Eleusinia (Metageitnion), and Greater Mysteries (Boedromion) in one journey (*Arkh. Eph.* (1914) p. 168, lines 26-29 (Helly *Gonnoi* 2, no. 109, pp. 121-22 (French translation, p. 122)). However, spondophoroi could set out well in advance of a sacred truce, as *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672 indicates (discussed below, nn. 35, 65, with text). For the dates of the truce of the Eleusinian mysteries, see Pritchett *Greek State at War* 1.121-24 n. 28; on the truce, cf. Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 94-98.

It is possible that the length of the Olympic *ekekheiria*, which has been subject to much debate, with suggestions ranging from the literal month - thirty days - to as many as four months, was a *hieromenia*.<sup>20</sup> The Olympic truce may only have lasted one month, but this festival was of great Panhellenic significance, and given that the *hieromenia* presumably included the five days given over to the festival, and that pilgrims needed to travel long distances to attend, a period of more than one month is extremely probable. Athletes had to be in Elis one month before the festival began,<sup>21</sup> so presumably the truce would have been in effect for their period of travel, and thus commenced several weeks before they were due in Elis.

It was clearly expected that such truces would be accepted. The Athenians guaranteed the safety of all those pilgrims who attended the Eleusinian mysteries, not only on Attic soil but also arranged it for pilgrims travelling through other territories, by sending out spondophoroi who would seek acceptance of the sacred truce.<sup>22</sup> Aeschines reports as unusual the response of the Phokians in the 350s to the spondophoroi announcing the sacred truce for the Eleusinian mysteries: “When the spondophoroi announced the truce of the mysteries, the Phokians, alone amongst the Hellenes refused to accept the truce... Those announcing the Mysteries reported that the Phokians, alone of all the Hellenes, had not accepted the truce... to prove that I am telling the truth, call the spondophoroi”.<sup>23</sup> The fact that the Spartans’ presence at Dekeleia caused the Eleusinian procession to be interrupted in the later years of the Peloponnesian War seems to suggest strongly that they did not accept the truce which the Athenians sought.<sup>24</sup> The fact that the spondophoroi sent out to announce the sacred truce covering the Eleusinian Mysteries to the Trikhoneians in 367/6 were captured and imprisoned, might seem to bode ill for the sacred truce itself.<sup>25</sup> Sacred truces, however, do seem to have been generally observed, and there were penalties for those who did not abide by their terms. For example, the Eleans excluded the Spartans from the Olympic festival in 420, because in that year the Spartans had sent troops to Lepreon, in Elis, after the Olympic truce had been proclaimed in Elis.<sup>26</sup>

States interested in participating are asked to maintain the sacred truce throughout their territories, and those who do so are to be numbered amongst those

---

<sup>20</sup> Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 88.

<sup>21</sup> See ch. 4 n. 168, with text.

<sup>22</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6B.17-47.

<sup>23</sup> Aesch. 2.133-34. Note esp. 2.133: τοῖς σπονδοφόροις τοῖς τὰς μυστηριώτιδας σπονδὰς ἐπαγγέλλουσι μόνοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωκεῖς οὐκ ἐσπείσαντο.

<sup>24</sup> See above n. 16.

<sup>25</sup> *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3; discussed below nn. 54, 64, 76-77 with text; ch. 2 n. 28, with text.

<sup>26</sup> Thuc. 5.49.1-50.2; cf. below n. 66. ch. 2 nn. 46-54, with text.

states which can make use of the shrine. It is clear that those who do not accept the truce for the Eleusinian Mysteries will not be granted access to the mysteries. The Eleusinian Mysteries might seem to lack the status of Olympia in the sense that the Athenians, unlike the Eleans, do not seem to have had the power to inflict fines on those not observing the truce.<sup>27</sup> However, exclusion, such as the Athenians threatened against those who refuse to accept the truce, was of course a harsher penalty than a mere fine, and even the Eleans used exclusion as the ultimate penalty against the Spartans in 420.<sup>28</sup> The Eleusinian mysteries were in no sense less universal in appeal than the other Panhellenic festivals. Aeschines' statement that the Phokians were unique in not accepting the truce makes clear its universal validity under normal circumstances, and the Hellenes generally were invited to participate.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, the provisions for announcing the Pythian truce make it clear that those states who do not accept the truce will be excluded from the shrine.<sup>30</sup> When the Magnesians established a Panhellenic festival in honour of Artemis, the Leukophryena, in the third century, the theoroi who were sent out asked the Greek states to accept an *ekkekheiria* for the festival and the various states agreed to abide by this.<sup>31</sup> Similarly, the theoroi sent out to announce the Koan Asklepieia, founded in the third century, sought acceptance of the festival and also asked that its *ekkekheiria* be respected, and states agreed to do so.<sup>32</sup>

Sacred truces, therefore, made provision for pilgrims to travel in safety from their home state to the Panhellenic festivals. These truces were a precondition for the successful organisation of a festival as well as an essential factor of a pilgrimage for the pilgrims themselves. Although pilgrims were occasionally attacked during this sacred time, such incidents were rare, and the truces were clearly successful in fulfilling their aim of encouraging the pious to travel, assured of their safety, to their pilgrimage destination. The ability of pilgrims, both private individuals and the theoroi sent by the state, to travel freely and safely to sacred sites was of importance to

<sup>27</sup> Thuc. 5.49.1, 5.

<sup>28</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 6B.27-36; cf. Rougemont *BC I 97* (1973) 96-97.

<sup>29</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 78.24-26, .30-34; see Meritt *Hesp.* 14 (1945) p. 78. Clinton *Hesp.* 49 (1980) p. 278 states that *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68 side A, lines 25-27 seems to relate at first sight to procedures in the case of infractions of the sacred truces, but believes there is not enough space in the only half preserved lines for "such a procedure to be expressed".

<sup>30</sup> *LSCG* 78.47-48.

<sup>31</sup> *I. Magn.* 31.15-16, .27-28; 38.14, .48; 39.16; 41.7, .10; 42.7-8; 43.17, .27, .30-31; 45.15; 46.22; 50.20; 52.13, .18-19; 53.8; 54.24; 56.14; 57.8; 58.6; 61.27, .57; 62.4-5; 63.8; 73b.18; 79.6-7, .20; 81.3; 82.3; 85.17; 87.8; cf. 33.18; some of the references are restored. The invitation decree is itself preserved, presumably as delivered by the theoroi when announcing the festival: *I. Magn.* 16.

<sup>32</sup> Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylierkunden aus Kos* 4.44, .46; 5b.17, .21-22; 6.4, .9, .26, .28, .39, .44; 7.8, .10; 8.2; 14.7; 15.5 (restored), .7; 16.3.

the Hellenes. The terms of the Peace of Nikias of 422/1, made between the Athenians and the Spartans, for a period of fifty years, are clear on this point and, in fact, the first clause of the treaty, as recorded by Thucydides, is concerned with the safety of pilgrims. The prominence of this clause must indicate that the war to date had infringed upon religious activities and the general concern that was felt as a result. The treaty guarantees the right of anyone who wishes, according to custom, to travel to the Panhellenic sanctuaries, sacrifice there, consult oracles and attend the contests, to do so without fear, whether by land or by sea.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, in an earlier treaty, the armistice for twelve months between Athens and Sparta, the clause guaranteeing access to the religious site of Delphi is the first in the treaty's provisions: all those who wished were to have the right to consult the oracle.<sup>34</sup> It seems clear that warfare and hostilities had meant that some Hellenes had not been able to consult the oracle, while the fact that the clauses concerning sacred sites and their pilgrims come first in both treaties indicates both the concern felt over such activities and the traditional status and significance of sacred sites generally.

The “messengers of peace” were sometimes termed *spondophoroi*, “truce bearers”. But this specific term, as applied to the bearers of the sacred truces, was unique to the Eleusinian mysteries and the Olympic festival, though the application of the term to the latter has been questioned.<sup>35</sup> The heralds of other sacred truces, which included those for the Isthmian, Nemean and Pythian festivals, were apparently not known as *spondophoroi*.<sup>36</sup> Prior to these festivals, officials known as *theoroi* were

<sup>33</sup> Thuc. 5.18.2: περὶ μὲν τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν κοινῶν, θύειν καὶ ἰέναι καὶ μαντεύεσθαι καὶ θεωρεῖν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τὸν βουλόμενον καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν ἄδεως.

<sup>34</sup> Thuc. 4.118.1: “Περὶ μὲν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ μαντείου τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου δοκεῖ ἡμῖν χρῆσθαι τὸν βουλόμενον ἄδολως καὶ ἄδεως κατὰ τοὺς πατέρας νόμους...”; cf. Parke, *Wormell Delphic Oracle* 1.196-97.

<sup>35</sup> Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1849; for the possibility of *spondophoroi* for an Argive festival, see Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.3 (both discussed below nn. 41-43, 67-70, with text). It is interesting to note that *Arkh. Eph.* (1914) p. 168, lines 35-37, cf. 26-29 (*Helly Gonnoi* 2, no. 109, pp. 121-22) extends the use of the term *spondophoroi* to those announcing the Panathenaia and the Eleusinia in addition to the Mysteries, but this might simply be an extension resulting from the *spondophoroi* being made responsible not only for the *epangelia* of the Mysteries but also for those of these two other festivals. The Panathenaia took place in late Hekatombaion and the Eleusinian mysteries in Boedromion, about one and a half months later, so these *spondophoroi* probably set off early in Hekatombaion or even earlier (for *spondophoroi* setting off in the first prytany of the political year (Hekatombaion), see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4); cf. on this decree Giovannini *Catalogue des Vaisseaux* 54 with n. 2. Polyb. 28.19.4 mentions two *theoriai* announcing respectively the Panathenaia and the Mysteries, so that the situation in the inscription did not always apply.

<sup>36</sup> Roux *Delphes* 176 states that there were *spondophoroi* for the Pythia but adduces no evidence, while Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1850 notes that the proposed restoration σπονδο[φο- in *FD* 3.2,

dispatched to announce them and their respective truces, and the decrees of the third century, recording the acceptance of the establishment of new Panhellenic festivals, included provisions that the states accepting these celebrations observe a peace for the duration of the festival. It seems therefore that the spondophoroi and the theoroi announcing the festivals fulfilled the same function, although there were distinctions between the two that require elucidation.

Messengers bearing invitations to states for pilgrims to visit the relevant site were required only for those religious centres that focused on an annual, or more infrequent, celebration. Religious sites which did not focus on a specific occasion as the main activity of the sanctuary attracted pilgrims throughout the year and not for a particular event. Accordingly, the oracular shrines of Dodona, Didyma and Delphi, and healing shrines such as those at Epidauros, Oropos and Kos, did not send out invitations for pilgrims to consult the oracle or to seek a cure, and pilgrims would come unsolicited to partake of the sacred services provided by the sanctuaries in question. However, Delphi, Epidauros, and Kos had, in addition, special penteteric events and to these, because they were held only at long intervals, pilgrims were invited by means of special messengers. Thus pilgrimage sites, which celebrated sacred events at regular intervals, sent out theoroi or spondophoroi, while those that carried out religious functions on an everyday basis welcomed pilgrims without such invitations.

Religious officials announcing festivals tended to travel in delegations of two or three members. Athenian spondophoroi announcing the Greater and Lesser Mysteries would be chosen from the families of the Kerykes and the Eumolpidai, and would travel as a pair, one being chosen from each family.<sup>37</sup> The duty of announcing the sacred truce was restricted to a family closely associated with the religious rites of the Eleusinian Mysteries, and since they were chosen from those most intimate with the

---

140.14 make spondophoroi at Delphi only a possibility. Cf. Stengel *Griechischen Kultusaltertümer* 50 (spondophoroi responsible for *epangelia* of Panhellenic festivals only at Olympia and Athens). See Hesych. s.v. ἱεράγγελου· θεωροί, ἀγγέλλοντες τὰς πανηγύρεις.

<sup>37</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1235; 1236; *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3.12-13. Cf. Dittenberger *Hermes* 20 (1885) 229; Foucart *Mystères* 268-69; Stengel *Griechischen Kultusaltertümer* 179 n. 3; Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1441; Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1849. *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68 side A, line 31 refers to an age qualification for the *epimeletai* of the Mysteries, and Clinton *Hesp.* 49 (1980) p. 276 suggests a restoration of a similar age qualification (either thirty or a “greater minimum age”) for the spondophoroi at lines 1-2 of the inscription. But the only similarity between side A, line 31 (two *epimeletai* are to be chosen from all the Athenians), ἐκ τῶν ὑ[πὲρ τριάκοντα] ἔτη γεγονότων and [γε]γονότων of line 2 is the participle: insufficient grounds, perhaps, for the restoration of an age qualification for the spondophoroi at lines 1-2. Clinton 276 also proposes to restore in lines 1-2 a reference to the spondophoroi being chosen from the Eumolpidai and the Kerykes, following *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1236, along with the dates when they were chosen.

mysteries, these heralds may have been more inviolate than the generic class of heralds. Athenian financial accounts record three sets of spondophoroi setting out at different times of the year in order to announce the truce for the Greater Mysteries,<sup>38</sup> and while it is possible that the same pair travelled to three different places, returning to Athens after their invitations to each state had been issued, it seems more probable that there were three different pairs charged with visiting different locations.<sup>39</sup> The field of invitees was wide, covering the Hellenic world: a task for more than one pair. The delegations of Elean spondophoroi responsible for announcing the Olympic festival are recorded as consisting of three members, and they were often the sons of the *theokoloi*, servants of the god.<sup>40</sup> and it should probably be assumed that there were several parties of three, each trio travelling to a particular part of the Hellenic world, as the field for participants in the Olympic festival was as wide as that for the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Argives, in sending out heralds to announce the commencement of a sacred truce at the time of Agesipolis' invasion in 388/7, dispatched two according to their custom. These have been taken to be spondophoroi,<sup>41</sup> but Xenophon does use the word "heralds",<sup>42</sup> and furthermore the religious event involved may not have been the Panhellenic Isthmian festival as has been sometimes assumed.<sup>43</sup>

The truce, apparently, was not only announced through the words of the spondophoroi, but may also have been put in writing. An Athenian decree of the third century, promulgated by the Kerykes and the Eumolpidae, praises a hierophant for writing the announcement, *epangeia*, of the sacred truce and for doing the task with

<sup>38</sup> See n. 55 below.

<sup>39</sup> In this context, the statement of Mosley *Envoys and Diplomacy* 22 that "...envoys did not often fulfil more than one mission at a time before returning home...." ought not to be taken as applicable, as the theoroi announcing the Magnesians Leukophryena and the Koan Asklepieia both travelled to various destinations in a "round trip". That the spondophoroi would travel to more distant locations first and work their way to those nearer seems to be indicated by *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no.3; cf. Cawkwell *REG* 73 (1960) 430-31.

<sup>40</sup> Three spondophoroi, sons of *theokoloi*: *I. Olymp.* V 86; 91; 92; in 85 restored as sons but no traces; in 89 the *theokoloi* restored as fathers, with the restorations fitting the traces; three but not the sons of the *theokoloi*: 90; 95; 100; in 84 there are three blank spaces where the names of the spondophoroi would have been, but note that the evidence is from the Roman period. Cf. Stengel *Griechischen Kultusaltertümer* 195; Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1441; Tillyard *BSA* 12 (1905-06) 471.

<sup>41</sup> Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1442.

<sup>42</sup> *Xen. Hell.* 4.7.3: ἔπεμψαν, ὥσπερ εἰώθεσαν, ἐστεφανωμένους δύο κήρυκας ὑποφέροντας σπονδάς.

<sup>43</sup> Pritchett *Greek State at War* 1.1:4, on the analogy of the similar instance involving the manipulation of the Karneia by the Argives (*Thuc.* 5.54.3), believes that the incident of *Xen. Hell.* 4.7.3 belongs to the same festival; cf. Parlier *Miasma* 155 n. 59.



*eunoia*, goodwill.<sup>44</sup> This practice is usually assumed to have been the usual procedure,<sup>45</sup> in which a written form of the *epangelia* accompanied a formal announcement to the appropriate authorities.<sup>46</sup> The states that were invited by *theoroi* to the newly created Koan Asklep<sup>ē</sup>ia and Magnesian Leukophryena passed formal decrees accepting the invitation and confirming the status of the festivals.<sup>47</sup> It is probable that a similar procedure formalised the acceptance of the sacred truce announced by the *spondophoroi*: the acceptance of the sacred truce would have taken the form of a written acceptance of the *epangelia*. Writing is unequivocal; with the terms of the sacred truce confirmed in writing, there would have been unambiguous proof of the acceptance of the peace.<sup>48</sup>

Naturally, the purpose of announcing a sacred truce was to enable pilgrims to travel in safety to a particular destination. At the time of the sacred truce for the Eleusinian Mysteries the Athenians were not only inviting those who wished to be initiated but also asking that states send offerings of first fruits, *aparkhai*, to Athens on the grounds of ancestral practice and the instructions of the oracle at Delphi.<sup>49</sup> Of course *spondophoroi*, and *theoroi*, could come into contact with military activity, so they would need to be immediately recognisable. Garlands may possibly have served as a recognition device, and a late etymologist states that *theoroi* would place wreaths on their wagons.<sup>50</sup> Sceptres were the traditional insignia of heralds, and the remains of a carved sceptre on the statue base of a *spondophoros* at Olympia has suggested

---

<sup>44</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1235*; cf. *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68 side A, lines 1, 26, and see p. 275 for comments on the restoration of the first letter of [ἐ]παγγελέσεως at line 1; cf. on the hierophant's role in writing the *epangelia*, Clinton *Sacred Officials* 23.

<sup>45</sup> Stengel *Griechischen Kultusaltert<sup>um</sup>* 178; Foucart *Mystères* 268-69; Schweigert *Hesp.* 8 (1939) p. 10; Clinton *Sacred Officials* 22; idem *Hesp.* 49 (1980) p. 275. The Athenian inscription *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1235* is taken as evidence for other non-Athenian *spondophoroi*; see Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 215 (Olympia); Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1441-42 (spondophoroi in general).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 215.

<sup>47</sup> Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylierkunden aus Kos* 1-16; *I. Magn.* 16-87.

<sup>48</sup> Schweigert *Hesp.* 8 (1939) p. 10 notes *Arkh. Eph.* (1914) p. 168, lines 35-38, which outlines instructions for the *spondophoroi*, but this is different from the actual writing out of the *epangelia* in the form in which it was to be delivered, for which the hierophant was honoured.

<sup>49</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup> 78.24-26, .30-34*; *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68, side B, a, line 13, and cf. side A line 10 which mentions the oracle of Apollo and may refer to the request for *aparkhai*. On Delphic involvement, see *Hesp.* 49 (1980) p. 276, with n. 32 for references.

<sup>50</sup> Hesych. s.v. *θεωρικῶς*: ἐστεφονοῦν γὰρ οὗτοι τὰς ἀπήνας. *LSJ<sup>9</sup>* 1647, col. 1, s.v. *στλεγγίς*, cites Heraclid. *Tar. ap. Erot. Sosib.* 4 that a *stlengis* (tiara) was "worn by the *θεωροί* sent to an oracle or at a solemn festival." A *stlengis* was worn by some of the initiates in the Andanian mysteries, see ch. 4 n. 20, with text.

that this may have been a normal part of their equipment,<sup>51</sup> and this identification seems valid, considering the general evidence that sceptres were a ubiquitous accoutrement of heralds.<sup>52</sup> Since heralds were regarded as inviolable,<sup>53</sup> it seems reasonable to extend this to the spondophoroi; moreover, the Athenians, in objecting to the Trikhoneian detention of spondophoroi for the Eleusinian Mysteries, protested that the action was “contrary to the common laws of the Hellenes.”<sup>54</sup>

The sacred heralds would have required some form of financial assistance in their travels. In one of the financial accounts of the Eleusinian *epistatai*, overseers, and the *tamiai*, treasurers, of the “Other Gods”, three payments are recorded as being made to the spondophoroi of the Mysteries.<sup>55</sup> When they arrived at particular sites they may have been provided with food and lodging, and in one case, the city of Gonnoi chose theorodokoi to entertain the Athenian spondophoroi; these theorodokoi would have provided the spondophoroi with their requirements while in the city.<sup>56</sup> The spondophoroi would, however, presumably have met with other expenses on their journeys (such as the cost of food as they travelled from place to place), for which they would require a direct sum of money. The spondophoroi for the Greater Mysteries sent out to the islands received money in the first prytany from the *epistatai*; the amount, as restored, was two hundred and fifty drachmas.<sup>57</sup> After the entry recording a payment for the Dionysia in the Piraeus, there is mention of a similar payment for the spondophoroi for the Great Mysteries,<sup>58</sup> and another, later in the

<sup>51</sup> Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1442; *I. Olymp.* V 414. Cf. Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1849, who refuses to accept this as evidence that the Elean announcers of the Olympic truce were known as spondophoroi.

<sup>52</sup> For the herald’s staff (κηρύκεῖοι), note Hdt. 9.100.1 (κηρυκῆϊον); Thuc. 1.53.1 (ἄνευ κηρυκείου) with Schol. on same (cf. Gomme *Hist. Comm. Thuc.* 1.190); Dem. 51.13; Dein. 1.18; Boetzkas *RE* 11 (1922) 330-42; Mosley *Envoys and Diplomacy* 85; Hornbostel *Syrakusanische Herolde* 233-45. For a herald’s *kerykeion* see frontispiece, and fig. 1.5.

<sup>53</sup> Hdt. 7.133.1-134.2; Wéry *AC* 35 (1966) 469-70, 479; Mosley *Envoys and Diplomacy* 84, 87; Oehler *RE* 11 (1922) 349-57.

<sup>54</sup> *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3.13-14; see also above n. 25; below, nn. 64, 76-77; ch. 2 n. 28, with text.

<sup>55</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4, .106-07, .227.

<sup>56</sup> *Ark. Eph.* (1914) p. 168 (Hely *Gonnoi* 2, no. 109, pp. 121-22). At lines 10-11 Sokolowski (see *Hesp.* 49 (1980) p. 260 n. 10) in a previous edition of the inscription *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68 side A, restored a reference that the cities to which the spondophoroi were travelling were to provide them with *epiochia*. The restoration need not be accepted, but, *contra* Clinton *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 276-77, there is no reason why such a request need not have been made. It was the usual procedure that the theoroi announcing other Panhellenic festivals were looked after, in each city that they visited, by theorodokoi, for which see below nn. 89-91, with text; cf. n. 108, with text.

<sup>57</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4; cf. Foucart *Mystères* 269; Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1442.

<sup>58</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.106-07.

account, for spondophoroi for the same mysteries, in a context that cannot be dated.<sup>59</sup> Only the first entry records a destination, the islands, and the fact that the later entries do not specify a destination might mean that they are payments for some domestic duty. The usual interpretation of these entries is, however, that they refer to spondophoroi being sent out to announce the sacred truce to other states, the interval between the references indicating that spondophoroi were sent out at different times to different locations, according to proximity, enabling them to arrive at invited states in enough time for the latter to send official delegations and pilgrims to the mysteries.<sup>60</sup> These were very popular, and it was important that invitations went out well in advance so that all who wished to do so could make plans to travel to Athens. The spondophoroi, as receivers of public money, would have been liable to an audit, *dokimasia*, on their return to Athens,<sup>61</sup> and it is also possible that the spondophoroi would have submitted a report which was published.<sup>62</sup>

This inscription from Eleusis provides some clues as to when the Athenian spondophoroi were sent out. The first payment for those travelling to the islands in order to announce the Greater Mysteries took place in the first prytany, and assuming that they set out at once (this seems an unavoidable assumption for the money would not have been paid out very much in advance), they would have had ample time to make their announcement in the islands, for the Mysteries took place in the month Boedromion, and a departure in the first prytany would have allowed them at least one and a half months, and up to two and a half months, to announce the truce. The second payment in respect of the Greater Mysteries came at the time of the Dionysia in the Piraeus. This took place in the tenth prytany, indicating that these particular spondophoroi had been sent out to announce the Mysteries with a minimum of forty five days in which to make the *epangelia*.<sup>63</sup> An Athenian decree of 367/6 recording the protest concerning the capture of Athenian spondophoroi by the Trikhoneians was passed in the third prytany of that year, and is to be connected with the Greater

<sup>59</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.227.

<sup>60</sup> Foucart *Mystères* 269; Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1848; cf. Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1442 n. 1; Mylonas *Eleusis* 244.

<sup>61</sup> The actual evidence is slight; *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68, side A, lines 5-6 refers to a *dokimasia* in a context which seems to concern the spondophoroi. A sacrifice after the *dokimasia* (which may or may not have been for the spondophoroi) is mentioned (line 6), and would accord with religious practice of thanking the gods for assistance with a successful mission.

<sup>62</sup> *Hesp.* 49 (1980) pp. 263-68 side A, line 23: [ἀ ἀν] ἀπογράφωσι ἀναγρά[φειν] (with p. 277).

<sup>63</sup> Schweigert *Hesp.* 8 (1939) p. 10; cf. Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 90. The third reference, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.227, is in an undated context.

Mysteries, held in Boedromion.<sup>64</sup> In this particular instance the spondophoroi might not have been sent out very much in advance.<sup>65</sup> At what time the Elean spondophoroi were sent out is unknown; the Eleans and the Spartans had a well known altercation on the point at which the truce came into force.<sup>66</sup>

Latte is alone in maintaining that the announcers of the Olympic truce were not titled spondophoroi. In Olympian inscriptions there are references to theoroi and their theorodokoi, among them the instance in which Damokrates of Tenedos was honoured as theorodokos of the Elean theoroi.<sup>67</sup> Because of this, Latte dismisses the evidence of Pindar, who mentions “the heralds of the Olympian season, the spondophoroi of Zeus, son of Kronos,”<sup>68</sup> claiming that Pindar has avoided the correct technical term, and referred to the announcers as spondophoroi rather than theoroi, and he argues that only for Eleusis is the designation spondophoroi certain.<sup>69</sup> But spondophoroi are referred to in other Olympic documents,<sup>70</sup> and it can hardly be assumed that these spondophoroi merely performed tropaic duties, and were not assigned a truce bearing task. It would seem that if any term were the more technical, it is surely the one which specifies exactly what it is that the truce bearers are to do: spondophoros is on this ground more likely. The spondophoroi mentioned in Elean inscriptions seem to have been especially chosen, as they are the sons of the *theokoloi*. If these same spondophoroi were responsible for proclaiming the Olympic truce, it can be assumed that they are to be identified with the theoroi received by Damokrates, and therefore those who announced the truce were chosen from a restricted group.

---

<sup>64</sup> *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3. The decree is dated by the reference to the arkhon, that is, to 367/6. The reference to the sacred truce of Demeter and Kore, and to the Eumolpidai and Kerykes, indicates that the spondophoroi were announcing the Eleusinian Mysteries. Schweigert *Hesp.* 8 (1939) p. 10 states that it is known from another decree that the tribe Oineis, which held the prytany when this decree was passed (lines 4-5), held the third prytany in 367/6. This means that the spondophoroi who were seized were announcing the Greater Mysteries; above n. 25, 54; below: 76-77; ch. 2 n. 28, with text.

<sup>65</sup> Spondophoroi for the Greater Mysteries were sent out in the first prytany in 329/8 (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672.4) and in the tenth, final, prytany in 328/7 (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672.106-07).

<sup>66</sup> Thuc. 5.49.1-50.1, see above n. 26, ch. 2 nn. 46-54, with text.

<sup>67</sup> *I. Olymp.* V 36, 39.9.

<sup>68</sup> Pind. *Isthm.* 2.23-24: κάρυκες ὠρίαν ἀνέγνον, σπονδοφόροι Κρονίδα / Ζηνὸς Ἀλεῖται; Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1848-49.

<sup>69</sup> Latte *RE* 3a (1929) 1849: “... muß die Möglichkeit offen bleiben, daß Pindar nach seiner Weise den technischen Ausdruck bewußt meidet, wenigstens solange nicht sichere Belege für die Bezeichnung der olympischen Theoren als Spondophoroi zutage gekommen sind...”

<sup>70</sup> See above n. 40, with text.

Pindar states that the competitor Nikomakhos was known to the Olympic spondophoroi, since they had experienced “some friendly favour” from him.<sup>71</sup> A possible explanation for this is that the spondophoroi had been sent out to seek acceptance for the truce, and had received some particular favour from Nikomakhos as their host. Pindar in writing this ode was presumably reflecting the actual state of affairs. Furthermore, the possibility of a dual terminology might be entertained. One individual, Eudoxos of Kyzikos, is described as “theoros and spondophoros” of the festival of Persephone (Koreia),<sup>72</sup> and that the Olympic spondophoroi performed duties similar to their Athenian namesakes thus ought to be accepted.<sup>73</sup> If so, it is worth noting that the two sets of Panhellenic spondophoroi, Olympic and Eleusinian, were both chosen from a special group, and this can be taken as an indication of the very real antiquity of the two events involved and of the status of the official announcers.

Spondophoroi would naturally have travelled to all the Hellenic states that had previously attended festivals, visiting all major cities and confederations. Athenian spondophoroi are, however, attested as having visited only a handful of the places to which they must have journeyed: Aetolia, Egypt, the Ionian islands, Phokis, Syria, Thessaly.<sup>74</sup> On the basis of an inscription at Delphi, in which Delphic sacred heralds take an oath, it has been thought that spondophoroi would have taken an oath prior to their departure.<sup>75</sup>

Since they proclaimed a truce which allowed pilgrims to make their way in safety to a specific sacred site, the sanctity of such spondophoroi seems to have been generally observed. They were the bearers of a truce which was sacred and which had the sanction of the gods, and moreover, they were announcing festivals which were being held in honour of the gods: it would therefore have been impious to attack them. There is one case from the fourth century in which the spondophoroi sent out by Athens in order to announce the sacred truce of the Eleusinian Mysteries were seized and imprisoned by the Trikloneians, members of the Aetolian League. The document reads:

---

<sup>71</sup> *Isthm.* 2.24: πάθοντες πού τι φιλόξενον ἔργον.

<sup>72</sup> Strabo 2.3.4 (98), see further n. 144 below; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 785.19-20: “theoroi and spondophoroi” in Syria. Paus. 5.15.10 refers to the Elean spondophoroi in a domestic context, namely the offering by the Eleans of a monthly sacrifice on the altar of Zeus at Olympia.

<sup>73</sup> Ziehen *RE* 18.1 (1942) 4 notes that the evidence of the inscriptions (cited by Latte) is late, and that the words of Pindar seem the deciding ones on this issue.

<sup>74</sup> *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3; Polyb. 28.19.4; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.4; Aesch. 2.133-34; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 785 (for which see Robert *Hellenica* 11-12 (1960) 107-08); cf. Foucart *Mystères* 268; Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 98; Miller *Deut. Arch. Inst.* 90 (1975) 219 n. 17.

<sup>75</sup> Michel 702.13; cf. Michel *DA* 4.2 (1911) 1441; Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 215.

“Since, after the league of the Aetolians had accepted the sacred truce for the mysteries of Demeter of Eleusis and of Kore, those who proclaimed the truce, members of the Eumolpidae and Kerykes, namely Prophetes and Epigenes, have been held in chains by the Trikhoneians, contrary to the laws common to the Greeks, there shall be chosen by the boule right away a herald out of the Athenians at large, who is to go to the League of the Aetolians and demand that the men be released....”<sup>76</sup>

The “laws of the Greeks” may refer to matters of custom, rather than written obligations, but it should be noted that the Eleans did have laws governing the sacred truce of Olympia, laws generally recognised and respected. This expression “contrary to the laws of the Greeks” points to the novelty of the spondophoroi being attacked, and the provocation to the Athenians was the greater, in that the sacred truce had already been accepted by the League. Schweigert argues that the seizure of the spondophoroi, in 367/6, can be related to the tension existing between Athens and Thebes at the time, a tension encompassing Thebes’ ally, the Aetolian League.<sup>77</sup> That there was a political motivation for the seizure is perhaps the best explanation, and would concur with other information, that pilgrims in the Hellenic world were generally safe, and that it was the dangers of actual warfare which would be most feared by pilgrims. In this case the Athenians placed their hope for the recovery of the spondophoroi in the ability of the league to discipline one of its member states. The outcome of the incident is not recorded (not all of the recording stone is legible, and it is possible that the result of the diplomatic activity was inscribed), but the extraordinary nature of this event helps to indicate that it was assumed that spondophoroi would carry out their sacred duty without interference.

It was not enough that the league accept the truce on behalf of the Aetolians; the spondophoroi, having proclaimed the truce to the league officials, then went on to announce it in all the league’s member states. This could be a matter of tradition: the spondophoroi, before the creation of the league, had always visited the states which came to constitute it, and continued to do so afterwards. The visits of the spondophoroi to the individual states could also point towards a necessity to proclaim the truce actually on the soil of each. It could well be that the safety of pilgrims was only to be guaranteed by the ceremonies which were performed in the territory of the state accepting the truce, and that these obliged the state to observe it.

Spondophoroi were presumably necessary because, although states might know that the date of the festival was coming up, they might have desisted from breaking off hostilities until the last possible moment, which could lead to misunderstandings and to violations of the truce. The necessity of proclaiming the truce is illustrated by the attack of the Spartans on Elean territory after the Eleans, as they themselves claimed,

<sup>76</sup> *Hesp.* 8 (1939) pp. 5-7, no. 3.

<sup>77</sup> Schweigert *Hesp.* 8 (1939) p. 12. The importance of this decree for the history of the Aetolian League is discussed by Schweigert pp. 8-9, 11-12, and by the authors cited by Harding *Peloponnesian War* 73; cf. also Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 102; cf. above nn. 25, 54, 64; ch. 2 n. 28, with text.

had already proclaimed the sacred truce in their own territory. The Spartans could not have failed to have known that the truce was about to be effected, but they argued that it required the actual proclamation of the truce in Spartan territory for the truce to be operative. Weniger has put forward the theory that the multiplicity of calendar systems in the Hellenic world led to the development that the truce was announced by *spondophoroi*.<sup>78</sup> This explanation is only partially satisfactory because it is hard to believe that individual states would not have had some idea of when the Olympic festival and the Eleusinian Mysteries were about to take place in terms of their local calendar. They would be aware, from experience, of when a sacred truce was about to commence, or at about what time of the year *spondophoroi* and *theoroi* would be arriving to announce a specific festival.

The Eleusinian Mysteries and the Olympic festival were thus announced by special heralds, who had a name uniquely applied to them: *spondophoroi*. Why there was this uniqueness is a matter only for conjecture, and it is possible that *spondophoroi* is in a sense an archaic term, and that these two festivals represent the older festivals of the Hellenic world, and that later Panhellenic festivals did not make use of this terminology. Perhaps the very antiquity of these two festivals reserved this term for their special use, while festivals inaugurated later, or acquiring a Panhellenic character only at a later date, may have made use of a plainer term out of a sense of religious awe for what must have been the oldest of the Panhellenic religious celebrations. That the *spondophoroi* seem to have been chosen from a special group at these two places is perhaps also relevant. The Athenians had a tradition of appointing their *spondophoroi* from a special family, while at Olympia this is paralleled, but not to the same extent, as there the sons of *theokoloi* had this privilege. A task rendered necessary by incessant warfare, and to a lesser extent by the divergence of calendar systems, the announcement of the sacred truce accompanying other festivals fell in the same way to *theoroi*.

Most of the pilgrimages in the Hellenic world were undertaken by private individuals who, for one reason or another, would decide to travel to a particular sacred site. Side by side with this there were what could be called “official pilgrims” attending specific religious celebrations. City states would send out representatives to attend a festival which was taking place at a certain site, and these representatives were also known as *theoroi*, while their journey to the sacred site, and the activity they

---

<sup>78</sup> Weniger *Klio* 5 (1905) 217-18; cf. Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΙ* 101; Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 94; Pritchett *Greek State at War* 1.125-26 n. 7. Plut. *Arist.* 19.9 points out the difficulties of the Greek calendar, observing that different groups of Greeks had different beginnings and endings for their months. See also Thomson *JHS* 63 (1943) 52-65; Pritchett *BCH* 81 (1957) 276-79, for calendric discrepancies amongst the Greek states; for a useful list of the months of several Greek calendars, see Thomson 55.

undertook there, was known as a *theoria*. The most important states would ensure that there were representatives of their state at all the major festivals. Thus Athens, for example, sent *theoroi* to the major Panhellenic festivals at Olympia, Delphi, Nemea and Isthmia, and to the festivals at Alexandria, Magnesia and Kos. These *theoriai* enabled a state to be officially represented at the festivals, and to take part in cult activities. Moreover, it seems that private individuals who wished to go on a pilgrimage to festivals at these sites could, at least in some cases, accompany the official *theoria*.

On the approach of a pilgrimage festival, the city which was hosting it would send out ambassadors to other Greek cities, reminding them of the approaching event. The officials chosen to make this announcement were known by various terms. The main term employed to describe the delegation was *theoria*, its members *theoroi*, and its leader the *arkhithoros*: there is, however, a difficulty of terminology here. A city about to celebrate a festival would send out ambassadors to various Hellenic cities inviting them to attend that festival and to accept the terms of a truce covering the festival.<sup>79</sup> These ambassadors were often termed *theoroi*, the same term as the one used for those ambassadors sent as the official delegation to a festival.<sup>80</sup> Both types of *theoroi* would be received by *theorodokoi*; the meaning of the word *theorodokoi* is dual, hence its meaning varies according to context, that is, there were *theorodokoi* who received *theoroi* announcing the approach of a festival and other *theorodokoi* who received *theoroi* representing their states at the actual celebrations.<sup>81</sup> The *theoroi* bringing word of a festival would not have to find their own accommodation upon arriving at a city or town, but rather would be provided with lodging and hospitality by a *theorodokos*. Thus both the city hosting the festival and the city invited to attend would have *theorodokoi* who would host both types of *theoroi*. There are also cases where those sent out to announce a forthcoming festival are not called *theoroi* but simply ambassadors.<sup>82</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Giovannini *Catalogue des Vaisseaux* 54.

<sup>80</sup> Bill *TAPA* 32 (1901) 196; Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 7-8, 105.

<sup>81</sup> Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 105-127, esp. 105; Perlman *Theorodokia* x, with xv, n. 1. Those who received the *spondophoroi* for the Olympic festival were known as *theorodokoi*: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 171. This does not lend weight to Latte's arguments that there were no Olympic *spondophoroi*, but would rather have been the most convenient term to use to describe those who were in fact "spondophorodokoi." While inscriptions at sacred sites list numerous *theorodokoi* for *theoroi* announcing a festival, it is interesting to note that there are only five known cases of *theorodokoi* hosting *theoroi* attending a festival: three are given by Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 105-06, Perlman *Theorodokia* xv adds another two.

<sup>82</sup> For *theoroi* termed *presbeutai*, see *J. Magn.* 23.4-6; 31.7-10 (cf. .30-31, the group as *theoroi*); 32.2-4 (cf. .27, .30 termed *theoroi*); 36.4 (cf. .23-25, termed *theoroi*); 43.2 (.30, termed *theoroi*); 54.3-5, .41-42, .48 (cf. .34, termed *theoroi*); 59a.8, .10-11, b.19-20 (?) (termed *theoroi*); 61.30, .86 (termed *theoroi* at .73; restored at .94); 70.6 (restored); 72.31; 73b.4; 80.23 (cf. .2); note also 35.3



Despite this complicated terminology, the cities receiving invitations all had specially chosen officials known as *theorodokoi*, who, no matter how the cities referred to the delegations which brought the invitation to the city, were responsible for both receiving the delegations and looking after them. Thus, for example, the city of Gonnoi, which referred to the delegation which brought the invitation as simply “men”, *andres*, nevertheless elected an official designated as a *theorodokos* to receive the delegation.<sup>83</sup>

As their title suggests, the *theorodokoi* of a polis where a religious celebration was taking place would receive the official delegates sent to represent other states at the particular sacred event which was taking place.<sup>84</sup> But the role of these “receivers of *theoroi*” probably also included that of providing shelter and hospitality for them. If this was not the case, then their role can only have been to greet the *theoroi* as or when they entered the polis and conduct them to their accommodation, and perhaps even to show them around the sacred site and the locality, though that these *theoroi*-receivers simply acted as tour guides seems inconceivable.

The exact nature of the *theorodokia* can be deduced from the manner in which the *theorodokoi* were chosen, since their office, at least for those celebrations whose pedigree predated the historical period, had always been hereditary. The new Panhellenic creations of the Hellenistic period saw the direct election (that is, by show

---

(cf. 4-5, 23, 26, 30-31, 33). There are cases where the *arkhitheoros* is referred to as a *presbeutes* with *theoroi*: 38.1, 38; 39.1; 40.2-3; 41.2; 42.1; 44.24 (cf. 37, termed *arkhitheoros* and *theoroi*); 45.3; 72.5, 10-11; 87.6, 10-11, 23-24. The *theoroi* are also referred to in other, somewhat banal, ways, such as “the men”, “those announcing the festival”, “those arriving”, “the men chosen to announce the festival” (see Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 9-10). In the various acceptance decrees, engraved at Kos, of the states who accepted the invitation of the Koans to participate in the Asklepieia, the *theoroi* entrusted with the task of conveying the invitation are generally referred to as an *arkhitheoros* and *theoroi* (for this festival, another third century inauguration of a new Panhellenic celebration, see Sherwin-White *Ancient Cos* 357-59; Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* pp. 27-28; ch. 8 n. 25, with text). But, in some of these decrees, reference is made to those announcing the Olympia and the Pythia, and these are described merely as “those announcing”: Herzog, Klaffenbach 13.32-33: τοῖς [τ]ὰ Ὀλύμπια περιηγέλλουσιν; 6. 32, 50: τοῖς τὰ Πύθια ἐπαγγέλλουσιν.

<sup>83</sup> *I. Magn.* 33, esp. 8, 23, 30-31; cf. Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 9-10.

<sup>84</sup> For the *theorodokia*, see Bill *TAPA* 32 (1901) 203; Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 104-127; Charneux *BCH* 90 (1966) 168; Perlman *Theorodokia* 1-35; cf. Rougemont *BCH* 97 (1973) 89; Dillon *ZPE* 83 (1990) 70-76; Cole *Theoi Megaloi* 48-56 (with specific reference to *theoroi* to Samothrace); Peppadelmousou *Theoria of Brauron* 256 n. 3. See Miller *Hesp.* 57 (1988) pp. 148-49 for a recently discovered list of *theorodokoi* to receive the announcers of the Nemean games (pre-publication discussion in Perlman *Theorodokia* 126-258). If the state sending *theoroi* to a festival lacked a *theorodokos*, they would find their own accommodation, such as the Athenian *theoroi* to Olympia who stayed in a tent: see ch. 3 n. 20, with text.

of hands) of theorodokoi by their states in many cases,<sup>85</sup> and it is conceivable that the theorodokoi thus chosen handed this position on to their descendants. It is known that those who were granted the honour of being theorodokoi for the theoroi announcing a forthcoming festival, and at least in some cases the theorodokoi chosen at the inauguration of a new festival, were granted this privilege for themselves and their descendants in perpetuity.<sup>86</sup> Thus it would seem that the office of the theorodokia was frequently a hereditary one for all those celebrations which involved theorodokoi.

---

<sup>85</sup> Examples of the election of theorodokoi and theoroi: the Athenians directly elected the theorodokos for a festival at Ephesos, *Hesp.* 6 (1937) pp. 448-50, no. 3.5-6, .23 (*SEG* 25.108; for the identification of the festival as the Ephetesia in honour of Artemis, see Crosby *Hesp.* 6 (1937) p. 451); examples of the Athenian election of *arkhi-theoroi* will be dealt with below nn. 96-97, with text; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.26-30, cf. .39: the Khians elect theoroi for the Delphian Soteria at the same time as they vote upon the decree, perhaps suggesting direct election of the theoroi; Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* 4.29-30: the theorodokos at Thelpoussa for the Koan Asklepieia was directly elected. Individuals elected for the position would presumably have nominated themselves for election, and one inscription expressly states that an individual Nikaios ἐκὼν προσ/εδέξατο the theorodokia for the Panathenaia, Eleusinia and the Eleusinian Great Mysteries: *Ark. Eph.* (1914) p. 168, lines 8-9 (*Helly Gonnoi* 2, pp. 121-22, no. 109); cf. Perlman *Theorodokia* 18 with 27 n. 35.

In some cases general terms such as ἐπέσθαι and ἀρῶνται are used, throwing no light on the method of election: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.53-54, cf. 61-62; cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.26-30; *I. Magn.* 28.5; 35.32-34; 36.22-23. Election is made the responsibility of officials: *I. Magn.* 50.49-52; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.53-54. The league of the Aetolians, in accepting an invitation to participate in the Nikephoria founded by Eumenes II, instructed each of its member cities to appoint theorodokoi for the Pergamene theoroi who will announce the festival *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 62.9.23-24; similarly the league of the Achaeanians for the Leukophryena, *I. Magn.* 31.30-34; for the festival of the Nikephoria, see Segre *Hellenica* 5 (1948) 101-28; for the Leukophryena, see Kern *Hermes* 36 (1901) 491-515, and briefly Kroll *RE* 12 (1925) 2287-88). *BCH* 77 (1953) 168-76 (*SEG* 12.217) concerns the Aetolians and Delphians on the Leukophryena at Magnesia: they accept the invitation to attend, but provisions to choose theorodokoi for the Magnesians who will in future years announce the festival are restored. *I. Magn.* 18: King Antiochos III accepts the *epangelia* of the Magnesians but does not make arrangements for theorodokoi. Presumably the king was to fulfill this role, as in the initial instance; cf. nn. 87, 94, 148 with text. Similarly, when the Koans announced the inauguration of a new festival, the Asklepieia, theorodokoi were chosen: Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* 4.29-30, .50-51; 6.54-55; 7.15. On this topic, see Perlman *Theorodokia* 8-10, 17-20. In two cases a city itself agreed to act as theorodokos: *I. Magn.* 33.30-31; *BCH* 45 (1921) p. 28, col. 5.27; cf. Perlman *Theorodokia* 2 with 22 n. 4.

<sup>86</sup> The office of the theorodokia could often be awarded as a hereditary honour: *BCH* 105 (1981) 612-13 (*SEG* 31.306) awards a Corinthian and his descendants hereditary theorodokia for the Nemean festival and that of Argive Hera; see also *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1 48; 49; 50; 51; 94-96; *IG* V 390-394; *FD* 3.1.24; 3.1.86; *AE* (1976) 83-86 (*SEG* 26.445), restored; *I. Magn.* 50.51-52; cf. Perlman *Theorodokia* 19-20 for existing festivals.

Nothing is specifically known about the socio-economic background of those chosen as theorodokoi, but there were several monarchs amongst the known holders of the office.<sup>87</sup> The hereditary nature of the office suggests that the position had an aristocratic origin, and that it may ultimately have had its beginnings in the ritualised guest-friendship system which was a feature of archaic aristocratic society. The office of the *proxenos* was similarly hereditary in nature, and in it the survivals of this guest-friendship are explicit. Moreover, in granting privileges to individuals in other states poleis often linked the duties of *proxenos* and theorodokos, granting the position of both in perpetuity.<sup>88</sup>

A *proxenos* was someone whose duty was to take care of the representatives of the state for which he was responsible when these travelled to his polis.<sup>89</sup> This included looking after them in not only a political but also a material sense – providing them with entertainment, food and shelter. *Proxenois* would thus have come from amongst the wealthy, those who could afford to “entertain in style”. But the office of *proxenos* only made provision for delegates arriving on political matters, and not for theoroi visiting a polis or site for a religious ceremony. The evidence for the *proxenia* concerns only secular matters: the *proxenos* had a secular duty, the theorodokos a religious one. It is possible to draw a parallel between the *proxenia* and the theorodokia; in a similar fashion to the way in which the political representatives would be received and given hospitality by a *proxenos*, the theoroi attending a festival, it seems safe to conjecture would be met by a theorodokos who would also act as their host, providing them with accommodation.<sup>90</sup>

Such a duty would presumably have been undertaken at a cost to the theorodokoi, who were expected to meet any expenses associated with entertaining the theoroi, and in this sense the duty was similar to a liturgy. This would tie in with the premise that the theorodokoi were from a wealthy socio-economic background. Their wealth would ensure that the theoroi were hospitably entertained, and that the theoroi

---

<sup>87</sup> See the examples of Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΔΟΣ* 122; Perlman *Theorodokia* 23-24. The Nemean list of theorodokoi includes a king: Miller *Hesp.* 57 (1988) p. 153. Cf. nn. 94, 148

<sup>88</sup> See, for example, *IG IV<sup>2</sup>* 1 49; 50; 53; 60.

<sup>89</sup> The most recent work on *proxenia* is Marek *Proxenie*; see also Walbank *Athenian Proxenies*; Wallace *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 189-208; Gerolymatos *Espionage and Treason passim*. Xouthos on his first visit had stayed with a *proxenos* at Delphi, and during his stay had taken part in a Bakkhic rite: Eur. *Ion* 551; there is no suggestion that he went to Delphi specifically for this celebration. Xouthos and Kreousa in coming to Delphi to seek advice about their childlessness seem to have stayed with Xouthos' *proxenos*: Eur. *Ion* 1039.

<sup>90</sup> There seems to be a reference to this in the work of Lucian (*Syr. Dea* 56), who states that the pilgrims to the shrine of Assyrian Juno, on the Euphrates river, were received by a host whom they did not know properly, but who had been appointed for each polis as hosts. The office of host at this shrine was hereditary, and the hosts were known as *xenodokoi*.

carried back to their home-state suitably favourable reports of the hospitality of the host-city.<sup>91</sup> The polis celebrating the festival, then, would generally not provide accommodation for theoroi, and it, or the state sending the theoroi, would appoint someone to meet this expense. If the state did not provide shelter for the important official delegations attending religious celebrations, it need be no surprise that little was done for the ordinary faithful in this matter.<sup>92</sup>

The social class of the theoroi also warrants consideration. There is little evidence to suggest who was eligible to be chosen as a theoros, and most cities, in making arrangements for the election of theoroi, simply state in the relevant decree that “theoroi are to be chosen”. In reality, however, theoroi were probably selected from a restricted category and it seems safe to assume that the theoroi chosen to announce a festival would come from an upper socio-economic group. They would need to be articulate, for even if they brought the terms of the truce or invitation written down they would have to enter into discussions with those accepting the truce on behalf of their community. Not only would they be involved in official discourse, but would be received (be given *xenia*) and dined in the official state dining hall, associating with the officials of the host state.<sup>93</sup> Several of the theorodokoi who received them were obviously of high standing, and this was presumably reflected in the status of those whom they received.<sup>94</sup> While there is evidence to indicate that spondophoroi would be chosen from specific aristocratic families, there is no evidence to suggest that the same applied to the theoroi announcing or attending festivals. Moreover, in Athens, which was a fully fledged democracy, the level of political participation was quite high,<sup>95</sup> and many Athenians would have been members, at some time in their lives, of the executive council known as the *boule*. It is perhaps possible that quite ordinary people could have been chosen as members of embassies, and that, as long as money was provided, citizens not of the highest socio-economic class could be selected for theoriai. Possibly Athenian citizens in general may have been more articulate and socially aware than members of other states due to the greater degree of political

---

<sup>91</sup> The failure of one individual, Kraion, who had received ambassadors at Delphi, to provide lodging of a standard commensurate with the expectations of the Theban ambassadors led to an unfavourable report at Thebes; see Dillon *ZPE* 83 (1990) 64-76; ch. 3 n. 40. The liturgic nature of theoriai at Athens is discussed below.

<sup>92</sup> See ch. 3.

<sup>93</sup> Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* 6.50-51, 8.8-10, 11.11, 12.27, 13.27-28; and see further discussion below, with regard to money for expenses granted to theoroi, nn. 104-08, with text.

<sup>94</sup> Kings, tyrants, and sons of tyrants as theorodokoi: Boesch *ΘΕΩΡΟΣ* 122; Perlman *Theorodokia* 23-24; a queen as theorodokos: Perlman 23; cf. nn. 87, 148.

<sup>95</sup> Sinclair *Democracy and Political Participation* 20-23, 114-19.

participation at Athens at all social levels, though there is no firm evidence to indicate conclusively that any but upper class Athenians served as *theoroi*.

It is unclear how most of the Greek states who sent *theoriai* chose their *theoroi*. Our best evidence comes from Athens, where the eponymous *arkhon*, immediately upon entering office, chose the *arkhitheoros* who would lead the *theoria* to Delos. One known *arkhitheoros* of the Delian *theoria* was Nikias, whose activities in this office are detailed by Plutarch, while, when Athens voted to accept the request of Ptolemy to attend the inaugural *Ptolemaia* in Alexandria, they also voted that Kallias of Sphettos be the *arkhitheoros*. He and the other *theoroi* were elected by show of hands in the *ekklesia*, indicating that popular acclaim was the method used in this case.<sup>96</sup>

The members of the Athenian *theoria* for the Pythia were chosen both by and from the *boule*, and Demosthenes notes that in the year that the Athenians boycotted the Pythia, they chose no *theoroi* from the *boule*. In his speech against Meidias, Demosthenes states that Meidias was so impious that after having indicted Demosthenes on a charge of murder, he had allowed him to conduct initiatory rites and sacrifices for the *boule*. He had also, without protest, permitted Demosthenes to act as *arkhitheoros* of the *theoria* which was being sent to the Nemean festival in honour of Zeus. Demosthenes was presumably a member of the *boule* and thus it seems that the *arkhitheoros*, and possibly the other *theoroi* for the Nemean festival, were chosen from its members.<sup>97</sup>

The decree of the Khians accepting the invitation to attend the inaugural *Soteria* at Delphi provides evidence from another state regarding the election of *theoroi*. This festival was being established to commemorate the repulse of the Gallic invaders from Greece, who had been turned back just as they had reached the Delphic oracle. The Khians resolved to choose *theoroi* for the *Soteria* immediately, but decreed that in future *theoroi* for this festival would be chosen at the same time as those for the *Olympia*. The terminology employed indicates that there was to be a direct election - by hands.<sup>98</sup> That direct election rather than lot was employed at Khios, while appointment was by an official in the case of the Athenian *arkhitheoros* responsible for the Delian festival, indicates the social standing of these *theoroi*. This use of direct election in choosing *theoroi* would, as in the case of other elective offices (such as the *strategia* at Athens), tend to favour the upper echelon: those who could afford to cultivate social and political prominence. If *theoroi* were to be called upon to engage

<sup>96</sup> Choosing an *arkhitheoros*: [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3; cf. Rhodes *Commentary* 626; Nikias: Plut. *Nik.* 3.5; see ch. 7 n. 18-23, with text; Kallias: *Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) pp. 2-4, lines 57-58 (*SEG* 28.60).

<sup>97</sup> Dem. 21.115: [Meidias] εἴασε δ' ἀρχιθεωροῦντ' ἀγαγεῖν τῷ Διὶ τῷ Νεμείῳ τὴν κοινὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως θεωρίαν.

<sup>98</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.26-30.

in diplomatic activity, those with social prominence and political skills would be preferred, while an *arkhitheoros* would presumably prefer to be associated with other members of his own class and background. The Athenian *theoria* to Sounion, for example, which was seized by the Aeginetans, consisted of many noble Athenians.<sup>99</sup> The fact that the captured *theoroi* were aristocrats is an indication that this *theoria* was considered to be an important activity.

Names of individual *theorodokoi* appointed to receive *theoroi* announcing festivals are known from the great *stelai* erected by the state hosting the festival as a way of honouring these *theorodokoi*. The *theorodokoi* are listed by their place of residence, and thus presumably these lists not only served an honorific purpose but also acted as a record for the *theoroi* setting out to announce festivals in particular places. These *stelai* indicate the vast extent of participation by the Hellenic states in major festivals throughout the Greek world.<sup>100</sup>

The costs of the official pilgrimages to various sacred sites were borne in three ways. The state could finance the entire *theoria*; the *arkhitheoros* of the *theoria* would meet the expense; and there is also evidence to suggest that the burden could be shared between the state and the *arkhitheoros*. At Athens, at least some of the *theoriai* were financed through liturgies, and, as with all liturgies, this gave scope for the liturgist either merely to meet his obligation as required by the state, or to go beyond the

<sup>99</sup> Hdt. 6.87; see below n. 139, and discussion at ch. 2 n. 18, with text.

<sup>100</sup> Lists of *theorodokoi* exist for Delphi, Argos, Olympia, Epidauros, and Hermione (original publication given, with selected *SEG*). Delphi: *BCH* 45 (1921) 1-85, *BCH* 89 (1965) 658-64, *AJP* 101 (1980) 318-23 (*SEG* 26.624, 30.494); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 90 (*SEG* 25.576); cf. Robert *BCH* 70 (1946) 506-23; Daux *REG* 62 (1949) 1-30. Argos (Nemean games): *BCH* 90 (1966) 156-239, where note the maps of the locations of cities of *theorodokoi* on 171-91, also 710-14 (*SEG* 23.189, 26.427, 30.361); cf. *BCH Suppl.* 6 (1980) 269-73, no. 4 (*SEG* 30.357); *Hesp.* 57 (1988) pp. 148-49. Olympia: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 171; cf. *I. Olymp.* V 39. Hermione (for the Khthonia): *IG* IV 727a; cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051. Epidauros: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1 94-95 (*SEG* 11.410-411, 26.447); *Hellenika* 8 (1950) 7-10 (*SEG* 11.413); *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1 96, a list of awards of *theorodokia*, functions as a list of *theorodokoi*. Cabanes *Épire* 116-120, with 143-45 nn. 55-85 argues that the Epeirote cities of the Epidaurian *theorodokoi* list *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 1 95 are arranged in the geographical order in which the *theoroi* visited them (note Hammond *CQ* 30 (1980) 473); cf. for Astypalaia's participation in the *Epidauria*, ch. 8 nn. 196-97, with text. For an Argive list, see Charneau *BCH* 90 (1966) 165. Giovanniri *Catalogue des Vaisseaux* 52-62 argues that the catalogue of ships in the *Iliad* corresponds closely to the *theorodokoi* lists for the Delphian Pythia, that is, that the geographical order of the catalogue corresponds with the places which *theoroi* announcing the Pythia visited, suggesting that the Pythian *theoroi* visited cities in a predetermined order; see fig. 1.2. For lists of *theoroi* who represented their cities at Samothrace, see Fraser *Samothrace* 2.1, 62-73 (cf. 13-14); Cole *Theoi Megaloi* 49-51, with 48-49, 51-56; compare with these the lists of *mystai* at Samothrace, Fraser 74-116; Cole 43-44. See figs. 1.3-1.4 for distribution maps of Samothracian *theoroi* and *mystai* respectively; for the Samothracian Mysteries, see ch. 5 n. 2.

minimal requirements and spend lavishly on the *theoria* in order to make an impression on the *demos*.

As is usually the case with our knowledge of ancient institutions, the best examples for the organisation of *theoriai* are from Athens. Aristotle, in writing that the greatness of the scale of liberality is relative to the splendour of the occasion or object, states that the amount of expenditure which would be great for a *trierarkhos* would not be extortionate for an *arkhitheoros*.<sup>101</sup> This is clear evidence that *arkhitheoriai* at Athens could be very expensive, though Aristotle's comment needs to be tempered by the observation that there seem to have been *arkhitheoriai* which cost considerably less than the cost of a *trierarkhia*. In one case a speaker in a lawsuit claims that the liturgies of an *arkhitheoria*, *arrephoria* and "other things of the same kind" cost him thirty minas, and he is at pains to stress that he has spent a good deal of money on his liturgies.<sup>102</sup> *Arkhitheoroi* would thus necessarily have come from the elite, given the expenses which they had to outlay. The *theoroi* who accompanied the *arkhitheoros* need not necessarily have come from the elite if it is assumed that they did not have to meet considerable expenditure; the indications, however, are that *theoroi* were probably from the wealthier classes. The best known *arkhitheoria* is that of Nikias to Delos: the cost is unknown, but Plutarch's description testifies to a lavish expenditure.<sup>103</sup>

In some cities, *theoriai* do not seem to have been liturgic, and *ephodia*, journey money, and money for sacrifices were provided; the sacrifice would have been the main duty of the *theoroi* attending a festival.<sup>104</sup> However, the fact that service on a *theoria* required time away from the home city, implying a leisured existence, would favour the wealthy for such service on *theoriai*. Fifty drachmas were allocated by the Khians to *theoroi* for the sacrifice which they would make at the Delphian Soteria, and for *ephodia*, thirty drachmas for each *theoros*.<sup>105</sup> The "League of Islands" provided money for a crown, sacrifice and *ephodia* for the three *theoroi* it sent to Alexandria for

---

<sup>101</sup> Arist. *Nik. Eth.* 1122a (4.2.2). The cost of a *trierarkhia* was approximately a talent: Lys. 21.2 (seven *trierarkhiai* for six talents). For the liturgic nature of *arkhitheoriai* at Athens, see Davies *JHS* 87 (1967) 37-38.

<sup>102</sup> Lys. 21.5.

<sup>103</sup> Plut. *Nik.* 3.5-6; cf. ch. 7 n. 19 with text. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1635.34-35 lists payments made to *arkhitheoroi* and to a *trierarkhos* for the Delian festival, so whereas Nikias in the fifth century financed the *theoria* apparently solely from his own finances, this was not invariably the case in the fourth century; cf. Rhodes *Commentary* 626. 1. *Priene* 174.26-27 mentions an *arkhitheoria* in a list of liturgies, so it involved personal expenditure on the part of the *arkhitheoros* involved.

<sup>104</sup> For *ephodia* paid to Athenian ambassadors, see Westermann *CP* 5 (1910) 203-16, who argues for a rate of 1 1/2 drachmas a day rising to 2 1/2 in the late fourth century.

<sup>105</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.30-31, 38-39.

the games established by Ptolemy<sup>106</sup> An interesting case is that of Kallias: when Ptolemy Philadelphos, king of Egypt in the early third century, established the festival of the Ptolemaia in honour of his father, and the Athenian *demos* voted to send a *theoria* to attend the festival, Kallias was chosen as *arkhitheoros* to lead the Athenian *theoria* to this first celebration of the Ptolemaia. The *demos* voted money to him for the expenses associated with the *theoria*, but Kallias refused the money and conducted the *theoria* completely at his own expense.<sup>107</sup> Thus money was provided by the polis for this *theoria*, but the generosity of a private citizen meant that in fact the polis did not need to meet the expense on this occasion. Inscriptions give evidence that the state often provided money for the *theoroi* attending a festival, and that assistance might even be given to those *theoroi* who announced a festival.<sup>108</sup>

One inscription prescribes that the *theoroi* bearing the *epangelia* from Pergamon were to receive as much hospitality as the *theoroi* announcing the Olympia, and that, as requested by the *theoroi*, the equestrian contests at the festival were to be recognised as *isolympion*.<sup>109</sup> Another inscription makes provision for a payment to the Athenian *arkhitheoros*, seemingly for the Nemean festival, indicating that this *arkhitheoria* was either completely or partially subsidised by the state.<sup>110</sup> A decree of Delphi is interesting in that it awards *xenia* to two *theoroi* from Khersonasita on the Pontos because of their generosity and these two are thus singled out from the hundreds of *theoroi* who must have attended the Pythia on behalf of their states; the two are not termed *theoroi* but since they have travelled to Delphi to sacrifice in response to an invitation by Delphic *theoroi* to attend the Pythia, this must have been their position.<sup>111</sup> The evidence for the way in which Greek states were invited to

<sup>106</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.57-59.

<sup>107</sup> *Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) pp. 2-4, lines 55-64. The amount of money which the *demos* offered to Kallias is the subject of restoration, but it might have been fifty minas (line 60-61); see *Shear Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) p. 34.

<sup>108</sup> *I. Magn.* 33.17-20 (as much as is given to those announcing the Pythia; note here, and elsewhere, the payment of the *ekkekheiron*, an allowance for those announcing the *ekkekheiria*); 37.36-37 (*xenia*); 38.43-44; 41.16-17; 42.12-13; 44.30-33; 50.47-49, .52-54; 87.19-20 (100 drachmas as a first fruits offering to the goddess); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.57-59; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.30-31, .38-39; *xenia* and money to *theoroi* announcing a festival from the city they are visiting: Herzog, *Klaffenbach Asylieurkunden aus Kos* 4.16-17, .29-30, .48-50 (money for the *theoroi*, esp. .17, and for the god Asklepios); 5b.10-12 (*xenia*, and perhaps money, the context being fragmentary); 6.14-15, .31-32, .49-50 (*xenia*, as much as those announcing the Pythia receive); 8.8-11 (*xenia*, and money for the *aparkhe*, first fruits); 9.6-7 (restored, *xenia* and *aparkhe*); 11.10-11 (3 minas for sacrifices, and *xenia*); 12.27-28 (*xenia*); 13.27-33 (*xenia* and 10 minas for the sacrifice and procession); 14.8-9 (restored).

<sup>109</sup> Michel 291, esp. .15, .17, .26; cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051.21-23; *I. Magn.* 40.18-19.

<sup>110</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 365b.

<sup>111</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 604.



festivals is mostly restricted to the third and second centuries BC. Moreover, the evidence is of a unique nature as the invitations are not for long-standing festivals, but rather for ones which had only just been established. For example, when the city of Magnesia in Asia Minor founded the festival of the Leukophryena, the city sent out *theoriai* to many Greek cities asking them to attend and to do so on a regular basis and separate groups of *theoroi* took the message throughout the Greek world. The procedure for requesting attendance survives only for these new festival foundations, but in the case of long established festivals the procedure was presumably the same.<sup>112</sup>

The *theoroi*, once chosen, would have had to ensure that they left their home city in enough time to reach the festival city. Representatives from Sicily, such as Syracuse, which sent *theoroi* to the Leukophryena festival at Magnesia, would have had to make a long trip.<sup>113</sup> To what extent festivals were timed to take advantage of good sailing weather is uncertain, but this may have been a factor taken into consideration when the organisers of new festivals chose a date for their celebration.

Each *theoria*, arriving at the city whose attendance was being requested, explained the nature of the festival, in the case of the Leukophryena that specific sacrifices were to be made to the goddess, and that games were to be held. Why the festival was being established was also explained. In the case of the Leukophryena, there had been an *epiphaneia* of the goddess Artemis, as a result of which the Magnesians had sought the advice of the Delphic oracle, which had advised the city to establish a festival in honour of the goddess.<sup>114</sup> When the Magnesian *theoroi* arrived at a particular city, they invited it to accept “for all time” the sacrifices and the games which had been established; the city accepting the invitation promised to send representatives “for all time” in return. What this undertaking clearly involved was a decision by the city to send official representatives to the festival whenever it occurred. In many of the decrees replying to the request of the Magnesians, there are

---

<sup>112</sup> In the Hellenistic period, several new festivals were established for which invitations were sent throughout the Hellenic world. The best preserved set of invitations relates to the establishment of the Koan penteteric festival in honour of Asklepios, see Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylieurkunden aus Kos passim*. The invitations for the Magnesian Leukophryena have also survived, see Kern *I. Magn.* 16-87. The decree of the Neosotic league accepting the invitation to participate in the penteteric festival Ptolemy established in honour of his father is preserved: *SIG<sup>3</sup> 390*; the Athenian acceptance: *Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) pp. 2-4, lines 55-64; acceptance of the Soteria: *SIG<sup>3</sup> 402, 408*; cf. Nachtergaeel *Galates* 209-382, 391-519; acceptance of the Nikephoria at Pergamon: *SIG<sup>3</sup> 629 and 630*.

<sup>113</sup> *I. Magn.* 72.

<sup>114</sup> *I. Magn.* 37.15; 38.5; 43.8; 54.13 (and others).

clauses providing for the immediate election of theoroi to attend the inaugural festival.<sup>115</sup>

There is some evidence that states refused to attend festivals as a means of making a political point. Demosthenes records that the Athenians, outraged by the treatment which the Phokians had received at the hands of the Macedonians, sent no theoroi or judges, *thesmothetai*, to the Pythian festival at Delphi, and refused to send their ancestral theoria.<sup>116</sup> Clearly, a diplomatic protest was intended, for the Athenians had always attended in the past, and it was usual for states to agree to send delegations for all time.

In nearly all of the cases where the number of theoroi is recorded, either those who are announcing or those who are attending a festival, the number of theoroi is almost always three (this excludes the pilgrims travelling with them and the accompanying contestants if cultural or athletic competitions were involved). There are a number of inscriptions giving the number as three, and this is generally the case throughout the Greek world: less commonly, two are chosen. For example, Kos sent out groups of two or three theoroi to invite states to attend the inaugural celebration of the penteteric festival in honour of Asklepios.<sup>117</sup> Priene, which chose two theoroi to attend the Great Panathenaia at Athens, provides another example of a two man theoria.<sup>118</sup> The evidence of the Magnesian decrees is also clear on this point; three theoroi were sent out to announce the establishment of the Leukophryena and to invite Hellenic states to send theoroi to celebrations of the festival.<sup>119</sup>

Why there was usually three theoroi is a matter for conjecture only. Public money was often involved; the *demos* often provided the theoroi with funds for

<sup>115</sup> "For all time": εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον; *I. Magn.* 31.38; 32.33-34; 37.26-27; 50.36; 54.34-36; note also *SIG<sup>3</sup>* 390.36-38.

<sup>116</sup> Dem. 19.128: ὥστε μήτε τοὺς ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς θεωροὺς μήτε τοὺς θεσμοθέτας εἰς τὰ Πύθια πέμψαι, ἀλλ' ἀποστῆναι τῆς πατρῴου θεωρίας. For the treatment of the Phokians at the end of the Third Sacred War, see Paus. 10.3.1-2; cf. Buckler *Philip II and the Sacred War* 140-42. In the modern world, boycotting the Olympic Games was a matter of mutual retaliation in the 1980s.

<sup>117</sup> Groups of two theoroi: Herzog, Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* 6.16-17, .21-22, .37-38, .54-55; 7.2-3; 12.12-13; 13.11-12; 16.2-3; groups of three: 4.8-9, .22-23, .33-34, .42-43; 5a.2-3, b.1-2, .15-16 (note restorations 5a-5b); 11.3-4, .14-15 (restored); 15.3-4 (restored), and see the list in Herzog, Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* pp. 28-30. This can be compared to the Eleusinian and Elean spondophoroi, who travelled in groups of two or three.

<sup>118</sup> *I. Priene* 5.10-11; cf. *SIG<sup>3</sup>* 604.3-4: two theoroi were sent to Khersonasita on the Pontos to announce the Pythia.

<sup>119</sup> *I. Magn.* 18.3-4; 19.2-3; 31.8-10 .42-44; 32.3-4; 33.8-9, .25; 34.3-4, .24-25; 35.4-5, .27-28; 36.5-6, .24-25; 37.11-12, .33-34; 38.1-4; 40.2-4, .10-13; 41.2-3; 43.2-4; 44.8-10, .37-38; 45.3-7 (this list is not exhaustive).

sacrifice. Three might have been thought better for the prevention of collusion in dishonest use of these public monies, but more than three might have made the group too large. Another consideration might have been the number of festivals in a year or over a four year period as the number of theoroi required by a particular city to meet its festival commitments might have been considerable, and finding individuals to act as theoroi, given the time involved in absence from the polis, might have meant that the size of the delegation had to be restricted.

The role played by theoroi in the festivals which they were attending is suggested by the etymology of the words theoroi and theoria. Possibly the original function of the theoroi was to observe the celebrations on behalf of their cities, and to provide official representation. Just as ordinary people attended the Panhellenic contests to watch the various contests,<sup>120</sup> so too would this have been one of the activities of the theoroi. But the role of the theoroi was not limited to passive sight-seeing: their most important role, in fact, seems to have been to participate in the offering of sacrifices to the deity in whose honour the festival was being held.<sup>121</sup> The cities sending delegations would thus be represented at sacrifices aimed at winning the good will of the gods. It was clearly an attempt to win or to retain the favour of the particular deity for one's state, and many states, in agreeing to send theoroi to the Leukophryena at Magnesia, stressed that they were doing so because of their *eusebeia* towards the goddess, Artemis, and emphasising their eagerness to "show clearly" that they honoured the goddess. Implicit in this was the idea that not to send delegations to religious festivals was in some sense impious or unwise.

There are further examples which indicate that the main role of the theoroi was a sacrificial one. The Aetolian League undertook to send theoroi to the festival of Athena Nikephoria in Pergamon, 'whenever sacrifices are being made.'<sup>122</sup> At the establishment of the Soteria at Delphi, the island of Kos decreed that the theorodokos and theoroi chosen for the festival were to sacrifice a bull with its horns gilded to Pythian Apollo as a thanksgiving for the deliverance of Hellas from the barbarians.<sup>123</sup> Khersonasita on the Pontos, in response to an invitation to attend the Pythia, sent two individuals to make sacrifices, who sacrificed a hecatomb to Apollo and twelve bulls to Athena and distributed the meat to the citizens of Delphi.<sup>124</sup> Kallias as *arkhithoros* for the Athenian theoria at the first celebration of the Ptolemaia at Alexandria had

<sup>120</sup> Dio Chrys. *Or.* 8.11-12.

<sup>121</sup> Suda s.v. θεωροί.

<sup>122</sup> SIG<sup>3</sup> 629.21-22: ἀποστέλλειν δ[ὲ / θεωρ]οὺς ἐν Πέργαμον ἐπε[ί] καὶ ἄθυσία καθήκει τᾷ Ἀθάναι τᾷ Πικαφόρωι.

<sup>123</sup> SIG<sup>3</sup> 398.21-25.

<sup>124</sup> SIG<sup>3</sup> 604.

charge, with the *theoroi*, of “the sacrifice on behalf of the city.”<sup>125</sup> When Antiokhos was king in Judaea and Jason was the high priest of the Temple, the latter chose citizens of Antioch as *theoroi* to attend the penteteric games being held at Tyre. The main purpose of the *theoroi* was to sacrifice to Herakles, and they had been given money for this purpose; the *theoroi*, however, decided to use the money in a more constructive manner: they diverted it towards the building of ships.<sup>126</sup>

Evidence from some states indicates that *theoroi* from certain cities were also responsible for carrying first fruits to the festival. The *demos* of Priene decreed, in 326/5, that they send a *theoria* to Athens to request of the Athenians that the people of Priene be allowed to participate in the Great Panathenaia by sending representatives.<sup>127</sup> This case is interesting from two points of view; firstly, the people of Priene asked if they might attend the Great Panathenaia, and clearly, therefore, if a polis did not normally send a delegation to a particular festival, the city might not necessarily receive an invitation to do so. Moreover, the request to be allowed to attend shows that there was an etiquette involved in the sending of delegations: a delegation simply did not turn up without an invitation. Clearly, the people of Priene were intending to send a deputation to the Great Panathenaia so that the *demos* of the Athenians might know of the *eunoia* the Prienians felt for Athens, and this *eunoia* stemmed from the activities of the strategos Diphilos, stationed at Samos.<sup>128</sup> Diphilos seems to have undertaken some military action beneficial to the people of Priene, perhaps action against pirates, for Athens placed stress on keeping the seas safe in the Lykourgan period.<sup>129</sup>

In addition to responsibility for sacrifices, the *theoroi*, and in particular the *arkhitheoros*, had a duty towards other members of their polis who were also attending the festival, and the account of Nikias’ *arkhitheoria* to Delos highlights this responsibility, since Nikias was responsible for the performance of the *choroi*, for their expenses, and for conveying them from Athens to Delos. Similarly, inscriptions from some states charge the *theoroi* to care for those sailing with them. Given that

<sup>125</sup> *Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) pp. 2-4, lines 62-64: [τῆς δὲ] θυσίας ἐπιμεληθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεω[ς] καὶ τῶν ἄλλω[ν] ἀπρά[ντ]/ων ὧν προσῆκεν μετὰ τῶν θεω[ρ]ῶν.

<sup>126</sup> 2 *Macc.* 4.18-20. Other examples of *theoroi* sacrificing: *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 402.30; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390.55-56 (and they are to present a crown to Ptolemy, .57); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051.14-17; *Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) pp. 2-4, lines 55-64; *I. Priene* 5.11-13; *I. Magn.* 31.30-31; 32.29-31; 33.22-24; 35.25; 50.34-35. The above are some of the more specific references, while the decrees which accept new festivals invariably accept at the same time the sacrifices to be held at the festival, thus implying that the *theoroi* coming from other cities would take part in these sacrifices.

<sup>127</sup> *I. Priene* 5; cf. ch. 7 n. 126, with text.

<sup>128</sup> *I. Priene* 5.17-20.

<sup>129</sup> See ch. 2 n. 35, with text.

many festivals had musical contests, to which states sent *choroi*, their care may have been one of the prime responsibilities for *arkhitheoroi*, who could also have acted as leaders of the *theoria* to and from the site. It is also possible that those participating in games at a festival travelled with the *theoroi*.

Instances of *theoroi* engaging in direct diplomacy while carrying out their duties as *theoroi* are known. Deinarkhos states that Demosthenes, *arkhitheoros* to Olympia in 324, wanted to use his position as a means of obtaining an interview with Nikanor for the purpose of discussing Alexander's "Exile's Decree."<sup>130</sup> This tends to suggest that the use of the office of *theoros* or *arkhitheoros* for diplomatic purposes may not have been unusual. During the Peloponnesian War, when the Spartan king Agis and Sparta's allies were preparing to aid Khios in a planned revolt from Athens, Corinth would not join in because it was the time of the Isthmian truce, the Isthmian festival being under their jurisdiction. The Isthmian truce had been proclaimed and the Athenians sent *theoroi*: in the course of the festival the intention of the Khians became clearer to the Athenian *theoroi*, who, returning home, must have made the situation known to their fellow Athenians, for the Athenians took steps to counter the plans of the Spartans.<sup>131</sup> Festivals were clearly an ideal venue for finding out information about events in other states. Two *theoriai* visiting Alexandria in the second century became involved in diplomatic activity, one announcing the approach of the Panathenaia, and the other the approaching date of the Eleusinian Mysteries. These *theoriai* were dispatched by Ptolemy to Antiokhos to seek peace with the latter, and represented a neutral party for Ptolemy. Their composition must have given Ptolemy confidence that they could make headway with Antiokhos.<sup>132</sup>

Another possible example of such diplomatic activity is reflected by an inscription which honours an Athenian *arkhitheoros* to Nemea in 323 "for the things which he reported to the *demos* of the Athenians." Miller suggests that the rumours of Alexander's death which were circulating at this time could provide some clue as to why the *arkhitheoros* was honoured: he suggests that it was for sounding out allies for a revolt against Macedonian domination; this revolt, the Lamian War, broke out in Greece shortly afterwards.<sup>133</sup> Even if this possibility is discounted, it is clear that

<sup>130</sup> Dein. 1.81; cf. Diod. 17.109.1, 18.8.2-7.

<sup>131</sup> Thuc. 8.9.1-10.2, note esp. 10.1: 'Εν δὲ τούτῳ τὰ Ἰσθμια ἐγίγνετο, καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (ἐπηγγέλθησαν γάρ) ἐθεώρουν ἐς αὐτά. The Athenians did send a regular *theoria* to the Isthmia, so ἐθεώρουν is probably a reference to the Athenian *theoroi* sent to this particular celebration; cf. Popp *Einwirkung* 140-41. See ch. 2 n. 55, with text, for the Corinthian refusal to become involved.

<sup>132</sup> Polyb. 28.19.3-20.13.

<sup>133</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup> 365a*, esp. .7-9; see Miller *Leonai, the Nemean Games, and the Lamian War* 100-08; Gerolymatos *Espionage and Treason* 80-82 (cf. *SEG* 21.294, esp. 30.66). Another important case

theoroi could become involved in diplomatic activity. In fact when the great number of festivals, and the number of corresponding theoriai travelling to various cities, is considered, it would not be surprising if theoroi became involved in diplomacy. Instead of a city choosing a special board of *presbeutai*, it is possible that theoroi, if they were heading in the right direction, might be employed for diplomatic activities.

Theoroi could be given physical protection: the Aetolian League in decreeing, in the second century BC, that theoroi were to be sent to celebrate the Nikephoria in Pergamon charge the incumbent strategos to look after them as they set out for Pergamon.<sup>134</sup> When theoroi arrived at Philippi from Magnesia bearing an invitation for attendance at the Leukophryena, the *demos* accepted the invitation, but also provided them with a military escort to Nea Polis, a nearby coastal city, from whence, presumably, they were to sail, unless this was their next destination, and the *demos* of Philippi were accepting responsibility for the theoroi only to that point.<sup>135</sup> The military guard was probably not merely a guard of honour as it is possible that the theoroi had encountered trouble on their way to Philippi or that the *demos* knew that such lay ahead on the road to Nea Polis.

Theoroi and theorodokoi were granted honours and privileges,<sup>136</sup> and this was a matter of protocol, though no doubt also of prestige. The theoroi would report back

---

which seems to have been overlooked in modern scholarship is *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 537 (late third century BC) in which a Cretan theoros travelling to Delphi, presumably for the Pythia, stopped *en route* at the Piraeus and divulged information which was useful to the Athenians about political conditions on the island.

<sup>134</sup> Michel 291.23-24 (179-72 BC).

<sup>135</sup> Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* 6.53-54; see also *I. Magn.* 35.36-37; 48.29-30; 53.68-70; 56.35-37; 82.15-16; 83.15-16 (largely restored); Michel 291.22-23; cf. ch. 7 n. 63, with text, for the seizure of Ionian theoroi by the people of Helike (Diod. 15.49.1-4, esp. 3). Themistokles was escorted from Sparta to the Tegean border by a honorary guard of 300 Spartans as a mark of respect for his part in defeating the Persians: Hdt. 8.124.3; Plut. *Them.* 17.3. Cf. ch. 2 n. 93, with text.

<sup>136</sup> Argos honoured a Thracian theorodokos for the festival of Zeus at Nemea (the Nemean games) and Argive Hera (this would be a festival of Hera at the Argive Heraion to which other states must have been invited by the Argives): *BCH Suppl.* 6 (1980) 269-73, no. 4 (*SEG* 30.357); cf. Miller *Hesp.* 57 (1988) p. 163 with n. 76. A statue base at Samothrace commemorates Parian theoroi; this might be a personal dedication, but more probably was made by the state of either Paros or Samothrace in return for services performed by the theoroi: *Hesp.* 48 (1979) p. 26 (*SEG* 29.797). In *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 189 Delphi grants hereditary honours, including *promanteia*, for a theorodokos; cf. *FD* 3.1.152. *I. Olymp.* V 39 honours an Olympic victor who returning to his home state Tenedos assumed the theorodokia of his father and carried out his duties with *eunoia*. Theoroi announcing new festivals were routinely praised and honoured, for example, Michel 291.29-30; *I. Magn.* 32.40-49; 33.24-26; 35.26-33; 48.20-21; *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 1051.17-20. Michel 392 is a Teian decree which honours Ammonios of Athens for being theorodokos for the Delian festival, indicating that, at least occasionally, non-

to a relevant body when they returned home, and it was important that a city should not provoke negative comments on its hospitality. They announced the festivals of the gods, and while there is no evidence that suggests that as heralds of sacred events they were thought to be under the protection of the deity of the festival, or under Hermes' protection as heralds, it can probably be assumed that the sacred nature of their mission meant that *theoroi* were accorded special treatment in the cities which they visited.

The Athenians sent delegations to many festivals. Demosthenes states that the Athenians refused to send a *theoria* to the penteteric Pythian festival because of the treatment that the Phokians had experienced at the hands of the Amphiktyonic Council,<sup>137</sup> and there also seems to have been an annual *theoria* to Delphi.<sup>138</sup> There was a *theoria* to Sounion which went by sea,<sup>139</sup> and also *theoriai* to Isthmia, Nemea, Olympia, Delos, and Siwah, in Egypt.<sup>140</sup> The *theoria* sent by the Athenian tetrapolis

---

citizens could act as *theorodokoi*; see Perman *Theorodokia* xv, 22-23 for this and other cases. It is possible that *theoroi* announcing existing festivals were also praised in decrees.

<sup>137</sup> Dem. 19.128; cf. above n. 116, with text.

<sup>138</sup> Schol. Aristeid. *Panath.* 189.8: ἴθεν Ἀθηναίων... κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ναῦν εἰς Δελφοὺς ἔπεμπον θυσίαν κομίζουσαν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐν τῇ τῶν Πυθίων πανηγύρει. The scholiast, however, connects a yearly *theoria*, conducted by sea, with the Pythian festival, a penteteric event.

<sup>139</sup> Hdt. 6.87. Jordan *Athenian Navy* 156 on the basis of Suda s.v. Θεωροί (that *theoroi* travelled by ship) states that there were Athenian *theoroi* who travelled by ship to the sanctuaries of Brauron and Eleusis. No *theoroi* are attested for the celebration of the Eleusinian mysteries, and the pilgrims travelled by land from Athens to Eleusis; only during the Peloponnesian War did the pilgrims go by sea, when the land route could not be used because of the Spartan fort at Dekeleia (cf. above n. 16 with references; ch. 4 n. 88, with text). Peppa-Delmousou *Theoria of Brauron* 255-58 argues that there was a *theoria* from Athens to Brauron which had ceased by the fifth century. According to Philostr. *Apoll.* 5.43 any ship which Apollonios travelled on in Egypt was like a sacred ship as at every site they visited by ship they either were taught or they taught a religious story (*logos*).

<sup>140</sup> Isthmia: Thuc. 8.10.1; Andok. 1.132 (this passage deals with Andokides' *theoria* to Olympia as well as Nemea, MacDowell *Andokides* 157 dating Andokides' *theoriai* to 400); Plut. *Thes.* 25.7. Nemea: Dem. 21.115; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 365a.7-8, b.3-8. Olympia: Andok. 1.132; Dein. 1.81; Phot. s.v. Πάραλος (cited by Jordan *Athenian Navy* 162 n. 36; cf. Ar. *Wasps* 1382 where ἐθεώρουν might not mean in a capacity as *theoros* (*contra* Jordan 162 with n. 35), but as at Thuc. 6.16.2, where Thucydides in having Alkibiades refer to his *theoria* to Olympia must be referring to a "viewing" in a general sense as Alkibiades was not part of the official Olympic delegation (Andok. 4.30; Athen. 534d; Plut. *Alk.* 12.1); cf. Bill *TAPA* 32 (1901) 200-01; Lambert *Hist.* 35 (1986) 107-08 (see ch. 3, n. 18 for Alkibiades); Thuc. 3.104.3, where he clearly uses the word in a non-official context. Andokides was *arkhitheoros* at the Olympic festival, but Lambert *Hist.* 35 (1986) 107-08 suggests that in the sixth century this was the duty of the *arkhons*; *bouleutai* and *thesmothetai* were members of the Pythian *theoria*: Dem. 19.128. For Delos: see ch. 7 nn. 2-24, with text; for participation in the Magnesian Leukophryena, see *I. Magn.* 37; participation in the Koan Asklepieia is not attested,

to Delphi and Delos is especially interesting, as the tetrapolis was not an independent authority, but a unit of the Athenian state. This is the only example from Attica (and probably elsewhere in Greece) of a theoria being sent by a civic group within the state. This probably harks back to the time when the tetrapolis was an autonomous and prosperous group of cities independent of Athens, and when the tetrapolis became incorporated into the Athenian state, the tradition of sending a theoria to Delphi and Delos survived.<sup>141</sup>

Athens provides us with more detailed information than any other city about the announcing of festivals and arrangements which this city made for its theoriai to important cult centres. But this is balanced by much epigraphic detail from other cities which presents an overall view of the institutions of the theoria and theorodokia throughout the Hellenic world. The Magnesian and Koan festivals are well attested through a series of decrees, and Delphi, Epidauros and other sites also yield significant information. Literary evidence largely concerns Athens, though Plutarch records that after the battle of Plataea, during the second Persian invasion, Aristides proposed that *probouloi* and theoroi from Hellas gather at Plataea every year, and that every four years there be celebrated games to be known as Eleutheria, to commemorate the freedom of Hellas. The Plataeans were to be inviolate and to be held to be consecrated.<sup>142</sup>

Much evidence points towards a high level of inter-city contact centering on religious activity. Religious activity probably motivated more high-ranking individuals to leave their cities and travel to other places than any other single factor, and on a more regular basis. In the third and second centuries there were many new

---

but given the wide range of the invitations which survive it is certain that Athens was invited to recognise and to take part in this festival, with the relevant decrees now lost. The oracle of Ammon at Siwah: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1642.14-15* mentions an Athenian theoria "to Ammon"; cf. Jordan *Athenian Navy* 163-64 (*contra* 163 n. 41; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1496.95-97*, a record of sacrifices to Ammon, is probably to be connected with a local cult, and cannot be ascribed to the theoria to Egypt); Parke *Oracles of Zeus* 216-18; on *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1642*, note Woodward *BSA* 57 (1962) 8-13; ch. 2 n. 45. Plut. *Thes.* 25.7 is interesting in that Plutarch states that Theseus made an agreement with the Corinthians that Athenians travelling to the Isthmian games be provided with a place as large as the sail of the theoric ship which bore them to Isthmia. It could also be noted that Aeschyl. *Theoroi* (or *Isthmiastai*) is no longer considered by Sutton to refer to satyrs travelling to the Isthmian festival: Sutton *GRBS* 22 (1981) 335-38; for text of the fragments, see Smyth, Lloyd-Jones *Aeschylus* 2.

<sup>141</sup> *FGH* 328 Philochoros F 75 (Schol. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1047); Steph. Byz. s.v. Τετράπολις τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ἔχουσα δήμους καὶ πόλεις τέτταρας: Οἰνόην, Προβάλινθον, Τρικόρυνθον, Μαραθῶνα. *SIG<sup>3</sup> 5.1*: Delphi grants *promanteia* and *proedria* to the tetrapolis; see Dittenberger's commentary *SIG<sup>3</sup> vo. 2*, p. 12 for further epigraphic references to tetrapolitan activity at Delphi. See also Ziehen *RE* 5a (1934) 2231; Deubner *Feste* 204; Jordan *Athenian Navy* 162 n. 3; cf. Kearns *Religious Structures after Cleisthenes* 203.

<sup>142</sup> Plut. *Arist.* 21.1-2, note also 3-6; cf. ch. 3 n. 9, with text.



festivals established, which meant that Greek states often sent their theoroi, and accompanying pilgrims, further afield than ever before. In particular, the establishment of the Ptolemaia in Alexandria meant that theoroi regularly made their way to Egypt to celebrate a Greek festival,<sup>143</sup> and the Hellenisation of Egypt under the Ptolemies also caused theoroi announcing festivals to make their way to Alexandria.<sup>144</sup> The theoroi announcing the establishment of the Koan Asklepieia in the third century travelled to Italy and Sicily, mainland Greece, the Aegean islands, Alexandria, and Bithynia.<sup>145</sup> States accepting the Magnesian invitation to accept the Leukophryena included: Alexandria, the Seleucid dynasty, the koinon of Crete, Pergamon, the koinon of the Boeotians, Thessaly, an Aetolian state, the koinon of the Akarnanians, the Epeirotes, Gonios, the koinon of the Phokians, Kephallenia, Ithaka, Athens, Megalopolis, the koinon of Achaia, Argos, Sikyon, Corinth, Messenia, Korkyra, Epidamnos, Chalkis, Eretria, Paros, Mytilene, Klazomenai, Rhodes, Knidos, Kos, Laodikeia in Lycia, Antiokheia of Persia, Gortyn, Syracuse, Antiokheia in Pisidia, Tralles, and an unknown Pergamene city.<sup>146</sup>

As an activity that involved travel and the representation one's state, the office of theoros was restricted to men.<sup>147</sup> But women could be theorodokoi.<sup>148</sup> Thus wealth and presumably the social prominence which came with it allowed for a deviation from the generally chauvinistic nature of Greek society.

The Andrian theoria to Delphi was such as to suggest that a vessel was employed specifically for the purpose of conducting the theoria, rather than the theoria gaining a berth on a merchant vessel. This seems to have been the case from a consideration of the members of the theoria, and the inscription recording its members<sup>149</sup> states that it included three *arkhitheoriai*, a seer, an *arkhon*, a herald, a

<sup>143</sup> *SEG* 1.366 (Samos); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 390, a decree of the Nesiotic League (the island league centred on Delos); *Hesp. Suppl.* 17 (1978) pp. 2-4.

<sup>144</sup> Cook *Inscribed Hydra Vases* 25, no. 10 (*AJA* 1 (1885) 22, no. 6), a theoros announcing the Delphian Soteria, discussed in ch. 4 n. 152, with text; Polyb. 28.19.4: Athenian theoriai announce the Panathenaia and the Mysteries; Strabo 2.3.4 (98): an Athenian "theoros and spondophoros" in Egypt. It is clear that theoroi could travel great distances in order to announce a festival.

<sup>145</sup> Herzog, Klaffenbach *Asylierkunde aus Kos* 1-16, and see p. 30.

<sup>146</sup> *I. Magn.* 16-87: the identification of some of the states listed above are not completely certain; the Dionysian tekhnitai also accepted the invitation.

<sup>147</sup> Female theoroi for the Olympian festival at Ephesos were not religious ambassadors for the festival but rather spectators: Robert *CRAI* (1974) 176-82; Merkelbach *ZPE* 24 (1977) 178.

<sup>148</sup> Women as theorodokoi: Perlman *Theorodokia* 22. The six known cases include a monarch; Cleopatra, queen of Epeiros, was theorodosos for Argos in the late fourth century BC: Perlman 23; cf. above, nn. 87, 94).

<sup>149</sup> *LSCG Suppl.* 38AB (*Hesp.* 18 (1949) p. 59, A & B; *SEG* 22.444; Rougemont *BCH Suppl.* 4); see Jordan *Athenian Navy* 156-57 for a brief discussion of this decree.

flautist,<sup>150</sup> several (an unspecified number of) priests,<sup>151</sup> and in addition there may have been a “high priest”.<sup>152</sup> There were also five men appointed by the *boule*, from amongst those going to Delphi, in order to ensure that everyone in the Andrian theoria behaved themselves.<sup>153</sup> This provision seems to indicate that the theoria was a large one and the mention of children as members of the theoria re-enforces this,<sup>154</sup> and implies the presence of women, unless the children were post-puberty boys not requiring a maternal presence. It seems certain then that the Andrian theoria to Delphi went on a ship devoted to this religious purpose. The Delian triakonter,<sup>155</sup> and the vessel bearing the theoria to Sounion,<sup>156</sup> are two other examples in which a theoria would have occupied a vessel in its own right.

Sacrifice was one of the most important aspects of Greek religion and Greek states by sending theoroi to festivals in other states ensured that their state made a sacrifice to the god for whom a particular festival was being held. To take one example, the attendance of the Athenian theoria at Olympia ensured that the Athenian state made a sacrifice to Zeus at his most important festival. By so doing they showed their piety to the gods, and displayed this piety to the other Greek states. The phenomena of the theoria and theorodokia gave an institutional framework to pilgrimage for persons designated to carry out official “pilgrimage activity”, and in doing so, the theoria and the theorodokia encouraged states to attend religious festivals. Through the universal official involvement of the Hellenic states these festivals prospered. State recognition of these festivals made it easier for ordinary pilgrims to travel to religious sites, either as part of a theoria sent by their state, or by themselves, by taking advantage of the *asylia*, the inviolability, which their home state had officially recognised for the sacred site in question. Sacred truces guaranteeing the safety of pilgrims, both those representing their states and ordinary individuals, encouraged pilgrimage activity and were an essential factor in attracting pilgrims to a particular celebration. The degree to which sacred truces did, in reality, protect pilgrims, is a matter for further consideration.

---

<sup>150</sup> *LSCG Suppl.* 38A.8-10.

<sup>151</sup> *LSCG Suppl.* 38A.14, cf. .27, with Daux *Hesp.* 18 (1949) p. 68.

<sup>152</sup> Daux *BCH* 13 (1949) 293 restores *LSCG Suppl.* 38A.33 as [βασ]υλεῖ θεαρέουσιν, and states that if this restoration is correct, then this is a reference to a high priest, such as was typical of societies of the period.

<sup>153</sup> *LSCG Suppl.* 38B.4-17. See Daux *Hesp.* 18 (1949) p. 68. This is further discussed in ch. 4 nn. 75-77, with text.

<sup>154</sup> *LSCG Suppl.* 38A.20-21: παῖς κ/αὐτὸν ἀνὲρ.

<sup>155</sup> See ch. 7 n. 19.

<sup>156</sup> *Hdt.* 6.87.