

MATTHEW DILLON

“THE HOUSE OF THE THEBANS” (*FD* iii.1 357–358)  
AND ACCOMMODATION FOR GREEK PILGRIMS

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 83 (1990) 64–88

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

## **“THE HOUSE OF THE THEBANS” (*FD* iii.1 357-358) AND ACCOMMODATION FOR GREEK PILGRIMS<sup>1</sup>**

I was first led to a consideration of *FD* iii.1 357-358, concerning the “House of the Thebans”, when dealing with a decree passed by the demos of the Aegean island of Andros.<sup>2</sup> The text of the inscription, dating to the fifth century, deals with the official religious delegation, the *theoria*, to be sent from Andros to Delphi. This decree is fairly well preserved, but its beginning is badly damaged. At line four there is an interesting reference to “three houses”. No other information about these three houses survives in the fragmentary context in which it occurs; whatever was said about them has been lost.

Daux, the editor of the Andrian decree, had no comment to make concerning these “three houses”, except to refer the reader to *FD* iii.1 358, in which he saw an analogous example in the “House of the Thebans” referred to in that inscription.<sup>3</sup> Sokolowski has claimed that the “House of the Thebans” of *FD* iii.1 358 is an example of a house used by pilgrims at Delphi.<sup>4</sup> But the identity of this “House of the Thebans” is not that clear; that is, it is not strictly correct to identify the house of the Thebans as a place where pilgrims stayed purely on the basis of a parallel with the Andrian inscription. It is important, then, to examine this decree, *FD* iii.1 358, which will lead not only to an assessment of its relevance for the accommodation of pilgrims at sacred sites but also allow consideration of the problems

<sup>1</sup> The following abbreviations are used for two works by M.P. Nilsson: *GGR: Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* (Munich: 1955), *GF: Griechische Feste* (Stuttgart: 1957), and two by F. Sokolowski: *LSCG Suppl.: Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques: Supplement* (Paris: 1962), *LSCG: Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques* (Paris: 1969).

<sup>2</sup> *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes* i (ed. G. Rougemont: 1977) no.7, *SEG* xxii 444. See G. Daux, ‘Un Règlement Culturel d’Andros’, *Hesperia* 18 (1949) pp.58-72, J. & L. Robert, ‘Bulletin Épigraphique’, *REG* 63 (1950) p.161 no.120. The inscription is also published by C.D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago: 1955) no.7, pp.190-191 (though omitting the initial fragmentary lines), Sokolowski, *LSCG* no.38, pp.76-80, G. Rougemont, ‘Les Théores d’Andros à Delphes’, *BCH Suppl.* 4 (1977) pp.37-47 (with no comment on the three houses).

<sup>3</sup> Daux, *Hesperia* 18 (1949) p.68. *FD* iii.1 358 and its companion 357, inscribed on the same stone, were originally published by T. Homolle, ‘Inscriptions de Delphes’, *BCH* 25 (1901) pp.135-139, and then by M.E. Bourguet, *FD* iii.1: *Épigraphie* (Paris: 1911). Homolle and Bourguet summarize the contents of the inscription without detailed comments; E. Ziebarth, ‘Gasthauser im alten Griechenland’, *Εἰς μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Λάμπρου* (Athens: 1935) p.340, is also paraphrastic.

<sup>4</sup> Sokolowski, *LSCG Suppl.* p.79; cf. no.51, p.104.

associated with such accommodation.<sup>5</sup> Other evidence bearing on this topic will also be examined.

With *FD* iii.1 358 it is also necessary to examine 357. The precise nature of the events dealt with by these two decrees, which date to the end of the third century,<sup>6</sup> is somewhat unclear. Only a few lines of 357 survive, and the contents of 358 do not clearly elucidate the issue dealt with by these decrees, which is a dispute between Theban presbeutai and a Delphian, Kraton.<sup>7</sup> The presbeutai had come to Delphi, in what capacity is not stated – whether as political ambassadors or religious ones, that is, pilgrims – and this is the first problem in interpreting these decrees. While at Delphi some of the Theban ambassadors had stayed at the so-called “House of the Thebans”. A translation of *FD* iii.1 358 follows:

(1) It was resolved by the polis in a valid assembly with votes ordained by law. *Since* the presbeutai who have arrived from the polis (2) of the Thebans recalled both the *philia* towards the polis and the benefactions performed by the Thebans for the shrine, (3) and they discussed the house so that it might be maintained for them just as it had been in the past, and they brought the *psephisma* in which (4) it had been recorded that Kraton had not given lodging to some of the Thebans who were present such as his forefathers had received (5) from the polis of the Thebans: and when we summoned him into the ekklesia, he (Kraton) said that he neither laid claim (6) to the house of the Thebans nor had he excluded any of those (of the ambassadors) who were present, but (he said) that he maintains (the house) for the Thebans just as his (7) ancestors had handed it over to him and he conducted the presbeutai along with the arkhontes around the *xenon* (guest-quarters), and (8) the house in which Theokritos was previously living, and the two *ergasteria* which overlook the stoa; (9) he agreed that he would restore the house which had been blocked off back into the *xenon*. *Therefore* in order that (10) the Thebans might know that the existing *philia* and *eunoia* with the [polis of the Delphians – – ]... the presbeutai (11) that the polis of the Delphians maintains the [existing *philia* – – as in] past time: (12) and concerning the inscription.... Kraton. (13) The presbeutai whom [the polis of the Thebans] chose...

---

<sup>5</sup> This is a topic of particular relevance to the study of Greek pilgrimage, upon which the author is currently working for the degree of Ph.D. Any comments both on the present article and additional evidence are particularly welcomed.

<sup>6</sup> As Bourguet, the editor of this inscription notes, the arkhon and bouleutes of Delphi are not named in this inscription (*FD* iii.1 p.206). A date for the inscription cannot be ascertained by reference to any internal event. Bourguet states that the height of the letters of 357-358 is the same as those on the inscriptions 352-353, and as these two latter inscriptions date to 219/18 BC (because of a reference to the strategos Dorimakhos) he dates 357-358 to the same period; that is, somewhere in the late third century. *FD* iii.1 357-358 were discovered near the Hellenikon under the Theban treasury.

<sup>7</sup> A Kraton is mentioned as a bouleutes in several Delphian decrees: *FD* iii.1 168, 176, 314 (dated to the late third century), 284 (of indeterminable date) and 428, with a restored reference to an arkhon Kraton (but it is dated to the early third century). It is possible that this bouleutes Kraton is the same as the one being referred to here, but this cannot in any way be ascertained. Kraton is a common enough Boiotian name, and in fact the references to a Kraton as a bouleutes need not necessarily all refer to the same Kraton. However, the fact that Kraton held a hereditary position (this will be discussed below) means that it would not be surprising if he did hold a position as bouleutes at some stage in his life, but certainty on this point is impossible. Even if he did hold this office, it probably would not be of any relevance for the interpretation of *FD* iii. 1 357-358.

It is clear from 358 that the Thebans were unhappy with the hospitality provided by Kraton. They had returned to Thebes. There they came before the Theban assembly and a decree was passed authorising presbutai to travel to Delphi and make complaint against Kraton. At Delphi, presbutai presented the decree which had been passed at Thebes (lines 3-5). The group of ambassadors who were offended by what they thought was inadequate hospitality on Kraton's part may not have been the same as those who went to Delphi with the complaint, but it would make sense that at least some of the original party would return to Delphi in order to give a personal account of what had offended them.

The Theban decree is partly preserved as 357. There is a reference to the *oikia* (lines 4, 6, 7), to the amphiktyonic representatives, the *hieromnemes* (lines 4, 6),<sup>8</sup> and to the presbutai (note here the dialect variation), who had gone to Delphi (line 6). The reference to the amphiktyonic representatives indicates that the Thebans had brought their complaint before the amphiktyonic council (cf. 358, 5).

These Theban ambassadors stressed the *philia* of the Thebans towards the Delphians, and the benefactions (*euergetemata*) which the Thebans had performed for the shrine (358, 2-3). Concerning the house, the presbutai asked that it be maintained for them just as it had been in the past (358, 3). They then brought forward the decree which complained that Kraton had not given them the lodging such as his ancestors had received from the Thebans (358, 3-5). Kraton was then summoned before the *ekklesia* (358, 5).

Kraton defended himself against the charge that he had not given lodging, *katalysis*, of a high enough standard to the Theban ambassadors. He maintained that he had not laid claim to the house of the Thebans (358, 6). This could be interpreted as a response to a charge that the Thebans had brought against him: that he *had* laid claim to this house. He further stated that he had not excluded any of the Theban presbutai from using the house (358, 6). Thus the Thebans claimed that Kraton had not given them the standard of lodging which they had expected, and which they had provided for Kraton's ancestors, whilst he counteracted by stating that he had not denied any of the Theban presbutai lodging. The two opposed claims are not contradictory.

The Thebans requested that the house be maintained for them just as it had been in the past; Kraton stated that he maintained the house for the Thebans, just as his ancestors had

---

<sup>8</sup> The original editor, T. Homolle, read  $\Theta\epsilon\iota\beta\acute{\eta}\omicron\nu$  (?) in line 6 and not, as Bourguet, the subsequent editor,  $\iota\alpha\rho\omicron\mu\nu\alpha[\mu\acute{o}]\nu\omicron\nu$ . But Homolle considered his own reading uncertain, and the reference to the *hieromnemes* is secure in line 4.

handed it down to him (358, 6-7). Kraton thus seems to be disclaiming any responsibility for the changes to the house which have angered the Thebans. But these changes had been made in the not too distant past, otherwise the request that the house be returned to its previous condition is meaningless. Therefore, if not Kraton, then his immediate predecessor was responsible for the changes; otherwise the complaint would have been made earlier. Alternatively, when Kraton states that he has maintained the house in its previous condition, he could mean that he maintained it as a place where the Thebans can stay, just as his ancestors had, but that he has made physical changes to it.

Probably as a means of resolving the dispute Kraton took the *presbutai*, along with the Delphian *arkhontes*, to see both the *xenon* and the house in which Theokritos had lived and the two *ergasteria* which overlook the stoa (358, 8-9). He then agreed, presumably after some further discussion that τὸ οἶκημα τὸ ἐνοικοδομημένον ἀποκαταστασεῖν ἐν τὸν ξενῶνα (358, 9). After recording his agreement to do this, the decree, fragmentary at this point, seems to stipulate that the resolution to the problem be recorded so that the Thebans might know that the *philia* and *eunoia* had been restored between the two states (358, 9-11).

It is in what Kraton agreed to do that the nature of the Theban complaint is clearly elucidated. When the Thebans had made their complaint they had asked, as noted above, that the house be maintained as it had been in the past (358, 3). But what precisely is it that Kraton agrees to do? The word ἐνοικοδομημένον (line 9) is the important one here. In the classical period the verb ἐνοικοδομέω means “to build”, “build onto” or “to block up”. The best meaning for the word here, given the context, seems to be “blocked off”: Kraton agreed to restore the previously blocked-off *oikema* (back) into the *xenon*.

Thus a section of the *xenon* had been converted into an *oikema*. The two *ergasteria* might also have occupied space thus created, but as these are not specifically mentioned in what Kraton agrees to do, they might have been part of the original structure. This conversion of the *xenon* into a smaller *xenon*, *oikema* and possibly *ergasteria* provoked the anger of the Thebans and their request. For the alterations meant that the house had not been maintained as previously and thus their lodging quarters would have been smaller. This explains the reference to some of the ambassadors being given lodging of a style inferior to that which Kraton’s ancestors had received from the Thebans. Further, Kraton’s statement that he had not denied anyone lodging could indicate that some of the ambassadors, because of the smaller size of the *xenon*, refused to tolerate what would have been cramped conditions, and found *katalysis* elsewhere.

What is particularly interesting is the attitude of the Thebans to what they call “the house” (357, 4, 6, 7; 358, 3), and the same structure which Kraton calls “the House of the Thebans” (358, 6), for the so-called “House of the Thebans” is actually the house of Kraton. He is clearly its owner and not merely a caretaker: it is he who is held responsible for these renovations, which have apparently been carried out without the approval of a higher body, such as the amphiktyonic council or the Delphians; he is the one summoned. The Thebans complain that he has not given them the hospitality which they deserved, as measured against that which his ancestors had received from them (358, 4-5). Kraton mentions that the house had been handed down to him by his ancestors (358, 6-7). It is Kraton who takes the Theban ambassadors and the arkhontes on a tour of the house (358, 7-8), and it is he who agrees to restore it (358, 9). Therefore, the house of the Thebans belongs to Kraton.

However, the Thebans are able to lobby the amphiktyonic council and the Delphians, and to do so successfully, that the house be returned to its previous form (358, 3 and 9), and can complain about the standard of the lodging which they had received there (358, 4). On what grounds could they do this? Although not owning the house, the Thebans considered that they had a special interest in it, an interest acknowledged by both the amphiktyonic council and the Delphians as well as by Kraton. Their request that the house be maintained as previously indicates that their association with it is of long standing. It is called the “House of the Thebans” by Kraton, and presumably he is using a common appellation here. The Thebans must often have come to Delphi and availed themselves of Kraton’s hospitality or, before him, that of his ancestors. This explains their possessive attitude towards the house.

There are perhaps other reasons why the Thebans brought complaint about the changes which had been carried out to the house. For their association with the house to be of such long standing and for them to have availed themselves of the hospitality of Kraton’s ancestors, and now of Kraton himself (although this did not meet their expectations), it is clear that the use by Theban ambassadors of the “House of the Thebans”, a house which belonged to Kraton’s ancestors, was a use based on heredity. The Thebans had always availed themselves of the hospitality of the particular family to which Kraton belonged. That is, he and his ancestors held some sort of hereditary arrangement with the Thebans for the use of the house. Furthermore, one aspect of the Theban complaint, as mentioned above, was that the Theban ambassadors had not received the standard of lodging (*katalysis*) such as Kraton’s ancestors had received from the Thebans (358, 4-5). Clearly there were hereditary rights *vis-à-vis* the Thebans. Kraton himself does not seem to have received such hospitality yet – his ancestors are mentioned, but he himself is not (358, 4-5). But his

ancestors clearly had the right to expect *katalysis* of a high standard at Thebes. That Kraton is not mentioned does not mean that he himself has been excluded from this privilege. If he had been excluded, the Thebans could not bring complaint about the hospitality which they had received from Kraton. Rather, Kraton has not yet had opportunity to avail himself of a hereditary right to expect *katalysis* from the Thebans.

It is only when the house had come into Kraton’s possession that the Thebans made complaint about the changes which have been made to the house. As argued above, this means that Kraton or his immediate predecessor had made the changes. If the latter, then this could be the first time since Kraton had come into possession of the house that the Thebans had visited Delphi. He himself had not had the opportunity to receive Theban hospitality. Or Kraton may have made the changes soon after coming into possession of the house – that is, he had only recently come into possession of it, and had not made a visit to Thebes, although he was entitled to do so just as his ancestors before him. But the fact that his family had a right to *katalysis* of a high standard at Thebes, and a responsibility to provide accommodation of a commensurate standard at Delphi, clearly indicates that Kraton held a hereditary position.

The Thebans may have felt that the honour which had been bestowed on Kraton’s ancestors, and which Kraton now held by virtue of heredity, was an important one, and that he was under certain obligations towards the Thebans on this account. Thus, they felt no reticence about criticising him for what had been done to the house. Moreover, they must also have viewed their own position as an important one. By reducing the size of the *xenon*, the importance of their office and of their mission had been attacked, precedence being given to a house for Theokritos (and possibly to two *ergasteria*) over the traditional right of the Thebans to make use of the *xenon* in its previous form.

Kraton’s position was a hereditary one, and two possible hereditary positions suggest themselves. Kraton may have been a Theban proxenos at Delphi. Alternatively, he may have been a theorodokos, a receiver of the *theoria* sent regularly by Thebes to Delphi.

It is unlikely that Kraton was under any sort of legal obligation in this matter. The positions of proxenos and theorodokos were awarded by the state for which one would be acting as proxenos or theorodokos. There were obligations attaching to these positions, but the awarding state did not have any legal power to enforce them. If proxenoi or theorodokoi did not fulfill their duties, then the position they held would presumably lapse – unless the state which had awarded the honour could bring pressure on the individual concerned via the political machinery of the honorand’s state.

Kraton's position, whether proxenos or theorodokos, was prestigious, as is illustrated by the large number of honorific decrees which bestowed these hereditary positions on particular individuals. The case of Alkibiades is a well known one: he renewed his family's lapsed proxenia with Sparta and was apparently motivated to do so by the *kudos* which accrued from holding such a position (Thuk. 5.43.2, 6.89.2-3). Kraton's willingness to appease the Thebans was presumably motivated by a desire to retain his hereditary position and accompanying social prestige.

However, Kraton must also have been under political pressure to appease the Thebans as the issue was in a sense a political one involving both Delphi and Thebes.<sup>9</sup> When the Thebans presented their case to the amphiktyonic council and the Delphians they mentioned the *philia* which the polis of the Thebans had for the city of Delphi, and the benefactions which the Thebans had performed for the shrine (358, 2-3). When the issue was resolved, the Delphians recorded the resolution (see above), so it seems, in order that the Thebans might know that the Delphians maintained the existing *philia* and *eunoia* (the latter hitherto unmentioned) with the polis of the Thebans (358, 9-11). Thus the amphiktyonic council's and the Delphians' primary interest in appeasing the Theban presbantai lay in restoring to normal the *philia* and the *eunoia* existing between the two states, indicating the important role these concepts played in the conduct of inter-state relations.

It might seem obvious that there would have been pressure on the holders of hereditary office to maintain that office and not to give cause for complaint to the polis which had granted them that office. It might be taken for granted that there existed on the part of the holders of the hereditary office an obligation which could be enforced by the polis in which they lived, for the reason that these positions and their holders played an important role in the relationship between the polis and the awarding state. However, in this instance there is a case in which the holder of a hereditary office, held responsible for changes which have angered the ambassadors of another state, is obliged to act in a certain way in order to undo the damage caused by that action. Actual cases in which proxenoi or theorodokoi after having acted in a particular manner were required by their home states to act in a specific way, so that the interests of the home polis were not placed at risk, are otherwise unattested.

Part of the very real importance of this decree, in fact, lies in the light it sheds on the nature of such hereditary positions as the proxenia and the theorodokia, and the view which a polis might take of such positions if the individual holder of them caused any ructions in

---

<sup>9</sup> In particular note the references to the polis in 358 (lines 1 and 11).



inter-state relations. Kraton, either as proxenos or theorodokos, was held accountable by the amphiktyony and by Delphi, and was obliged to undo the damage done to Theban-Delphian relations.

Two positions are a possibility for the Theban presbutai who had come to stay at the “House of the Thebans”: they were either political ambassadors or theoroi. The question of identity rests largely on terminology. The Theban ambassadors are referred to as presbutai. If the Theban ambassadors are theoroi, that is pilgrims sent out as the official representatives of their state, then why are they not referred to as such? The same question applies to Kraton if he were a theorodokos.

The language of the two decrees is general. Kraton holds a hereditary position, but he is given no title. He is called neither proxenos nor theorodokos, but it is quite clear that he must have held either of these two positions: he receives ambassadors, and by virtue of a position which his family had held for some time. If parallel examples of individuals who were theorodokoi but not so named existed, then there would be precedents for assuming that Kraton was a theorodokos. There are, however, only five known cases of individuals who received theoroi who were attending a festival. In each case these five are termed theorodokoi.<sup>10</sup> Thus there is no parallel here, but five examples are not a very convincing survey.

There is a difficulty of terminology here which must be addressed. The terminology of the words theoroi and theorodokoi is dual, hence their meaning varies according to context. A city about to celebrate a festival would send out ambassadors to various hellenic cities inviting them to attend that festival. These ambassadors were often termed theoroi.<sup>11</sup> This

---

<sup>10</sup> Three are given by P. Boesch, *Θεωρός: Untersuchung zur Epangelle griechischer Feste* (Göttingen: 1908) pp. 105-106; P.J. Perlman, *The ‘Theorodakia’ in the Peloponnese* (unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of California; Ann Arbor: 1984) p.xv adds two more.

<sup>11</sup> Evidence seems to point out quite clearly that the number of actual theoroi in a delegation was usually three (and no more), leaving aside the pilgrims travelling with the theoroi and the accompanying contestants if cultural or athletic competitions were involved. 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. Groups of two theoroi were sent out to some states: R. Herzog & G. Klaffenbach, *Asylieurkunden aus Kos* (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin) 1 (1952) pp.1-30: **6**, 16-17, 21-22, 37-38, 54-55; **7**, 2-3; **12**, 21-31; **13**, 11-12; **16**, 2-3; groups of three to others: *ibid.* **4**, 8-9, 22-23, 33-34, 42-43; **5**, [1-2], [15-16]; **11**, 3-4, [14-15]; **15**, [3-4]. 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 (this list is not exhaustive): O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin: 1909) **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, 34-35; **38**, 1-4; **40**, 2-4, 10-13; **41**, 2-3; **43**, 2-4; **44**, 8-10, 37-38; **45**, 3-7.

term is also the one used for those ambassadors sent as the official delegation to a festival.<sup>12</sup> Both types of *theoroi* would be received by *theorodokoi*; 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>13</sup> The *theoroi* bringing word of a festival would not have to find their own accommodation upon arriving at a city or town. Rather, as is argued below, these *theoroi* would be lodged 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 cases where those sent out to announce a forthcoming festival are not called *theoroi* but simply ambassadors.<sup>14</sup> However, there are no examples where the ambassadors sent to a city celebrating a festival are termed simply *presbeutai* rather than *theoroi*. But this could be put down to a number of factors. The amount of evidence for *theoroi* attending a festival is slight, and in fewer examples less deviation from the usual terminology can be expected. There is also, of course, the fact that when *theoroi* are referred to as *presbeutai* the context in which they occur might not permit their identification as *presbeutai* – those of *FD* iii.1 358 may well be *theoroi*, but certainty is impossible given the lack of context for their trip to Delphi.

As well as being the site of a famed and important religious cult, which attracted many pilgrims who sought to consult the oracle or who engaged in sight-seeing (cf. Eur. *Ion* 184-235), Delphi was the site of a panhellenic festival, the Pythia, and from the third century the

---

<sup>12</sup> C.P. Bill, ‘Notes on the Greek Θεωρός and Θεωρία’, *TAPA* 32 (1901) p.196, Boesch, op.cit. pp.7-8.

<sup>13</sup> Boesch, op.cit. pp.105-127, especially p.105, Perlman, op.cit. p.x, with p.xv n.1.

<sup>14</sup> For *theoroi* termed *presbeutai* see Kern, op.cit. nos. **23**, 4-6, **31**, 7-10, 39-40 (cf. 30-31, termed *theoroi*); **32**, 2-4 (cf. 27, 30 termed *theoroi*); **36**, 4 (cf. 23-25, termed *theoroi*); **43**, 1 (cf. 30, termed *theoroi*); **54**, 3-5, 41, 48 (cf. 34, termed *theoroi*); **59a**, 8, 9-10, 31 (heavily restored], **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). There are cases where the *arkhitheoros* is referred to as a *presbeutes* with *theoroi*: **38**, 1, 38; **39**, 1; **40**, 2-3; **41**, 1; **42**, 1; **43**, 1 (cf. 30, a group referred to as *theoroi*); **44**, 24 (cf. 37, termed *arkhitheoros* and *theoroi*); **45**, 3-4 (cf. 32, 40, a group referred to as *theoroi*); **72**, 5, 10-11 (cf. 31, a group referred to as *presbeutai*); **87**, 6, 10-11, 24; note also **35**, 3 (cf. 4-5, 23, 26, 30-31, 33).

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, op.cit. pp.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* from Kos entrusted with the task of conveying the invitation are generally referred to as *arkhitheoros* and *theoroi*. 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, op.cit. **13**, 32-33: Olympia; **6**, 32-33, 49-50: Pythia.

festival of the Soteria was instituted.<sup>15</sup> Any ambassadors going to Delphi might be considered as going for a religious purpose, but since the amphiktyonic council met there annually there would have been an influx of presbeutai at the time of the meeting. Many of the amphiktyonic representatives may have stayed with the proxenoi of their states, and thus the Theban ambassadors may have been attending a meeting of the amphiktyonic council.

However, there is evidence to suggest that the amphiktyons would not take lodging with proxenoi. The Delphian amphiktyons honoured one individual, Mentor of Naupakton, with the hereditary privileges of *prodikia*, *asphaleia*, *asylia*, *ateleia* and the right of the “first tent” (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 422 [*SGDI* 2513], 9-11).<sup>16</sup> The first four are all known to be important privileges and to apply to Delphi, and while the nature of the privilege of the first tent is not made clear, its inclusion along with these other important privileges indicates that it is also important, and

as these other privileges are to be exercised in connection with Delphi, the right of the tent must similarly be so. Mentor has the right to the best position for pitching his tent when he comes to Delphi. Awarded to a fellow amphiktyon (as line 8 makes clear) the natural interpretation is that when the Amphiktyonic council met at Delphi the members stayed in tents, but that in future Mentor will have the best site. Thus the amphiktyons made use of tents as a means of accommodation while at Delphi, rather than staying with citizens of the town. Another consideration in assessing whether the Thebans had been attending a meeting of the amphiktyonic council is that the Thebans, having stayed at the “House of the Thebans”, returned to Thebes, and then either they or another set of ambassadors went to Delphi and came before the amphiktyonic council. Unless that council remained in session for quite some time, it seems necessary to disassociate the first visit by Theban presbeutai from the amphiktyonic council. Therefore the presbeutai of *FD* iii.1 357-358 are probably *theoroi*, official pilgrims sent out by their state, perhaps to take part in the celebration of a festival or to consult the oracle. That the Thebans mentioned the benefactions which they

---

<sup>15</sup> For the Soteria see the detailed account in G. Nachtergaele, *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes* (Bruxelles: 1975) pp.209-382 and 391-519.

<sup>16</sup> For another reference to tents at Delphi see *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 523, 7-13, discussed below. In the discussion of accommodation for pilgrims which will follow, several references are made to the use of tents by pilgrims. “Tent” is the generally accepted translation of *skene*. But it should be noted that W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (trans. J. Raffan [Oxford: 1985]) p.107, describes such a translation as “misleading”. However, he himself translates τοῖς σκηνοῦσιν (*Xen. Anab.* 5.3.9) as “those encamped in tents” (*ibid.* p.67). Nilsson takes the word *skene* to mean “Zelte oder Buden” (*GF* p.341; cf. *GGR* p.828). A reasonable translation thus seems to be “tents”. These tents need not be assumed, however, to have been flimsy affairs: Xenophon, for example, refers to “well-built” *skenai* (*Hell.* 7.4.32). That they were well-built probably indicates the use of stout poles for the support of the tanned hides which comprised the walls and roof of the tent.

had performed for the Delphian shrine (358, 2) may also be relevant here.

If it is accepted that the “House of the Thebans” was a place where the Theban theoroi to Delphi stayed, then the three houses mentioned in the Andrian decree can perhaps be explained similarly. The Andrians sent a large contingent to Delphi: there were three arkhitheoroi, several priests and a boat-load of pilgrims.<sup>17</sup> The three arkhitheoroi correspond neatly with the three houses at Delphi. It is possible that each arkhitheoros took charge of a section of the pilgrims, and that each arkhitheoros stayed with a different theorodokos at Delphi. Alternatively, Daux and Sokolowski<sup>18</sup> may have been wrong in assuming that the three houses mentioned in the context of the Andrian theoria have anything to do with the accommodation for this theoria at Delphi.

The accommodation for the Theban presbutai needs to be put into the context of the type of accommodation of which pilgrims made use when they visited the sacred sites of the hellenic world. The ordinary pilgrim obviously would not have fared as well as the Theban presbutai at the “House of the Thebans”. When religious festivals or sacred mysteries were being celebrated large numbers of pilgrims could be expected to flock to the site of these events. Despite this, there is very little evidence to suggest that the authorities in charge of such religious occasions made any particular arrangements for seeing that pilgrims were adequately housed. Pilgrims attending religious celebrations in large urban centres would have found that the competition for available accommodation was stiff, and many may have found that their use of such accommodation was precluded by the market mechanism of supply and demand. Other centres away from the main concentrations of population simply could not provide shelter in the form of permanent dwellings for the influx of pilgrims.

The institution of the theorodokia in itself seems to preclude the notion that accommodation was generally provided by the host state for ordinary pilgrims.<sup>19</sup> As their title suggests, the theorodokoi, in a polis where a religious celebration was taking place, would receive the official delegates sent by other states to represent them at the particular

---

<sup>17</sup> See *CID* 7, 4-17 and 33.

<sup>18</sup> Daux, *Hesperia* 18 (1949) p.68, Sokolowski, *LSCG Suppl.* p.79.

<sup>19</sup> For preliminary reading on the theorodokia see Bill, *op.cit.* p.203, Boesch, *op.cit.* pp.104-127, P. Charneux, ‘Liste Argienne de Théarodoques’, *BCH* 90 (1966) p.168, Perlman, *op.cit.* pp.1-35; cf. G. Rougemont, ‘La Hiéroménie des Pythia et les <Trêves Sacrées> d’Éleusis, de Delphes et d’Olympie’, *BCH* 97 (1973) p.89; see S.G Miller, ‘The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games’, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) pp.147-163 for a recently discovered list of theorodokoi who would receive the announcers of the Nemean games (pre-publication discussion in Perlman, *op.cit.* pp.126-258).

sacred event which was taking place. But the role of these receivers of theoroi probably also included that of providing shelter for the theoroi. If it did not, then the only assumption which could be made about their role was that they greeted the theoroi as or when they entered the polis and conducted them to their accommodation, perhaps even showing them around (giving them a tour, one could say) – that these theoroi-receivers simply acted as tour guides is inconceivable.

A clue to the exact nature of the theorodokia lies in the manner in which they were chosen. For the office of the theorodokoi, at least for those celebrations which had a pedigree going beyond the historical period, had always been hereditary. The new panhellenic creations of the hellenistic period saw the election of theorodokoi by their home states in at least some cases,<sup>20</sup> but it is conceivable that the theorodokoi thus chosen handed this position on to their descendents. However, it is known that those who were granted the honour of being theorodokoi for the theoroi announcing a forthcoming festival, leaving aside those theorodokoi chosen at the inauguration of a new festival, were granted this privilege for themselves and their descendents in perpetuity.<sup>21</sup> Thus it would seem that the office of the theorodokia was a hereditary one for all those celebrations which involved theorodokoi.

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>22</sup> The hereditary nature of the office suggests that the position had an aristocratic origin, and that it may ultimately have had its premises 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 both in perpetuity.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Note the choosing of theorodokoi by hellenic states when the Magnesians, by dispatching theoroi, announced the institution of a festival in honour of Artemis Leukophryene, see Perlman, *op.cit.* pp.8-10 and 17-20 (who gives inscription numbers but not line numbers), and similarly when the Koans announced the inauguration of a new festival, the Asklepieia: Herzog & Klaffenbach, *op.cit.* 4, 29-30, 50-51; 6, 54-55; 7, 15.

<sup>21</sup> See Perlman, *op.cit.* pp.19-20.

<sup>22</sup> See the examples of Boesch, *op.cit.* p.122, Perlman, *op.cit.* pp.23-24. The Nemean list of theorodokoi includes a king: Miller, *op.cit.* p.153.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, *IG* iv (1) 49, 50, 53 and 60.

Proxenoï were responsible for taking care of representatives of the states of which they were the proxenos when such representatives travelled to the appropriate polis.<sup>24</sup> This included looking after them in not only a political but also a material sense – providing them with entertainment, food and shelter. Proxenoï 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. It made no provision for theoroi visiting a polis or area 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 reception of theoroi who were attending a festival or similar sacred activity. They would be met, it seems safe to conjecture, by a theorodokos who would also act as their host, providing them with accommodation.<sup>25</sup> By virtue of his position as theorodokos, Kraton provided accommodation for the Theban theoroi.

Such a duty would presumably have been at least partly leitourgic in nature, with the theorodokos meeting any cost associated with entertaining the theoroi, and 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 carried back to their home-state suitably favourable reports of the hospitality of the host-city itself. Kraton’s failure to provide lodging of a standard commensurate with the expectations of the Theban ambassadors led to an unfavourable report at Thebes.

The polis celebrating the festival, then, would generally not provide accommodation for theoroi. It, or the state sending the theoroi, appointed someone to meet this expense. If the state did not provide shelter for the important official delegations attending religious celebrations, it need not surprise that little was done for the ordinary faithful in this matter.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> The most recent work on proxenia is C. Marek, *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt: 1984).

<sup>25</sup> There seems to be a reference to this in the work of Lucian (*Concerning the Syrian Goddess* 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 was hereditary, and the hosts were known as *xenodokoi*.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. A.D. Nock, ‘The Guild of Zeus Hypsistos’, *HTR* 29 (1936) p.77 (= A.D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* [ed. Zeph Stewart; Oxford: 1972] p.434), who notes that while a mystery centre would have buildings for the carrying-out of secret rites, and Asklepieia places in which the ill could seek cure, most precincts had simply the sacred building itself. It could also be noted, however, that accommodation for those who were ill would not necessarily be provided. Pausanias (2.27.7) states that in his own time a house was built at Epidauros in which women could give birth and men could die, but that previously women gave birth and people died out in the open air. It is thus a misnomer to believe that there were special provisions made for such people at all healing centres.

It has been stated by some modern authors that permanent accommodation was not provided by the Greeks within sacred precincts because of religious sensibilities.<sup>27</sup> This is true enough; the sanctuary was set aside for the deity,<sup>28</sup> but this is not explanatory in itself of why pilgrims had to rely on tents for accommodation and some sacred sites did provide limited accommodation for select pilgrims, but outside the temenos itself.<sup>29</sup> Consideration must be given to the fact that the primary motivation of pilgrims was religious. Pilgrims did not need any other inducement to attend religious festivities in other states. That is to say, states conducting these events would not have felt obliged to provide accommodation at all.

Practical considerations explain why religious centres, despite attracting large numbers of pilgrims, would not attempt to provide accommodation for such pilgrims, even if the main function of the site were religious. For example, the panhellenic Olympic games were the only panhellenic celebrations that occurred at this site. Thus every four years the site would be inundated with pilgrims. But on no other occasion would Olympia attract visitors on this or even on a very much reduced scale. The building and provision of permanent dwellings was therefore not feasible, unless exorbitant rents were charged at festival times. It could be noted that the *katagogion* at Plataia, which accommodated official delegations to the panhellenic Eleutheria, was built in 426 from materials salvaged from the sacked city.<sup>30</sup>

Pilgrims attending festivals or sacred mysteries in populated centres may have been able to find accommodation in inns, hotels and the like. A type of private board might also have been available. The demos of the Athenians, states the writer of the text commonly referred to as the “Old Oligarch”, derives many benefits from the fact that the allies are bound to have many of their law-suits tried at Athens. These benefits included the profit to be made on hiring-out rooms by those who have extra rooms in their house ([Xen.] *AP* 1.17-18). The influx of pilgrims would have provided similar opportunities for the exploitation of those in need of lodging.

---

<sup>27</sup> G. Deschamps & G. Cousin, ‘Inscriptions du temple de Zeus Panamaros’, *BCH* 11 (1887) p.382, V. Chapot in *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* v (Paris: 1919) s.v. Tentorium, p.117.

<sup>28</sup> See Burkert, *op.cit.* pp.85-86.

<sup>29</sup> It could be noted, however, that the Spartan king Agesilaos pitched his tent in the shrine of Poseidon at Isthmia in 390. The Argives had been preparing to celebrate the Isthmian games, but were frightened off by his approach with his army (Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.2). Agesilaos often camped in the temenos of shrines (Xen. *Ages.* 5.7).

<sup>30</sup> The Plataian *katagogion* is discussed below; see Thuk. 3.68.3 as evidence that it was built of salvaged material.

It may be thought that some pilgrims could have stayed with relatives or friends at the sacred site, if this were located in a major population centre. But the possibility that ordinary people can stay with friends or relatives some places distant from their own homes is a relatively modern one. It is unlikely that ordinary people in the hellenic world would have had such connections outside their own polis, given both the nature of the polis and the lack of opportunities for ordinary people to make such associations. A pilgrim may have had a metic relative in another state, and if so could have sought shelter with him, but the pilgrim who was so fortunate would have been rare.

It was noted above that the Delphian amphiktyons probably made use of tents while they met at Delphi. It seems that the use of tents as a means of temporary accommodation was widespread at religious sites. The evidence for this comes from various sites. Some of these sites were healing centres, others were mystery cult centres, the venue for panhellenic games, or the seat of an oracle. All shared the feature of being popular sites (some more so than others), attracting large numbers of pilgrims. However, the best evidence for tents comes from the inscribed cult regulations of the sacred mysteries of Andania.<sup>31</sup> These were annual in nature, but this did not make the erection of permanent accommodation for pilgrims feasible. Amongst its wealth of detail on cult regulation, the inscription has a separate section devoted to the tents, *skenai*, of pilgrim-initiates (lines 34-39) suggesting that these were the main if not the only means of shelter for the pilgrims. Further, the tents of pilgrim-initiates at Andania were under the jurisdiction of the *sacred men* of the mysteries (line 34), also suggesting, because there were enough tents to require some sort of regulation, the importance of tents as a means of shelter.

The Andanian inscription records a stipulation on the size of the tents. Pilgrims attending the sacred site would have had problems if the tent which they had brought with them exceeded thirty feet in length on any one side (lines 34-35). Thirty feet maximum per side was to be the precise length: it was forbidden for curtains and screens to be placed around the tents (line 35). This could indicate that space was at a premium: the picture one forms is of large numbers of pilgrims jostling for space in the sacred plain of Andania.

Another possibility to explain the restriction on tents, that the aim was to blur the socio-economic differences between initiates because they were all equal in the eyes of the god,

---

<sup>31</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 736, republished by Sokolowski, *LSCG* no.65, pp.120-134. For a translation and a limited commentary see M.W. Meyer, *The Ancient Mysteries: A Sourcebook* (San Francisco: 1987) pp.51-59; for a partial translation see F.C. Grant, *Hellenistic Religions: The Age of Syncretism* (Indianapolis: 1953) pp.31-32 (lines 28-37). These regulations date to 92/91 BC.



seems less satisfactory. However, this idea could gain some support from the regulation in the same inscription which forbade initiates from keeping couches and silver to the value of more than three hundred drakhmai in their tents (line 38). The possibility that it represents sumptuary legislation seems negated by the fact that the permissible amount of property allowed is 300 drakhmai, a generous sum. The emphasis placed in the inscription on keeping order and on good behaviour (lines 41-45, 75-84, 112-114), could mean that these restrictions on the amount of personal property to be kept in the tents were a precaution against theft and associated problems. The difficulties of organising a large group of people must have been enormous enough without encouraging thieves and other disreputable elements, who we can imagine were attracted by the prospect of wealth stored in the tents of such large groups. Penalties for having more than the permissible amount in a tent were provided (lines 38-39).

This restriction on property is interesting on another account. It means that it was considered feasible by those formulating the regulations that some of the pilgrims staying in the tents would have more than 300 drakhmai of personal wealth. This is clearly an important factor in considering the socio-economic background of pilgrims. Some of the initiates staying in tents must have been wealthy, but accommodation in a tent was nevertheless suitable for them. However, each side of the tent could be up to thirty feet in length, so the tents could well have been comfortable with respect to their size. But how comfortable a particular tent was would have depended also on the number of individuals staying in it. That tents were an accepted mode of accommodation explains why there was never any provision of permanent dwellings on a *large scale* (a necessary qualification since some sites did provide accommodation for a select few pilgrims). Pilgrims were prepared to make do with temporary accommodation, though not completely to do without the luxuries of home, if it was a possibility that some of them would bring money, couches in excess of three hundred drakhmai, and their slaves (valuables: lines 38-39; slaves are mentioned several times: lines 76, 79, 80-84, 102, 105, 109; line 102 appears the only reference which need not indicate slaves brought along by pilgrims).

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

come to Olympia in order to honour Zeus for liberating them from the payment of *phoros*.<sup>32</sup> It is possible that these theoroi found accommodation in this theoric tent while at Olympia. Alternatively, Heniokhos might be referring to it as a theoric tent simply because it was being used by theoroi: they had come to Olympia in order to sacrifice to Zeus. Tents were sometimes erected at some religious ceremonies not only for the accommodation of pilgrims but also as places in which worshippers could participate in ritual meals. This use of tents must not be confused with the use of tents by pilgrims for accommodation.<sup>33</sup>

However, other evidence shows clearly that tents were a normal means of accommodation at Olympia. Competitors at the Olympic games stayed in tents. Alkibiades, for example, when he competed had a tent provided by the Ephesians which was twice the size of the tent of the Athenian theoria (Andok. 4.30, Athen. 12.534d, Plut. *Alk.* 12.1).<sup>34</sup> In 388/7 the Olympic crowd, urged on by Lysias, destroyed the *skennai* of the Olympic theoria sent by the tyrant Dionysios (Diod. 14.109.1-3, Dion. Hal. *Lysias* 29-30; the speech, which has not survived extant, is the thirty-third oration in the Lysias corpus). There is also a reference to the *skene* of the tyrant Hiero, who had sent horses, chariots and drivers to participate in the Olympic games. Themistokles is recorded to have reacted angrily to the richness of the decoration of the *skene* and advised the hellenes to tear down the *skene* of the tyrant (Plut.

---

<sup>32</sup> *Fr.* 5: A. Meineke, *Fragmenta Comicoorum Graecorum* iii (Berlin: 1843) pp.563-564, T. Kock, *Comicoorum Atticoorum Fragmenta* ii (Leipzig: 1884) pp.433-434, J.M. Edmonds, *The Fragments of Attic Comedy* i (Leiden: 1957) pp.915-917, R. Kassel & C. Austin, *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin: 1986) pp.556-557. Bill (op.cit. p.204) rejects the usual interpretation, and briefly argues that the reference in the play to σκηνην θεωρικην is to “theatrical scene”. This, however, does not seem to be the natural interpretation of the lines. The reference to *phoros* (line 11) led Meineke (op.cit. p.563) to suggest a date when there would have been allies under Athenian domination between the Peloponnesian and Social wars, but Kock (op.cit. p.434) preferred “belli Chremonidei finis”. Edmonds (op.cit. p.917 note b) opts for a Peloponnesian war dating, taking the context to refer to the abolition of the *phoros* in 411. Most recently, Kassel & Austin (op.cit. p.557) believe the date to be *incertum*, but do note that contributions under the Second Athenian Confederacy were termed *syntaxeis* rather than *phoroi*.

<sup>33</sup> See Nilsson, *GGR* p.828 and *GF* pp.188-189, Burkert, op.cit. pp.107 with 390 n.80 and 234. At p.390 Burkert gives H. Schäfer, *Die Laubhütte* (Leipzig: 1939) as a reference, but unfortunately *non vidi*.

<sup>34</sup> Alkibiades’ participation at these Olympics is also mentioned at Thuk. 6.16.2 and Isok. 16.32-35. At Isok. 16.34 there seems to be a reference, *inter alia*, to the largeness of the tent when it is stated “...his generosity in the sacrifices and in the other expenses connected with the festival was so lavish and magnificent that the public funds of all the others were clearly less than the private means of Alkibiades alone” (16.35; trans. L. v. Hook [Loeb edition]). Bill, op.cit. pp.200-201, discusses Alkibiades at Olympia and correctly concludes that Thucydides, in having Alkibiades refer to his *theoria* to Olympia (6.16.2), must be referring to a “viewing” in the general sense, and that Alkibiades was not part of the official Olympic delegation.

*Them.* 25).<sup>35</sup>

The Arkadians went to war with the Eleans in 364, seized Olympia, and prepared to celebrate the Olympic games. The Eleans invaded Olympia in order to regain control of the games, defeated the Arkadians in battle, but withdrew having encountered difficulties in dislodging the Arkadians from the sacred area itself (*Xen. Hell.* 7.4.12-31). The Arkadians and their allies, fearful of the outcome of the following day’s battle, then cut down the “well constructed *skenomata*” and built a stockade (*Xen. Hell.* 7.4.32).

Aelian records that Plato, while at Olympia, stayed in a tent, and shared it with strangers (*Aelian VH* 4.9). However, it seems likely that the latter detail was added by Aelian, or his source, in order to provide a dramatic setting for the story and the dialogue which follow. Given the various pieces of evidence concerning Olympia, the lack of archaeological remains of dwellings at this site would seem to find an explanation in the use of tents by those staying there.

There is also evidence pertaining to tents at the Isthmian games, and its reflection of Olympic practice suggests that tents were used for shelter at all the panhellenic festivals, despite the fact that evidence for these other festivals is lacking. In a passage from Aristophanes’ *Eirene*, one of the characters secures a place in advance of the festival for his tent at the Isthmian games by marking out a circle in which to pitch it (lines 879-880).<sup>36</sup> The scholiasts state that this eagerness to obtain a tent site as quickly as possible was due to the narrowness of the Nemean site, a narrowness making lodging, *xenia*, difficult to obtain, so that spectators marked out their tent sites in advance; there were a limited number of advantageous spots on which to pitch a tent.

Accommodation would have been available at the Isthmian games for some. That *xenia* was difficult to obtain implies that it was available, even if limited, and the evidence of archaeology suggests a *xenon* provided by the authorities,<sup>37</sup> but more importantly, the

---

<sup>35</sup> The similarity causes E.M. Walker, *CAH* v (1927) p.36 (followed by C.H. Oldfather, *Diodorus vi* [Loeb edition] pp.294-295 n.2), to believe that the opposition of Themistokles to Hiero is a fabrication based on the later incident. The incidents are separated by a number of decades, and the fate of Dionysios’ *theoria* need not necessarily have put future dynasts on their guard. Nevertheless, the possibility of a doublet fashioned for political purposes should perhaps not be overlooked.

<sup>36</sup> For the joke contained in these lines, and the pun on “Isthmia”, see the scholiasts on line 879, and A. Sommerstein in his edition of Aristophanes’ *Peace* (Warminster: 1985) p.175. The joke and pun are meaningless unless they are parodying an actual occurrence: the fact that pilgrims to the games marked out a site for their tents at the Isthmia, a narrow site.

<sup>37</sup> See L.H. Kraynak, *Hostelries of Ancient Greece* (unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of California; Ann Arbor: 1984) pp.122-147, especially pp.140-147, with references.

theorodokia is worth mentioning in this context. While there is no evidence for theorodokoi at Nemea who would receive the official delegations of those states which had been invited to attend, there is however a list which records the theorodokoi of other states who would receive the Argive theoroi sent out to announce the celebration of the festival and inviting states to send theoroi as official representatives to the games. It seems safe to assume that there would have been a corresponding set of theorodokoi who would receive the theoroi attending the Nemean games – if so, then many of the theoroi visiting these games would have found accommodation in the city itself.<sup>38</sup> For them, not being at the actual site of the games would not have been a disadvantage. Their wealthy hosts may have had horses or the like to make use of; in fact, wealthier pilgrims may have had their own means of transport with them. In the regulations for the Andanian mysteries, couches are mentioned (lines 38-39), and these could only have been transported to the site of the mysteries by four-footed animals. But for pilgrims who came on foot, and for whom an unfavourable proximity from the centre of the contests would have been a disadvantage, it was an important consideration to secure a tent-site as soon as possible upon arrival at Isthmia, and the same may have applied to other sacred sites.

Syloson, son of Kallitelis, *strategos* of the Samians, at the time when the Samians were fighting the Aiolians and consequently had not celebrated the customary festival in the shrine of the goddess Hera, argued that they had a better chance of winning if they did celebrate the festival. The Samians were convinced, went to the shrine, and erected *skennai* (Polyaen. *Strat.* 6.45). This has been taken as a reference to tents used for accommodation.<sup>39</sup> However, the use of tents by the Samians could be dismissed on the grounds that the army was operating in the field and having tents made use of these, rather than returning to the polis and staying in their homes there. Moreover, in this case there might be an example of tents erected for the purposes of sacrifice, as the reference does not state specifically that the tents were for accommodation. Thus whether the tents were used for accommodation, and whether or not the Samians ordinarily in time of peace as opposed to war made use of them when celebrating the festival in honour of the goddess, is a matter of doubt.

Xenophon established a temple of Artemis at Skillous near Olympia, and annually he offered sacrifice to the goddess in which all the citizens, and the men and women living

---

<sup>38</sup> See Miller, *op.cit.* pp.148-149.

<sup>39</sup> By Frickenhaus, in his collection of evidence on the use of tents for accommodation during festival periods (*RE* iii A [1929] s.v. skene, p.472).

around, took part. The goddess provided food for those encamped in tents (Xen. *Anab.* 5.3.9).<sup>40</sup> Clearly those who had come in from the surrounding neighbourhood, and who lived too far away to retire at the end of the day to the polis, erected tents. A letter of Antigonos to Teos contains a reference to tents at a festival; mention is also made of those arriving to celebrate the festival, so this could be a reference to tents used by pilgrims while at Teos.<sup>41</sup>

There is also some late evidence which could be considered in this context, illustrating a continuity of practice. An inscription dated to AD 164-166 records that the priest of the temple of Zeus Panamaros at Stratonikeia erected (“made”) tents for the citizens, the *xenoi* and the slaves “at the place for the lodging of men”.<sup>42</sup> The reference to *xenoi*, as opposed to citizens, seems to indicate the presence of pilgrims.

There were restrictions, at least at some sacred sites, on where tents could be erected. A decree of the Delphian amphiktyons records a regulation that no-one other than king Attalos might pitch tents in the stoa of Attalos; a fine was provided for cases of flouting the regulation.<sup>43</sup> At Andania no-one other than the male supervisors of the cult was to pitch a tent within the area marked off by them; no other restriction on the actual placing of the tents is indicated.<sup>44</sup> As noted above, a late inscription from Stratonikeia mentions festival tents erected in the place set aside for lodging, and this has been compared with the Andanian provision and the suggestion made that this probably refers to some restriction on the place where tents could be erected.<sup>45</sup>

There is also some evidence which cannot be brought to bear on this topic, despite the efforts of modern sources to do so. The building known as the Leonidaion (Paus. 5.15.1-3)

---

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Nilsson, *GGR* p.828 and Burkert, *op.cit.* p.67.

<sup>41</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 344, 2-4; also C.B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (London: 1934) 3; cf. Nilsson *GGR* p.828 with n.7. This text is also translated by R.S. Bagnall & P. Derow, *Greek Historical Documents: The Hellenistic Period* (Chico: 1981) pp.13-17.

<sup>42</sup> M. Çetin Sahin, *Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 21: Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia I* (Bonn: 1981) no.203, 17-21.

<sup>43</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 523. Cf. Nilsson, *GGR* p.828, seemingly unaware that this inscription is actually *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 523.

<sup>44</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 736, 35-36; cf. Nilsson, *GGR* pp. 828-829 and *GF* p.341.

<sup>45</sup> G. Deschamps & G. Cousin, ‘Inscriptions du Temple de Zeus Panamaros’, *BCH* 15 (1891) p.175 (these scholars originally edited this inscription in *BCH* 11 [1887] pp 379-381, no.2).

at Olympia is sometimes described as being reserved for visiting officials and dignitaries.<sup>46</sup> But by this it should not be understood that this building housed all the *theoroi* attending the Olympic festival. Pausanias, the only ancient authority on the structure, mentions only that it was built at the expense of an individual named Leonidas, and that, in Pausanias' time, it was used as the residence of the Roman governor of Greece (Paus. 5.15.2). The building is fairly large (74.82 x 81.8 m.),<sup>47</sup> but the number of the rooms is not great,<sup>48</sup> and one cannot imagine that it held a great many occupants. The building is not to be imagined as some rambling monolithic *theoroi*-hostel. Few dignitaries could have stayed there,<sup>49</sup> and although some *theoroi* from important states may have been invited to stay the majority of *theoroi* had, apparently, to find their own accommodation.<sup>50</sup>

A similar case to that of the *Leonidaion* is that of the *katagogion* built at Plataia. With building materials salvaged from the polis, which they had completely razed in 426, the Spartans built a *katagogion* in the vicinity of the sanctuary of Hera, as well as a stone temple dedicated to the goddess (Thuk. 3.68.3).<sup>51</sup> Clearly, worship was to be continued at Plataia, and the emphasis on Hera presumably indicates that some form of religious event, perhaps

<sup>46</sup> See R. Stillwell (ed.), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* (Princeton: 1976) s.v. Olympia, p.649 and J. Swaddling, *The Ancient Olympic Games* (London: 1980) p.23.

<sup>47</sup> *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites* s.v. Olympia, p.649.

<sup>48</sup> See the plan in A. Mallwitz, 'Ein neuer Übersichtsplan von Olympia', *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (1971) p.154+.

<sup>49</sup> Kraynak, *op.cit.* p.55, on the basis of the passage where Aiskhines claims to have shared a room with two others while on the Second Embassy to Philip (Aiskh. 2.126), and that the small rooms of the *Leonidaion* could have held two, the large rooms four to six, people, suggests that over one hundred people could have stayed at the *Leonidaion* at any one time. The evidence of Aiskhines may not be applicable to the *Leonidaion*; in fact, the passage may even be partly rhetorical invention. As noted the *Leonidaion* is not a large building, and the rooms vary in size, so that it is just as possible that all the rooms held only one person, or the larger ones perhaps two or three. This would give a smaller number of guests, and would mean that those staying there would have done so in greater comfort than if larger numbers were lodged there. That there was not a double storey see A. Mallwitz, *Olympia und seiner Bauten* (Munich: 1972) p.251; cf. Kraynak, *op.cit.* p.53.

<sup>50</sup> Prior to the Roman period it is impossible to define strictly who made use of the *Leonidaion*. The vague appellation "dignitaries" must be employed. Presumably the Eleians made the decision as to who could stay in this building, but the mechanism by which they did so, and the criteria of choice which they employed, must remain conjectural, though perhaps it was a matter of custom as to who could make use of the building. The same questions could be asked concerning the *katagogion* at Plataia; see below. It seems that the Athenian *theoria* was one of those that did not have the privilege of accommodation in the *Leonidaion*: see Andok. 4.30 (cited above). For the date of the construction of the *Leonidaion* see Mallwitz, *op.cit.* p.252 and Kraynak, *op.cit.* p.54.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Nilson, *GGR* p.829.

even a festival (which may have been a continuation of a Plataian ceremony) was to occur at this site.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, celebration of the festival of the Eleutheria was presumably to continue.<sup>53</sup>

Finley notes that temples and cities commonly “... maintained lodging houses at shrines that attracted large numbers of visitors”.<sup>54</sup> But the implication of the building of the *katagogion* at Plataia is that there was no existing one there. Yet this polis was the centre of the Eleutherian festival, which must have attracted visitors from other, particularly Boiotian, states, and as noted some form of celebration in honour of Hera and not simply a local event seems to be indicated. These visitors must either have found accommodation in the polis itself before it was destroyed, or they had taken to tents, since it was the destruction of the city itself which led to the construction of the *katagogion*.<sup>55</sup> Important visitors coming to pre-destruction Plataia would have been hosted by Plataian *theorodokoi*; this could no longer be the case. Permanent accommodation would be preferred for important dignitaries, and the Spartan *katagogion* met this need.<sup>56</sup>

Whether this *katagogion* would have accommodated all the pilgrims coming to the site is a point which could be raised, for with all the Plataians either in exile, or massacred, the degree to which the Eleutherian festival was celebrated might well have been affected. Previously held and organised by the Plataians, it might well have been celebrated on a much reduced scale after the demise of the polis – indeed it would be surprising if this were not the case. Foreign attendance may have fallen off significantly, although this *katagogion* had a length of 200 feet, and, unlike the Leonidaion, an upper storey (Thuk. 3.68.3).

Hera’s sanctuary, with the destruction of the polis, was a site without habitation, such as Olympia. The Plataian *katagogion* may also have been reserved for the most important: it was large, but not enormous. Religious sites away from the centres of population were thus sometimes provided with a hostel. But any such hostel would fail to accommodate pilgrims

---

<sup>52</sup> A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides* ii (Oxford: 1956) p.358.

<sup>53</sup> For the Eleutheria see Plut. *Aristeides* 21. As with the Leonidaion, who made the decision about who could stay in the hostel is unknown. This may have been the responsibility of the Boiotian confederacy; Thebes is quite close to Plataia.

<sup>54</sup> In his notes to R. Warner’s Penguin translation of Thucydides (Harmondsworth: 1954) p.235 n.32.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Gomme, *op.cit.* ii p.358.

<sup>56</sup> I think that Sokolowski, in his commentary on the Andrian decree (*LSCG Suppl.* 51 p.104), errs in suggesting that this *katagogion* was a *hestiatorion*.

in large numbers.

Michel has claimed that *theoroi* attending religious celebrations were accommodated in public dwellings provided by the polis which was hosting the celebration.<sup>57</sup> But the evidence which he cites in every case refers not to sleeping quarters but to *hestiatoria*, banqueting halls. Tenos had built huge *hestiatoria* in order to cope with the influx of pilgrims taking part in the festival of Poseidon (Strabo 10.5.11).<sup>58</sup> These halls are not described as places of rest, and while it is possible that pilgrims found shelter in them at night, it would have been a far from satisfactory arrangement from a practical point of view.

Similarly, while it is known that the Eleians had a *hestiatorion* in which they dined the Olympic victors, this *hestiatorion* was actually in the Prytaneion (Paus.5.15.12), and Michel is mistaken in citing this passage. The tyrant Periander may have arranged entertainment in the *hestiatorion* for those who had attended the sacrifice to Aphrodite (Plut. *Gam. Paragg.* 146d), but this indicates nothing about the shelter for *theoroi*, nor does the fact that the Keians had a *hestiatorion* (Hdt. 4.35.3). None of these four cases mentioned by Michel provides information about accommodation for either *theoroi* or other pilgrims.

Pilgrims may have lodged in temples while visiting a sacred site. In 431 some Athenians, abandoning the countryside, took up residence in temples and the shrines of the heroes, except for the Akropolis and the Eleusinion (Thuk. 2.17.1, cf. 1.143.5, 144.4; 2.13.2, 14.1-2).<sup>59</sup> At the time of the mutilation of the *Hermai*, the Athenians became suspicious of a plot to overthrow the democracy (Thuk. 6.27.3, 28.2, 60.1.4, 61.1), and when it was

---

<sup>57</sup> P. Michel in *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* v (Paris: 1919) s.v. *Theoroi*, p.211 with n.11, citing Strabo 10.487 (10.5.11), Paus. 5.15.12, Plut. *Gam. Paragg.* 146d and Hdt. 4.35.4.

<sup>58</sup> Strabo 10.5.11. Ziebarth, op.cit. p.342, mentions this passage as an example of a *hestiatorion* ("Speisehaus"), as well as Hdt. 4.35.3 (on p.341), which is discussed below.

<sup>59</sup> At a later stage in the war more space was created for those who had come in from the country, but Thuk. 2.17.2 is not clear on whether the Athenians discontinued residency of the temples, but it does seem likely that this was the case. However, at the time of the plague, Thucydides (2.52.3) states that the temples in which they had taken up residence were full of the dead bodies of those who had died in them (presumably in 431, when war broke out) – but could he possibly mean that these people had moved in because of their illness at the time of the plague? Thus the apportionment of space which Thucydides describes in his narrative on 431 as having taken place "later" may in fact have taken place after the plague and because of it. It would be surprising if the temples were inhabited for the duration of the war, and the number of the deaths in the temples may have acted as a catalyst for ending residency in them if people at that stage had not left from their own accord (because of the corpses) or been killed by the plague. Residency in the temples may have been officially discouraged or the prohibition applying to the Akropolis and Eleusinion extended. Aversion to death within the sacred precincts may well have motivated the Athenians to end residency in temples; for this aversion see R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: 1983) pp.32-73, especially p.33 with n.5; cf. p.164 n.115, and note also Burkert, op.cit. pp.79 and 87.



discovered that a small band of Spartans had marched up to the Isthmos, the threat was taken so seriously that some of the Athenians, armed, spent that night in the temple of Theseus (Thuk. 6.61.2). These two cases indicate clearly that inhabitation of temples was unusual, restricted to war and emergency situations.

Temples were often used as incubation centres, and people slept in them seeking a cure. But while there is epigraphic evidence for these incubation procedures, not one of the extant inscriptions makes it clear if those involved in incubation procedures were allowed to dwell in the temple proper, keeping their personal effects and the like in the temple. Practical considerations can be noted. Temples were primarily places of worship. To have pilgrims lodging in them could interfere with the exercise of religious belief by the faithful. Temple cleanliness would also have been a consideration, as would the storage of personal effects. Anti-social behaviour in a sacred building could also lead to problems. The people of Knidos passed a decree forbidding men and women from sleeping in the sanctuary of Bakkhos, a decree was prompted by damage done to the shrine by Bakkhoi who had spent the night in the temple. Presumably they had been in a state of inebriation.<sup>60</sup> Damage to sacred property would be avoided by restrictions on sleeping in temples. A decree from Amorgos orders the *neokoros* (temple attendant) of the shrine of Hera to ensure that no foreigner (*xenos*) comes and stays in the shrine.<sup>61</sup> This provision aimed at preventing transients and the like from sleeping in the temple; by its very nature it excludes the possibility that any local person would sleep there.

Sacred sites often owned property, not only land but also houses. The latter, however, were let out for long periods of time, and thus would not have been available for the use of pilgrims. This was even the case at such sites as Delos, which could expect pilgrims on a regular, rather than periodic, basis.<sup>62</sup>

In conclusion, it can be stated that temples could be places of shelter during times of crisis, as during the Peloponnesian war, and that the ill could spend the night there in the

---

<sup>60</sup> F. Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées de L'Asie Mineure* (Paris: 1955) no.55, pp.141-142 (see the same for previous publications); note also that his list of “documents analogues” (ibid. p.142) refers not to other cases of the same sort but to other types of prohibitions.

<sup>61</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 981, translated in D.G. Rice & J.E. Stambaugh, *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion* (Chico: 1979) p.124.

<sup>62</sup> See the references and bibliographical details assembled by Kraynak, op.cit. pp.30-34 (her chapter on sanctuary-owned “hostelries”), to which now add D. Hennig ‘Die <heiligen Häuser> von Delos’, *Chiron* 15 (1985) pp.165-186.

hope of a cure. But pilgrims attending festivals probably could not lodge in temples for the duration of their stay at a sacred site. Official delegations would be hosted by wealthy individuals. The Theban presbutai who stayed with Kraton were pilgrims acting as official representatives, *theoroi*, of their polis, and Kraton was probably the Delphian *theorodokos*, *theoroi*-receiver, for these Theban *theoroi*, who enjoyed accommodation in a private residence. Other pilgrims of the hellenic world, however, found their own shelter; it appears that it was the lot of the ordinary faithful to make shift as best as they could. The most popular form of accommodation at sacred sites was the *skene*.<sup>63</sup>

**MATTHEW DILLON**

The University of New England

---

<sup>63</sup> I am grateful for the comments made by participants at the seminar on epigraphy; in particular I would like to thank my colleagues Assoc. Prof. G.R. Stanton, who read a previous draft of this article, and Mr. A. Treloar, who read a part thereof, and also Dr. D.H. Kelly, who made many valuable comments. They are not to be taken as agreeing with all of the views put forward here; errors which remain are, of course, my own.