

Hero Cult in Pausanias

Warren Huard

Department of History and Classical Studies

McGill University, Montreal

June 2012

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of Master of Arts.

© Warren Arthur James Huard, 2012

Table of Contents

Title Page	1
Table of Contents	2
Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
Introduction: The Concept of the Hero	5
1.1. Introduction: The Heroic Problem and Pausanias	5
1.2. Heroes as a Distinct Class of Beings in Ancient Greek Religion	7
1.3. Scholarly Definitions of the Hero and Hero Cult	10
1.4. Pausanias on Heroes as a Class of Beings	14
1.5. Pausanias on Individual Heroes in Relation to Their Defining Characteristics	18
The Sacrificial Terminology of Hero Cult	27
2.1. Ἑναγίζειν in Brief	28
2.2. Ἑναγίζειν Sacrifice, Sacrifice ὡς ἥρω, and Specified Heroes	35
2.3. Θύειν Sacrifice and Specified Heroes	42
2.4. Other Forms of Sacrifice, Heroic Honours, and Specified Heroes	46
Becoming a God	50
3.1. Gods and the Age of Apotheosis	50
3.2. Mortals Who become Gods: Trophonius	55
3.3. Mortals Who become Gods: Amphiaraus and Heracles	60
3.4. Becoming a God in the Time of Pausanias	65
Conclusion: Heroes and Their Worshippers	68
4.1. The Ἑναγής Subject of Hero Cult	68
4.2. Rituals of the Unspecified Hero	73
4.3. Conclusion	79
Bibliography	81

Abstract

The explicit and implicit definitional criteria of cult heroes as described by Pausanias are examined in an attempt to understand heroes in the terms of ancient Greek religion. The distinctions between gods, heroes, and other mortals are examined. Particular attention is paid to the rituals indicated by the verbs *enagizein* and *thyein* with a view towards understanding their role in hero cult. It is found that the sacrifice made to heroes distinguishes the one who sacrifices to them from the one who sacrifices to gods and that hero cult plays an important role in the religious life of the *polis* through its rituals of purification.

Les critères définitionnels des héros de culte, aussi bien implicites qu'explicites, tels qu'ils sont décrits par Pausanias, sont examinés dans une tentative de comprendre les héros du point de vue religieux de la Grèce antique. Les distinctions entre les dieux, les héros, et les autres mortels sont examinées. En particulier, nous nous concentrons sur les verbes *enagizein* et *thyein*, indicateurs de rituels, pour mieux comprendre leur rôle dans le culte des héros. Nous trouvons que le sacrifice aux héros distingue ceux qui les font de ceux qui sacrifient aux dieux. À part cela, nous trouvons aussi que le culte des héros est très important dans la vie religieuse de la *polis* à travers les rituels de purification.

Acknowledgements

Never before having had the opportunity to recognize those who have granted me their assistance in my studies in a manner such as this, I hope that my first efforts are not clumsy. I am glad to thank my supervisor Bill Gladhill for his comments on the drafts of the chapters of this thesis, and for his guidance of this project itself. For first introducing me to Pausanias, and doing much to inspire my interest in heroes, I thank my undergraduate professor Renaud Gagné. I also thank the other faculty members with whom I have worked and studied while at McGill, including Hans Beck, Lynn Kozak, Michael Fronda, Margaret Palczynski, Christina Tarnopolsky, Stephen Menn, Wade Richardson, John Serrati, Sarah Burges Watson, and Donald Baronowski. I thank too my friends and fellow Classics students Darren Hunter and Zoe Forest-Cooter for their assistance in translating my abstract, and Alexander Myhr, Walter Koh, and Carina de Klerk for their thoughts. I would like to thank as well the staff at McGill University who have helped me navigate the process of thesis preparation, including Colleen Parish, Mitali Das, Jody Anderson, and Angela Ngaira. I also thank the friends who have been there for me in various ways during my years here, including in no particular order Benjamin Elgie, Emma Chait, Liu Wancen, Kyran, Lia Garmaise, Edna Chan, Alexander Goldblatt, Rhiannon Gwyn, Harmon Moon, Cheryl McGilton, Elena Kennedy, Cyril Vallet, and Katherine MacDonald. Finally, with eyes directed ἐς θάλασσαν I thank my family, my parents Allan and Ellarose, and my sister Thea.

Introduction: The Concept of the Hero

The goal of this first chapter, after introducing the basic matter under investigation, is primarily to get a general understanding of what can confidently be said about the defining characteristics of heroes in Pausanias, after briefly establishing the existence of such a group in Greek religious tradition in the first place. It will be seen that Pausanias' heroes are beings inferior to the gods but far greater than most mortals, and associated largely with the epic past. Furthermore, at least a certain kind of hero appears to be of strictly local concern, which is largely in contrast to the gods, who are worshipped in various local forms across Greece. However, the cults of these local heroes are often closely tied to those of gods in both myth and ritual, for instance through the hero's founding of the god's local cult and his subsequent commemoration within it. Additionally, Pausanias speaks of "the rites customary to heroes," further indicating the existence of hero cult as a concept not only of modern scholarship but also of ancient Greek religion as understood by him, and relating this form of cult to particular ritual patterns. This is especially significant in light of the problem of classifying certain individuals mentioned by Pausanias as heroes and the consequent need to investigate the implications of the terminology used by him to describe the sacrificial rituals of hero cult, for there may be many more beings in Pausanias whom we could confidently call heroes if we could demonstrate that they receive the rites deemed by Pausanias to be customary to heroes.

1.1. Introduction: The Heroic Problem and Pausanias

It seems that the compilers of the great Byzantine lexicon known as the *Suda* have provided three entries for those seeking its definition of the hero. Under the entry for ἥρωας itself there appears Photius' ἡμίθεος, δυνατός, γενναῖος, in addition to the earlier lexicographer's citation of a grammatical note from the

Homeric scholia.¹ Somewhat before this there is an entry for ἥρωας, who are defined as τὰς ὑπολελειμμένους τῶν σπουδαίων ψυχάς.² Between these there appears the definition of a ἥρῳον as simply a μνημεῖον.³ There is thus a striking contradiction in the hero's nature as it appears from these definitions: the hero is a being both godlike and dead, somehow like the immortal gods while nonetheless subject to death like any other mortal being.

In attempting to understand these heroes of ancient Greek religion, modern scholars have at times created both definitions of the hero and models of the hero's cult which function prescriptively: a certain form of cult hero is taken as paradigmatic and then all others are evaluated on the basis of how well they seem to partake of this form. Moreover, certain beings may be identified as heroes based only on their apparent accord with the definition of the hero being used, even when this identification is contradicted by the very sources which have provided us with information about the 'hero' in question. The resulting heroes of modern scholarship may not properly correspond to any category of beings in ancient Greek religious thought. It is our intention to avoid examining heroes in this manner, but rather to identify the criteria underlying ancient specifications of certain beings as heroes, and to consider what the implications of these criteria might be for our understanding of the hero and of hero cult. It is only once this has been done that it might be possible for other beings to be called heroes properly on the basis of the resulting definition, and only when this does not contradict the sources by which the definition has been reached.

Since the criteria by which a certain one might be called a hero may vary not only between time and place but also by the source of our information, we shall confine this discussion to the work of Pausanias, a Lydian who wrote an account of what he found to be most notable on his travels through mainland

1 Suidas, *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. Ada Adler (Stuttgart, Germany, 1931), H.556.

2 Ibid., H.542.

3 Ibid., H.555.

Greece during the second century of this era.⁴ Pausanias is useful as a source for such a project as this: he writes extensively about religion, probably due both to his own piety and the simple fact that many of the most notable sites in ancient Greece were in various ways religious.⁵ Moreover, the breadth of his travels allows to some extent a synchronic investigation of Greek religious practices to be made by his reader, just as his antiquarian leanings provide a degree of diachronic perspective.⁶ However, Pausanias presents his own difficulties as a source, perhaps most significantly in that he does not write systematically about religious matters, however extensive his writings may be. Indeed, one of his few programmatic statements is made to remark that he only records what is most notable of that which he sees and hears: we are therefore left to infer what is commonplace to him and his contemporaries, which is unfortunate since it is largely commonplace information about heroes which is our object of investigation.⁷ However, the great diversity of local religious traditions detailed by Pausanias may allow us to overcome these difficulties, so long as we remain conscious of their presence.

1.2. Heroes as a Distinct Class of Beings in Ancient Greek Religion

It is necessary now to turn to the concept of heroes as a distinct class of beings in ancient Greek religious tradition in general, in order to understand the religious context in which Pausanias writes about them. Beginning with the earliest material, the word ἥρως itself appears formulaically in Homer as an honourable term of address for individuals and as a term for the Achaeans collectively: ancient scholars debated whether it was applied properly to the captains of the Achaeans alone or to all free men in general, but in either case, it is

4 For Pausanias as a Lydian see Christian Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, California, 1985), 13-15; for his date see again Habicht, 8.

5 For the piety of Pausanias see for instance *Ibid.*, 152-155.

6 For Pausanias as an antiquarian see *Ibid.*, 24.

7 Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*, ed. M. H. Rocha-Pereira (Leipzig, Germany, 1973), 3.11.1.

not immediately obvious that such usage distinguishes ἥρωες as a particular class of beings in Greek religion, i.e. as receiving worship apart from mortal humans and the Olympian gods.⁸ Hesiod, it is true, speaks of the fourth age of mortals as an ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, and as will be seen, this concept of an age of heroes would later be of great significance to Pausanias' own conception of heroes.⁹ However, the term's religious meaning many centuries earlier in the Archaic period is unclear and remains a matter of some debate.¹⁰ Indeed, arguing for a relatively late appearance of the term in a cultic context and with reference to a distinct class of beings, Jan Bremmer notes that the earliest known ritual usage of the term is from a 6th century BC Elean hymn to Dionysus, where the god is invoked with the words ἐλθεῖν, ἥρω Διόνυσσε, suggesting that no clear distinction was yet then made between gods and heroes and that the term ἥρωες continued instead to be used mainly as an honourable form of address for a distinguished individual.¹¹

Yet by the 5th century BC there is evidence from the writers of both drama and history that heroes were considered a class of beings distinct from the gods, with whom they are often mentioned.¹² For instance, Herodotus distinguishes between the ancient god called Heracles and the later hero of the same name, maintaining that different sorts of sacrificial ritual are appropriate to each, as indeed is the practice among certain Greeks.¹³ With this mention of different

8 Erwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, 8th ed., trans. W. B. Hillis (London, England, 1925), 118, 118 n. 26; Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. John Raffan (Malden, Massachusetts, 1985), 203.

9 Hesiodus, *Theogonia – Opera et dies – Scutum – Fragmenta selecta*, 3rd ed., eds. Friedrich Solmsen, R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (Oxford, England, 1990), *Opera et dies*, 159. Hesiod also calls heroes ἡμίθεοι, and it is likely on this basis that they are referred to as such in the passage from the *Suda* cited above; see Hes. *Op.* 160.

10 Jan N. Bremmer, "The Rise of the Hero Cult and the New Simonides," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 158 (2006) : 18.

11 Ibid.

12 Ibid.

13 Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. Carolus Hude (London, England, 1927), 2.44. The precise meaning of this passage is a matter of some debate to which we will return in due course, but it is at least clear that Herodotus endorses making separate sacrifices to Heracles in his capacity as a

sacrificial rituals as being appropriate to a god and to a hero we begin to see heroes more clearly as a distinct class of beings possessing a religious significance reflected in their cult. Herodotus is especially important in this regard, for he is also the first extant writer to speak of a ἡρώων.¹⁴ This first mention of a hero-shrine is made when speaking of Philippos of Croton, who perished in the expedition of Dorieus: on account of his great beauty the Egestans built the shrine upon his tomb and there offer sacrifices of propitiation to him.¹⁵ This suggests another distinguishing aspect of heroes, that they are both dead mortals and yet somehow greater than other dead mortals, and this distinction too appears to be of religious significance, since to it is attributed the reason for the foundation of the hero Philippos' cult.¹⁶

Advancing more than five centuries into the age of the Antonines, there can be little doubt that heroes in this period form a distinct class of beings in the mind of Pausanias. He makes a significant remark after setting out from Athens in the direction of the Academy: Ἀθηναίοις δὲ καὶ ἔξω πόλεως ἐν τοῖς δήμοις καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς θεῶν ἐστὶν ἱερὰ καὶ ἡρώων καὶ ἀνδρῶν τάφοι.¹⁷ This suggests a tripartite division made between gods, heroes, and dead θνητοί, although the gods are set apart here by their ἱερὰ while heroes and the dead both have only tombs. Much more will be said on the distinguishing characteristics of heroes in Pausanias below, but for now it is necessary simply to note their existence as a class. Additionally, it should be remarked that Pausanias is not the only later writer to make a division such as the one above. For instance, writing about a century after him, Porphyry states that τοῖς μὲν Ὀλυμπίοις θεοῖς ναοὺς τε καὶ ἔδε καὶ βωμοὺς ἰδρύσαντο, χθονίοις δὲ καὶ ἡρώσιν ἐσχάρας, ὑποχθονίοις δὲ βόθρους

god and to Heracles in his capacity as a hero.

14 Bremmer, 18. There are in fact several variations of this word used: this form will be used when speaking of it generally.

15 Hdt. 5.47. Specifically, they ἱλάσκονται him with θυσίῃσι.

16 These dead mortals who are not heroes will henceforth be called θνητοί, to distinguish them from both the ἥρωες and the ἀθάνατοι.

17 Paus. 1.29.2.

καὶ μέγαρα.¹⁸ This reveals a religious distinction, at least in the mind of Porphyry, between heroes and the gods termed *Olympian*, and furthermore suggests an affinity between heroes and the gods termed *chthonian*, perhaps also linked to the dead who dwell beneath the earth. More remains to be said on this subject as well, but again, it is most important for now only to note the existence of heroes as a distinct class of beings in Greek religion, and that part of their distinction may lie in the special rites of their cults.

1.3. Scholarly Definitions of the Hero and Hero Cult

So far no specific definition of 'the hero' has been employed in this discussion; those mentioned as heroes above have been recognized as heroes simply because they have been called heroes by ancient writers, and any of the characteristics which heroes as a group might possess have been inferred from what has been said about them in such passages and from what has been said about specific individuals named as heroes. While this is entirely deliberate for the reasons explained at the start, it may nonetheless be necessary to examine a broader range of beings than those explicitly called heroes by Pausanias in order to understand why anyone might be called a hero and receive cult in this capacity in the first place. For instance, Pausanias' work is divided into separate books for each region of Greece, and between these regions, whether on the basis of geography or ethnolinguistic group, there may be meaningful religious differences regarding heroes and their cults.¹⁹ This could result in the sorts of beings called heroes by Pausanias in one place being somewhat different than those called heroes by him in another, if at least he tends to call certain beings heroes on the basis of their being called that locally. To properly investigate hero cult it is therefore necessary to have some sort of working definition of a hero.

¹⁸ Porphyry, *De ante nympharum*, 3. (Cited from Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, England, 1922), 63.)

¹⁹ For instance, Pausanias indicates shrines called ἥρωα by far most frequently in his books on Attica and Laconia.

Nonetheless, it must be emphasized that any such definition must account first and foremost for those beings who receive cult and are actually called heroes.

As mentioned above, the hero's status as a dead mortal may be one of his defining characteristics. Indeed, beginning with Erwin Rohde's *Psyche*, which marked the commencement of the modern study of hero cult, the mortality of the hero has in various ways been considered one of his main defining features by modern scholars. Rohde himself, writing in 1893, proposes that hero cult developed from a kind of funerary cult: hero cult was an Archaic revival of the pre-Homeric worship of ancestors which had persisted at Mycenaean tombs throughout the dark ages, and heroes are properly “spirits of the dead” and not demigods or other sorts of lesser divinity.²⁰ More recent scholars, such as Carla Antonaccio, have on the basis of archaeological evidence challenged the idea that there was any persistence of cult at Mycenaean tombs into the Archaic period, and the idea that hero cult originates directly from Mycenaean tomb cult is generally no longer accepted.²¹ However, the basic connection marked by Rohde between the cult of heroes and the cult of the dead has been and remains influential.

Once this connection has been made, it may have a number of consequences. Again, Rohde has done much to influence later scholars. For instance, on the basis of literary evidence such as that of Herodotus and Pausanias, he emphasizes the importance of the possession of the hero's remains by the city to the hero's cult there, and from the locality of the grave follows more generally the local nature of the hero and his influence.²² Rohde also argues for the existence of a category of “chthonic” gods, closely related to the dead since they inhabit the same realm, and like heroes a kind of survival at the level of ritual from the pre-Homeric religion of Greece.²³ Indeed, heroes and the chthonian gods

²⁰ Rohde, 117, 120-123.

²¹ Carla M. Antonaccio, *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece* (London, England, 1995), 245; Burkert, 204.

²² Rohde, 121-122.

²³ Ibid., 158-162.

are ritually distinguished from the Olympian gods by the special form of their sacrificial ritual: termed ἐνκαγίζειν instead of θύειν, it is a rite of propitiation conducted nocturnally at a low altar or hearth; the black victim is slain with its head turned to the ground, and while the blood is let to pour into the ground the victim is burnt in its entirety.²⁴ Scholars since Rohde have argued whether any meaningful category of the chthonian ever actually existed in ancient Greek religion, and more pertinently for our purposes, whether the form of the sacrifice offered to the hero is one of his defining characteristics at the level of cult. Among the more recent, Renate Schlesier has argued against the idea of opposing categories of Olympian and chthonian in Greek religion, suggesting that this is a product of modern scholarship which derives ultimately from late and even Byzantine sources.²⁵ In contrast, Scott Scullion has argued that the category of the chthonian was a real one in ancient Greek religious thought, and one with particular importance to the cult of heroes and the forms of their sacrificial ritual, although he advances a less specific definition of the chthonian than earlier scholars such as Rohde.²⁶ However, the specifics of this debate are not our main concern here, but rather whether the hero of cult can be defined by the form of his sacrificial ritual, “chthonic” or otherwise. Gunnell Ekroth has argued well on the basis of both the literary and archaeological evidence that this is not the case, since, at least in the pre-Roman periods, heroes were apparently most commonly worshipped with the same rites usually associated with the Olympian gods.²⁷ We will return to the subject of ἐνκαγίζειν in hero cult below, but for now it is simply important to note that it may be unsound to base any all-encompassing definition of heroes of cult in general upon the form of their sacrificial rituals.

Obviously more must be said of heroes with regards to their defining

²⁴ Ibid., 116.

²⁵ Renate Schlesier, “Olympian versus Chthonian Religion,” *Scripta classica Israelica* 11 (1991-1992) : *passim*.

²⁶ Scott Scullion, “Olympian and Chthonian,” *Classical Antiquity* 13, no. 1 (April, 1994) : 118.

²⁷ Gunnell Ekroth, “The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods” (Ph.D. diss., Stockholm University, 1999), 253-256.

characteristics than that they are dead mortals who do not necessarily receive any form of sacrifice unique to them, whether specifically as heroes or more generally as chthonian entities. The other major aspect of the hero's definition, already hinted at above by Rohde in his rejection of the classification of heroes as demigods, is their distinguished status relative to *θηητοί*. This is a distinction made at the level of ritual: Rohde suggests that hero cult is in essence a kind of funerary cult extended beyond the private realm of the family and made communal, perhaps because its objects belonged to the aristocracy.²⁸ As Martin Nilsson phrased it in his extension of this argument, “the prince was revered by the whole people in life and death alike.”²⁹ Numerous other reasons for the extraordinary status of the hero have been suggested. Rohde suggests that among those variously called both gods and heroes were pre-Homeric gods who lost their divine status to some extent but never attained the status of “real heroes” since they were thought to have never died but to have attained bodily immortality: such were, for instance, Trophonius and Amphiaraus.³⁰ Additionally, Rohde says that as hero cult developed, certain heroes, such as Heracles, became significant beyond their original locale and as such were often considered gods instead of heroes.³¹ Finally, over time it developed that anyone prominent in life might be considered a hero in death, and so lawgivers and the founders of colonies were recognized as heroes upon their deaths.³² While more recent scholars commonly disagree with Rohde on the details of such points as these, they generally agree that heroes were considered mortals who were somehow distinguished in life. Irad Malkin, for instance, suggests that the cult of colony founders was not actually a “profaned”

28 Rohde, 125.

29 Martin P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion*, 2nd ed., trans. F. J. Fielden (Oxford, England, 1949), 103.

30 Rohde, 121.

31 Ibid., 131-132.

32 Ibid., 127-128. It is on this account also, says Rohde, that Philippus of Croton, mentioned above, receives cult.

form of hero worship but instead its source.³³ The disagreement in this case is not as to whether founders and other prominent individuals were worthy heroes but as to their role in the development of hero cult as a phenomenon.

Much more could be said here about the defining characteristics of heroes in modern scholarship, but, since it is the the defining characteristics of the hero according to Pausanias that are the subject of investigation here, it may be better to consider a minimal working definition so that no one who might be a hero to Pausanias will be excluded from investigation. We will therefore use the basic definition provided by Ekroth, namely that the “definition of a hero is that he is dead and receives worship locally on a more official level than the ordinary dead.”³⁴ The next part of Ekroth's definition, that a “hero can be called *theos* occasionally but still be a hero,” we will not take as a given: if Pausanias argues or simply says that a certain figure called by others a hero is properly in fact a god, then it would make little sense, if one is to correctly understand Pausanias, to argue as to why such a one is 'really' a hero than it does to consider why Pausanias calls such a one a god. We will, however, accept Ekroth's caution that the form of sacrifice received must not be assumed to define its recipient as a hero or not, while leaving open the possibility that certain forms of ritual may be understood as paradigmatically heroic.³⁵

1.4. Pausanias on Heroes as a Class of Beings

So far we have only noted the existence of heroes as a class of beings in Greek religion generally and reviewed some of scholars' thoughts about the defining characteristics of this class to reach a working definition of the hero; Pausanias has only been treated incidentally. We will now turn directly to Pausanias, first to see what he has to say about heroes as a specified group and

33 Irad Malkin, *Colonization and Greek Religion* (Leiden, The Netherlands, 1987), 12.

34 Ekroth, 9.

35 Ibid.

their defining characteristics in general, and then to see what can be inferred on this subject from what he has to say of individual heroes.³⁶

Although Pausanias does not write systematically about religious matters, he does write about them extensively, and in so doing he makes a number of scattered references to heroes as a group which allow his reader to infer something about their general characteristics. Firstly, he distinguishes heroes from the gods, as is implicit in the passage cited above, and elsewhere such as when he remarks that the Eleians revere Pelops over all the other heroes in the same way in which they revere Zeus over the other gods.³⁷ He elsewhere makes this distinction explicit: for instance, in his detailed description of Polygnotus' painting at Delphi he remarks that the early Greeks held the Eleusinian Mysteries to be greater than all other such rites to the same extent that they held the gods to be greater than the heroes.³⁸ Related to the distinct and perhaps inferior status of heroes relative to the gods is their status as dead mortals: this too has already been mentioned, although the passage cited above is in fact the only one in which Pausanias distinguishes heroes as a named group as being dead mortals, which he does only implicitly by mention of their having tombs.³⁹ In any case, this agrees with the general scholarly definition of heroes mentioned above, insofar as they are recognized as a group separate from the ἰθάνατοι gods and also other θνητοί, but

36 By “heroes as a specified group” is meant simply heroes spoken of explicitly as such, as for instance below at Paus. 10.31.11, as distinct from named heroes or other beings. The reason for turning to individual heroes to understand heroes as a whole is because Pausanias has much more to say of the former than the latter, since he does not systematically treat heroes as a Greek religious phenomenon.

37 Paus. 1.29.2, 5.13.1.

38 Ibid., 10.31.11. It is important to note that these few mentions of gods and heroes span Pausanias' work from the start to finish, for Pausanias is thought to have written his work over the course of several decades in the order in which it is presented. (For this see Habicht, 6-12.) In certain religious and other matters we see him change his opinion, sometimes explicitly, and so it cannot be assumed that his thoughts of heroes at one time will necessarily be the same as they might be at another. In this case, we see that Pausanias distinguished heroes from gods both early in his writing and towards its end if indeed not entirely throughout, which is not of course unexpected given the general importance of heroes in Greek religion at his time.

39 Ibid., 1.29.2.

at the same time like the latter in that they are themselves subject to death.

One of Pausanias' most frequent mentions of heroes as a group is in fact to the age of heroes and its characteristics. For instance, he says that ἐπὶ τῶν ἡρώων καλουμένων weapons were made of bronze, basing this claim on the evidence of Homer and the bronze weapons of Achilles and Memnon dedicated in temples at Phaselis and Nicomedia respectively.⁴⁰ Similarly, he says that, on the basis of certain verses in the *Iliad*, it is thought the town of Samicum was called Arene in the heroic age.⁴¹ These particular references to the age of heroes suggest that Pausanias' idea of who the heroes actually are is one influenced by Homeric poetry, a view which is strengthened by his mention elsewhere of those who wrote about the pains suffered by the heroes at Troy.⁴² However, Pausanias' heroes aren't only those of Homer, for his idea of the age of heroes is also probably influenced by Hesiod. This is likely because he speaks not only of the heroic age but also of πρὸ τῶν ἡρώων θνητὸν γένος, which closely recalls Hesiod's five ages.⁴³ Of course, that the ages are specifically those of Hesiod is likely because Pausanias shows a considerable interest in Hesiod, going as far as to investigate the ancient debates regarding the authorship of the Hesiodic corpus, and citing him more than any other poet except Homer himself.⁴⁴ Furthermore, in one passage he says that the war of the Seven was the most important of the wars fought between Greeks during the heroic age, which, taken together with his mention of the heroes' sufferings at Troy, agrees with Hesiod's characterization of the heroes as those who fought at Thebes and Troy.⁴⁵ It is therefore apparent that Pausanias' concept of the age of heroes has been informed by epic poetry.⁴⁶ However, whether this

40 Ibid., 3.3.6-8.

41 Ibid., 5.6.2.

42 Ibid., 8.10.9.

43 Ibid., 6.5.1; Hes. *Op.* 109-201.

44 Paus. 9.31.4-6; Rocha-Pereira, *Indices*, 252-259.

45 Paus. 9.9.1; Hes. *Op.* 161-165.

46 This is not surprising in light of the view of a number of scholars, opposite Rohde and his followers, that hero cult was influenced by epic poetry. See Burkert, 204.

defines his individual heroes and confines them all to a lifetime in the remote and legendary past will be examined below in the discussion of individual heroes.

Before turning to the examination of what can be learnt of the defining characteristics of Pausanias' heroes as a group from an examination of individual heroes it is necessary to mention the remaining characteristics he ascribes to heroes as a group. Firstly, he often contrasts epichoric heroes as a group with more famous beings. For instance, he suggests that the rivers Electra and Coeus in Messenia may be named respectively for the famous daughter of Atlas and father of Leto, or that they may be named for an Electra and Coeus τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἡρώων.⁴⁷ Similarly, he states that by some accounts the altar of Olympian Zeus at Olympia was built by the Idaean Heracles, but in other accounts by epichoric heroes.⁴⁸ It is not immediately clear whether this contrast is being made between epichoric heroes and more widely famous heroes or between epichoric heroes and beings of another sort, perhaps divine. Heracles, as will be seen elsewhere, presents Pausanias with an especially difficult case in this regard. However, it can be inferred that Pausanias recognizes the existence of heroes who are of a particularly local concern. This too agrees with much of the scholarship on heroes which stresses their local nature, although it leaves open the possibility of heroes recognized beyond the local realm.⁴⁹

Secondly, in mentioning that Parnassus is credited with both a human and a divine father, Pausanias notes that this is a characteristic of many other heroes as well.⁵⁰ We noted above that heroes are not simply any mortals but apparently those who are somehow distinguished: divine ancestry suggests one means by which this might be so. Of course, our concern is primarily with how the hero is distinguished at the level of ritual, but it should not be unexpected that this distinction might also be reflected somehow at the level of myth.

47 Paus. 4.33.6.

48 Ibid., 5.13.8.

49 Rohde, 121-122, 132; Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 346.

50 Paus. 10.6.1.

Finally, it is important that Pausanias once speaks of τὰ μνημόματα of the heroes, specifically against the Spartan king Cleomenes.⁵¹ The wrath of the heroes, demanding propitiation, has in fact commonly been considered one of their most common characteristics; Walter Burkert, for instance, speaks of the *menima* of the heroes.⁵² At the same time, this trait cannot be inferred from this passage alone as being characteristic of the heroes as a group in Pausanias, for here he also attributes it to the gods. In fact, Pausanias makes many more references to the μνήμια of the gods and divine retribution is arguably one of the main themes of his work.⁵³ It would therefore be a mistake to consider such wrath a defining characteristic of the heroes as a group on the basis of this passage, although it remains to be seen what his mentions of individual heroes might add to the discussion.

1.5. Pausanias on Individual Heroes in Relation to Their Defining Characteristics

It remains to be seen what else might be determined regarding Pausanias' thoughts about heroes as a group in general and their defining characteristics from his accounts of individual heroes. Firstly, it becomes clear that Pausanias' heroes are not confined to the heroic age of epic poetry. For instance, in Sparta Pausanias sees the ἡρώων of Cynisca, the first woman to win an Olympic victory: her father was the Spartan king Archidamus who reigned at the start of the Peloponnesian War, and so Cynisca belongs decidedly to the Classical period.⁵⁴ Earlier in his work, Pausanias says that Aratus has a ἡρώων still called the Ἀράτειον near the agora at Sicyon: this Aratus was a Hellenistic statesman who fought the

⁵¹ Ibid., 3.4.6.

⁵² Burkert, 207.

⁵³ Habicht, 153-4.

⁵⁴ Paus. 3.15.1; 3.7.10-8.1. It should be noted that Pausanias' mentions of hero shrines, such as this one, do not necessarily indicate anything about cult. Pausanias says nothing of Cynisca's cult, and it cannot be assumed that a cult even existed, at least in his own day. However, that she has a ἡρώων at least allows us to call Cynisca a heroine.

Macedonians and expanded the Achaean League.⁵⁵ However, Cynisca and Aratus are apparently exceptional cases, for most of those whom Pausanias specifically names as heroes or as possessing a ἥρωον do in fact belong to the much more remote past and the age of heroes.

A useful illustration of this may be seen at 1.36 when Pausanias is on the Sacred Way to Eleusis. He sees four grave sites and describes those who possess them: the first is the μνημα of Anthemocritus, the Athenian herald whose death at the hands of the Megarians shortly before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War brought the still-present μνημα ἐκ τοῖν θεοῖν upon Megara.⁵⁶ The second is the τάφος of Molottus, an Athenian military commander of the mid 4th century BC who fought against Philip in aid of the Euboean tyrant Plutarch.⁵⁷ The third is in fact a stream and stretch of land called Scirum after Scirus, the soothsayer from Dodona who founded the temple of Sciradian Athena at Phalerum and fought with the Eleusinians against Erechtheus and, having been slain, was buried beside the stream by the Eleusinians.⁵⁸ Frazer adds that Scirum was the site of a sacred ploughing at Midsummer, which was perhaps part of the Scira festival held during the month of Scirophorion during which there was a sacred procession from the Acropolis to Scirum.⁵⁹ The fourth is the μνημα of Cephisodorus, a Hellenistic statesman who led the embassy to Rome which resulted in the dispatch of Flamininus.⁶⁰ Of these four men, only Scirus belongs to the legendary past, while

55 Ibid., 2.8.1-6, 2.9.4.

56 Ibid., 1.36.3; Pausanias, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 2nd ed., ed. & trans. J. G. Frazer (London, England, 1913), *Commentary on Book I*, 487-488.

57 Paus. 1.36.4; Frazer, *Commentary on Book I*, 488.

58 Paus. 1.36.4.

59 Frazer, *Commentary on Book I*, 489. This procession, described by a number of lexicographers and scholiasts cited by Frazer, included the priest of Poseidon Erechtheus with his white umbrella, the priest of the Sun, and a priestess of Athena. This festival of Scirophoria was thought by some to take its name from the umbrella, with σκίρον being synonymous with σκιάδειον, but it has also been connected to the colour of the umbrella, white after gypsum or σκιρράς/σκίραν. (See Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 134-135.) It seems then that the eponymous hero Scirus must take his place among the many other explanations for the name of the festival.

60 Paus. 1.36.5-6; Frazer, *Commentary on Book I*, 489-90.

the other three are plainly historical figures: only Scirus is named as a hero.⁶¹ Of course, it is not particularly surprising that he is one, for he has, and presumably needs, much more than sheer antiquity to his heroic credit. As the alleged namesake of Scirum and its stream, he is specifically a hero of the common eponymous type, and he also lends his name to the cult of Athena which he is said to have founded; cult foundation is commonly attributed to heroes, and is one of the many ways in which they are linked to specific gods.⁶² As for Cephisodorus and Molottus, they are notable historical individuals, but apparently they might lack whatever Aratus and other more recent heroes have to their credit.

Anthemocritus however presents an interesting case. As will later be seen, it is very common for an individual hero to be one who has died unjustly and whose resulting μῆνιμα has required the foundation of a cult in order to be propitiated.⁶³ By the Athenian account, Anthemocritus seems to have had just such a death, although the resulting wrath upon his transgressors is apparently not his own but that of the Eleusinian goddesses. While it is possible that Pausanias does in fact consider Anthemocritus to be a hero but simply neglects to mention it, possibilities such as this will not be considered here until later. For now, it is simply important to note that most of Pausanias' unambiguous heroes are figures of the remote past if not the epic age of heroes itself, but that some more recent individuals may also be recognized as heroes in addition to these.

Having just mentioned it above, it may now be fitting to turn directly to the concept of heroic wrath. It has been thought to be a common trait of heroes generally, but Pausanias cannot be said to define it as specifically heroic with regards to heroes as a group. Individual instances reveal that it is indeed a trait of certain heroes, but at the same time that it is not defining insofar as it does not

⁶¹ Paus. 1.36.4.

⁶² For cult foundation see Diskin Clay, *Archilochus Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2004), 151-152; Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 345. For eponymous heroes see Jane Ellen Harrison, *Themis: A Study in the Social Origins of Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, England, 1927), 267-8; Rohde, 123.

⁶³ Burkert, 206-7.

characterize all heroes and is not specific to them either. One of the more memorable exemplars of heroic wrath is furnished by the myth of the Hero of Temesa. Pausanias relates that one of Odysseus' crew raped a Temesan maiden and was stoned to death by the Temesans on this account: his δαίμων then began killing the Temesans indiscriminately until, in obedience to the Pythia, they propitiated the Hero and constructed a temple for him where they sacrificed a maiden to him annually, until Euthymus the athlete fought the Hero and drove him into the sea.⁶⁴ This particular account of post-mortem heroic wrath resulting in the the foundation of cult for the hero belongs entirely to myth, for it would not appear from the story that the Temesans actually worshipped the Hero; Pausanias at any rate does not say that they continue to do so in his day. Although Pausanias furnishes other examples of this motif in the *aetia* of actual cults, as will be seen below, these generally do not belong to figures who are specified as being heroes. Explicit heroic wrath is in fact fairly rare in Pausanias and simply does not feature in most of what he has to say about heroes. In contrast, it has already been noted that the wrath of the gods is common in Pausanias because of his concern with divine justice and retribution. As such, wrath cannot be considered especially heroic on the evidence provided by those whom Pausanias names as heroes. However, it will later be considered again in light of its possible implications regarding our understanding of the sacrificial rituals of hero cult.

Another heroic activity in Pausanias is cult foundation. It has already been mentioned in the case of Scirus and the cult of Sciradian Athena at Phalerum.⁶⁵ Likewise, it has been mentioned that either the Idaean Heracles or local heroes were thought to have built the altar to Olympian Zeus at Olympia.⁶⁶ A number of further examples could be provided, such as that of Alexanor, the grandson of Asclepius by Machaon who built the Ἀσκληπιεῖον at Titane and receives sacrifice

⁶⁴ Paus. 6.6.7-10.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 1.36.4.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 5.13.8.

there ὥς ἥρω.⁶⁷ There are also heroes who are not necessarily the founders of cults but who are intimately involved in their founding. Such is, for instance, Astrabacus: he found the bloodthirsty image of Artemis Orthia in a thicket and consequently went mad, and Pausanias sees his ἥρῳον near Artemis Orthia's sanctuary at Sparta.⁶⁸ Similarly, an unspecified Spartan hero who guided Dionysus on his way to that city has a τέμενος beside the god's temple and, at the behest of the Delphic oracle, has a race run in his honour at the festival of Dionysus.⁶⁹ None of this is to say that Pausanias' heroes are all by definition cult founders. However, it remains that cult foundation is an activity commonly attributed to them, linking their cults to those of gods.

For the sake of completeness, it should also be mentioned that, as we would expect, Pausanias' descriptions of individual heroes agree with his characterization of them as a group in that they are dead mortals who are somehow exceptional, perhaps in the myths told about them but certainly at the ritual level in that they receive cult. This point need not be belaboured.⁷⁰ It should, however, be noted that the associated importance of the possession of the hero's remains is indeed present in a few of Pausanias' elaborations on particular heroes. For instance, he sees the τάφος of Hector in Thebes and mentions that his bones were brought there at the command of an oracle to bring them there and to

67 Ibid., 2.11.5-7.

68 Ibid., 3.16.6-11.

69 Ibid., 3.13.7.

70 The case of the hero Cleomedes of Astypalaea should perhaps be mentioned in this regard, for Pausanias says that the Astypalaeans were told by the Delphic oracle to honour him as one μηκέτι θνητὸν εἶναι, and so he receives worship as a hero. (See Paus. 6.9.8-9.) Cleomedes presents an unusual case in that he disappears miraculously and the Astypalaeans are not left in possession of any remains. Rohde considers this an indication that he has been physically translated to the immortal life. (See Rohde, 129.) In any case, Cleomedes is apparently not a dead mortal somehow distinct from other dead mortals but is in fact not a dead mortal at all, although he was clearly once mortal. While the case of Cleomedes may be atypical, it does help to suggest that it is valid to distinguish between ἥρωες and θνητοί, and to distinguish both from the ἀθάνατοι. In some ways the case of Cleomedes recalls that of those other figures who were once mortal but attained divinity, such as Heracles. These beings will be fully discussed in the third chapter, in order to consider what distinguishes heroes from them.

ἥρωα σέβεσθαι.⁷¹ In contrast, he immediately before this mentions the μνῆμα of Teiresias there, noting that it is in fact a κενὸν μνῆμα since Teiresias died elsewhere.⁷² Although he does not specifically say that Teiresias is a hero, the general notion that the possession of the dead hero's remains is of importance to his cult appears straightforward.

What can be inferred about Pausanias' conception of the hero from individual examples is complicated by the presence of numerous mortals who receive cult but aren't specifically named as heroes. Returning to the theme of wrath and propitiation, in Caphyae Pausanias sees a grove and temple of Artemis: he says that some local children once tied a rope around her image, said she was being strangled, and were consequently stoned to death by the Caphyans. Following this the pregnant women of Caphyae all gave birth prematurely to stillborn offspring and continued to do so until, at the behest of the Pythia, the slaughtered children were buried and given annual sacrifices for the reason that they had been slain οὐ σὺν δίκῃ; Pausanias adds that the children continue to receive this propitiatory sacrifice ἕτι καὶ νῦν, making this the aetiological myth concerning a historical ritual.⁷³ Yet whether the ritual can be considered indicative of hero cult is not entirely clear: the myth falls into a common pattern often associated with heroes, but Pausanias does not specify that the children are heroes.⁷⁴ Given Pausanias' stated policy of only recording what is most notable, we would not expect him necessarily to say that the children are heroes if indeed

71 Ibid., 9.18.5. Frazer adds to this the account of Tzetzes that Hector's bones were brought to Thebes at the command of Delphi that they be brought to a Greek city which took no part in the Trojan War in order to bring an end to the plague. This suggests the theme of heroic wrath again, and is one of many examples of a hero mentioned by Pausanias who is in other sources specified as wrathful and in need of propitiation, but of whose wrath Pausanias makes no mention. (See Frazer, *Commentary on Books IX., X., Addenda*, 59.)

72 Ibid., 9.18.4.

73 Ibid., 8.23.6-7.

74 A further reason which may be taken as possibly indicative of hero cult is that relating to the specific form of sacrifice received by the children: ἐναγίζειν. The role of this form of sacrifice in hero cult, both generally and in Pausanias in particular, will be more fully discussed in the second chapter. The implications of the common association between the cult of a hero and the cult of a god at the same site will be considered in greater detail in the fourth chapter.

this would have been obvious to his readers. Of course, to argue thus from silence carries its own risks: it could simply be that Pausanias does not call the children heroes because they are not in any way heroes.

Similar examples can be adduced regarding cult foundation. For instance, Pausanias tells an interesting story about Eurypylus, whose μνῆμα he sees between the temple of Artemis Laphria and its altar. This Eurypylus received from the spoils of Troy a chest containing an image of Dionysus wrought by Hephaestus himself for Dardanus at the behest of Zeus: upon opening the chest Eurypylus went mad and was not cured until, following the advice of the Delphic oracle, he came upon the annual human sacrifice formerly offered to Artemis Triclaria by the Patreans and there set the chest down, ending both the custom of human sacrifice for Artemis Triclaria and his own madness. Pausanias adds that the Patreans continue to sacrifice to Eurypylus at the annual festival of Dionysus which he thus instituted.⁷⁵ This myth is interesting for a number of reasons beyond simple cult foundation at the behest of the Delphic oracle, a motif already seen here to be recurrent in the aetiological myths of hero cults. Firstly, its bloodthirsty Artemis and motif of madness at the sight of the god's image are familiar from the myth of the hero Astrabacus related above. It also recalls the common association between hero and god, for heroes are often interred beside the altar of a god and receive sacrifice as part of the god's festival, as was seen just above of Alexanor, Astrabacus, and the unnamed Spartan who guided Dionysus.⁷⁶ Additionally, this is not the only extant myth involving the introduction of the cult of Dionysus during a festival of Artemis and the foundation of cult for the one who introduced Dionysus: an inscription from the shrine of Archilochus seems to

⁷⁵ Ibid., 7.19.6-10.

⁷⁶ For the commonality of this in general, see Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 338. Of course, it should be noted that Eurypylus is worshipped at the festival of the god Dionysus, while the goddess beside whose temple he is buried is Artemis: the two divinities are associated to Eurypylus in a way that is more common of just one deity, although as is mentioned, the association of the hero with this specific pair of gods is not without precedent.

relate that Archilochus did just that himself.⁷⁷ This suggests that such a connection with Artemis could be a motif in myths of the introduction of Dionysus' cult by a hero. Of course, as one of the kings of the Greeks who sacked Troy, Eurypylus is also a figure from the heroic age. For these reasons it would not be surprising for him to be a hero. However, Pausanias does not specify that he is one.

Returning to the eponymous heroes, Pausanias mentions a number of figures who appear to be like the eponymous heroes in everything except that they are not specified as being heroes. At Sparta, for instance, Pausanias mentions a number of eponymous figures including the legendary kings Lelex, Eurotas, and Lacedaemon.⁷⁸ From the later mentions of their ἡρώα we can safely number only Lelex and Lacedaemon among the heroes.⁷⁹ It is not however obvious that Eurotas should not also be considered an eponymous hero and indeed that Pausanias does not consider him to be one: Pausanias may simply have seen no noteworthy ἡρώον of Eurotas. Further evidence that Pausanias does not always designate his heroes as such, besides what has already been considered, is provided by Theseus. Pausanias mentions his ἱερόν and tells of how Cimon fetched his remains from Scyros, which recalls again the importance of the possession of the physical remains of the hero.⁸⁰ However, Pausanias says nothing here of Theseus being a hero, and it cannot be known with certainty that he numbers Theseus among the heroes until he later mentions his ἡρώον near the Academy.⁸¹

From the above it appears likely that Pausanias mentions many more heroes than those whom he explicitly calls heroes, and that no account of hero cult in Pausanias can be complete without considering these likely heroes. At the same time, his concept of the hero cannot be understood by simply designating as

⁷⁷ Clay, 16-17.

⁷⁸ Paus. 3.1.1-2.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 3.12.5, 3.20.3.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 1.17.2, 1.17.6.

⁸¹ Ibid., 1. 30.4.

heroes all those mortals who receive cult but are not called heroes by him. The reason for this is that he says some of these are gods, a group we already know to be distinct from heroes.⁸² As was already said, our definition of the hero must account first and foremost for those beings who are actually called heroes: it can now be added that the definition is inadequate if it numbers gods among the heroes.

So far we have not closely examined the sacrificial rituals of hero cult in Pausanias, not considering them necessarily to be part of the defining characteristics of the hero. However, there may be good reason to do so now: among the figures mentioned just above, the Caphyan children and Eurypylus, like the hero Alexanor, all receive sacrifice of the ἐναγίζειν type, and much has been said of this ritual in relation to hero cult.⁸³ Much more could be inferred about Pausanias' heroes if they could be confidently linked to this form of sacrifice. Additionally, Pausanias' mention of τὰ νομιζόμενα ἥρωσιν suggests that it may not be absurd to investigate whether particular forms of sacrificial ritual are especially heroic to him.⁸⁴ We shall therefore turn in the next chapter to ἐναγίζειν sacrifice in general and from there to a discussion of its possible significance in Pausanias in relation to hero cult.

82 See for instance Paus. 8.2.4. Again, the case of these exceptional divinized mortals will be considered in the third chapter.

83 See for instance Harrison, *Prolegomena*, 57-64, 337. It should also be recalled that Ekroth's objection that heroes and gods generally receive the same sort of sacrifice concerns an earlier period than that of Pausanias. See Ekroth, 253-256.

84 Paus. 4.3.9.

The Sacrificial Terminology of Hero Cult

Having in the previous chapter established that Pausanias' heroes are beings largely associated with the epic past, distinguished from both the ἄθάνατοι gods and θνητοί at the level of myth, it is fitting next to turn in detail to ritual in order to examine how it may inform Pausanias' concept of the hero. We will begin with a brief discussion of ἐναγίζειν sacrifice in Greek religion from sources outside Pausanias, since it is this form of sacrifice which has traditionally been associated with the cult of heroes in general. As will be seen, ἐναγίζειν is a word used for various forms of cult focused on the dead. It is used to describe ancestral cult and funerary cult in addition to hero cult, although it appears to often convey an unusual aspect when used of funerary cult, suggesting an underlying association between heroes and the dead. This allows ἐναγίζειν to lend a heroic aspect to funerary cult, and conversely an emphasis on mortality to hero cult. Turning next to Pausanias, we will first examine the role of ἐναγίζειν in hero cult, where it will be seen to be capable both of indicating the mortality of the hero and by relation of contrasting him with the gods, especially, although not always, when combined with the phrase ὥς ἦρω. The latter phrase, in addition to others like it such as ὅτε ἦρω, will also be examined, although it will be seen that it is difficult to make generalizations regarding their implications, since these phrases convey little by themselves and can only be understood in relation to other features of the cult as described by Pausanias, including its sacrificial ritual. Turning next to θύειν, which is sometimes used by Pausanias to describe the rituals of divine cult in contrast to those of hero cult, it will be seen that when used of hero cult the term may indicate the divine aspect of the hero, although at the same time it is not incompatible with cults that emphasize his distinction from the gods. Finally there will be a brief examination of other forms of ritual received by Pausanias' heroes, although it will be seen that it is difficult to form generalizations about

these.

2.1. Ἐναγίζειν in Brief

The word Ἐναγίζειν is apparently a verb related to the adjective Ἐναγής.⁸⁵ The word Ἐναγής itself is first attested in tragedy. Aeschylus uses it once when the chorus of the *Supplices* make reference to τέλεα made to the gods should one survive an ordeal, where the word appears to indicate that the sacrifices are made either under, or in fulfilment of, an oath.⁸⁶ A similar usage is seen in Sophocles, where Creon places a curse upon himself should he break his oath: he is called Ἐναγής and said to be trustworthy on this account.⁸⁷ The sense in both cases is, as would be expected, that the people and things termed Ἐναγής are somehow under an ἄγος. The meaning of the latter word is complicated. It may refer simply to a curse or pollution, and it carries a broader sense of what Robert Parker calls the “contagious religious danger” of someone or something set aside to the gods and away from humanity: such a one or thing is termed Ἐναγής and, as the passages cited above indicate, is not by necessity 'accursed' in the typical sense of the term.⁸⁸ However, the operational meaning of Ἐναγής appears generally to be 'accursed.' This meaning is seen in sources as early as Herodotus, who uses the word solely to describe the Alcmaeonidae, who are called the Ἐναγέες on account of their violation of Athena's temple.⁸⁹ Likewise, Thucydides uses the word only

85 It is notable how little is typically said of the word Ἐναγής in discussions of Ἐναγίζειν. For instance, while Gunnel Ekroth has extensively examined the word Ἐναγίζειν itself, she does not discuss Ἐναγής, which is in fact attested slightly earlier and far more frequently than Ἐναγίζειν. Jane Harrison briefly mentions the word in her own treatment of Ἐναγίζειν, translating it as “polluted” and “under or in a state of ἄγος,” which she understands in terms of taboo. See Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, England, 1922), 58-60.

86 Aeschylus, *Supplices*, in *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*, ed. D. L. Page (Oxford, England, 1972), 122.

87 Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, in *Sophoclis fabulae*, eds. H. Lloyd-Jones & N. G. Wilson (Oxford, England, 1990), 656.

88 Robert Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion* (New York, New York, 1983), 5-12.

89 Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. Carolus Hude (London, England, 1927), 1.61.1, 5.70-72.

in reference to the Alcmaeonidae, and he specifies that they are so-called because of the ἄγος of the goddess.⁹⁰ It is this usage of the word which predominates, and Pausanias too uses it solely in the sense of people and things accursed, including the Alcmaeonidae.⁹¹ It will be important to consider the implications of this when we turn to the usage of ἐναγίζειν, which means approximately 'to make (a thing) ἐναγής,' placing it in a state of ἄγος. It would seem that this refers to the act of sacrifice itself, the consecration of a thing to the gods, but it is possible that it could also convey the negative associations typical of ἐναγής, a sense of religious danger.⁹²

90 Thucydides, *Historiae*, ed. Henricus Stuart Jones (London, England, 1984), 1.126.

91 Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*, ed. M. H. Rocha-Pereira (Leipzig, Germany, 1973), 7.25.3. His other uses of the word are to describe the ἀνέραστα τολμήματα committed by Nero against his mother and wives at 9.27.4, the rocks from which Sciron hurled his victims as they are deemed by the Megarians at 1.44.8, and a nominee for the Messenian kingship claimed by some to be ineligible on account of his μίσσμα resulting from the murder of his daughter at 4.10.5.

92 For the 'procedure' of ἐναγίζειν sacrifice see the first chapter on 'chthonian' ritual. However, a word of caution is in order. There is in earlier scholarship a tendency to see the word as indicative of a specific ritual pattern. Harrison, for instance, finds that the pattern is indicated in Athenaeus' discussion of Athenian washing rituals made in purification and in honour of the dead as discussed in a certain treatise on ἐναγισμοί. (See Harrison, 59-61, citing Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 9.78.409.E. ff.) A victim is somehow slain by unspecified persons who then wash themselves, pouring the 'offscourings' of mixed blood and water and also some myrrh into a trench beside the grave: these offscourings appear to constitute the offering, and Harrison understands them, in the terms of 'chthonian' ritual, to be a kind of substitution for the one offering them in placation of the dead. (See Harrison, 60-61.) However, more recent scholarship has challenged the idea that there is a specific ritual procedure indicated by the word ἐναγίζειν, whether or not it indicates something in particular about the character of its recipients. (For the basic distinction between an emphasis on the character of a rite's recipient versus the form of the ritual itself see Scott Scullion, "Olympian and Chthonian," *Classical Antiquity* 13, no. 1 (April, 1994) : 77; Gunnell Ekroth, "The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods," (Ph.D. diss., Stockholm University, 1999), 280, henceforth to be referred to as "Sacrificial rituals.") Ekroth, for instance, downplays the importance of the passage quoted by Athenaeus, noting that its unclear context leaves our understanding of the ritual described in doubt. (See Ekroth, "Sacrificial Rituals," 69.) While she agrees that the word describes a kind of sacrifice in which a meal was not made of a victim, her review of the word's use finds that it can involve all sorts of offerings discarded in diverse ways: cakes could be left or libations made at the tombs of θνητοί or holocausts of animals made to heroes, and in the latter case an emphasis on the blood of the victim as seen in Athenaeus could be absent in favour of an emphasis on the complete burning of the victim. (See Ekroth, "Sacrificial Rituals," 70-71, 106-107. It must be remembered during the course of this discussion that ἐναγίζειν sacrifice defined in such terms should not be equated with chthonian ritual and in turn equated with the rituals typical of hero cult: Parker and others have

Both the word *ἐναγίζειν* itself and its derivatives are commonly used outside Pausanias in relation to ordinary ancestral rituals. Isaeus' orations are among the earliest of the literary sources to use the word thus.⁹³ For instance, in the *De Philoctemone* *ἐναγίζειν* and *χεῖν* appear twice together with reference to the rites performed *ἐπὶ τὰ μνήματα* by those who inherit the *κλήρος* of the deceased.⁹⁴ Similarly, in the *De Menecle* he speaks of his opponent as one who, by depriving him of his paternal *κλήρος*, would leave his father *μήτε τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ πατρῶα ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου μηδὲς τιμᾶ μήτ' ἐναγίζῃ αὐτῷ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτόν*, which suggests that these annual rites are among those typical of ancestral cult.⁹⁵ Indeed, Isaeus' final use of the word in the *De Apollodoro* confirms this usage, speaking of how all those nearing death are concerned that *ἔσται τις ὁ ἐναγιῶν καὶ πάντα τὰ νομιζόμενα αὐτοῖς ποιήσων*.⁹⁶

Isaeus is not alone in using *ἐναγίζειν* with reference to ancestral ritual.⁹⁷

remarked that the rites described by the term *ἐναγίζειν* are not particular to heroes, and in turn that the rites of heroes do not simply coincide with those described as *ἐναγίζειν*; see Parker, “ὥς ἥρωι ἐναγίζειν,” in *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, eds. Robin Hägg & Brita Alroth (Stockholm, Sweden, 2005), 39-40. How this is so in the case of Pausanias's rituals of hero cult shall be seen below.) It seems that we should perhaps accept Christoph Auffarth's conclusion that less important than the precise details of a ritual procedure is the significance attributed to it, and indeed that such ritual terms may not have exacting procedural meanings. (See Christoph Auffarth, “How to Sacrifice Correctly – Without a Manual?,” in *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, eds. Robin Hägg & Brita Alroth (Stockholm, Sweden, 2005), 20.)

93 The word is entirely absent from earlier epic and tragedy, although a form of it does appear in a fragment of Aristophanes: *καὶ θύομεν αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἐναγίσμασιν ὥσπερ θεοῖσι καὶ χοὰς γε χεόμενοι αἰτούμεθ' αὐτοὺς δεῦρ' ἀνείναι τὰγαθὰ*. (See Aristophanes, *Fragmenta*, in *The fragments of Attic comedy*, ed. J. M. Edmonds (Leiden, Netherlands, 1957), 488.12-14.) According to Scullion, these are offerings to the dead. (See Scullion, “Olympian and Chthonian,” 94.) There are no attestations of either the word or its derivatives in the epigraphical record until the late Hellenistic period: see Ekroth, “Sacrificial rituals,” 58.

94 Isaeus, *De Philoctemone*, in *Isée. Discours*, 2nd ed., ed. P. Roussel (Paris, France, 1960), 51.3, 65.2.

95 Ibid., *De Menecle*, in *Isée. Discours*, 2nd ed., ed. P. Roussel (Paris, France, 1960), 46.5.

96 Ibid., *De Apollodoro*, in *Isée. Discours*, 2nd ed., ed. P. Roussel (Paris, France, 1960), 30.4.

97 It should be mentioned now that Ekroth examines all known uses of *ἐναγίζειν* in the second chapter of her study on the rituals of hero cult, “Sacrificial rituals,” 57-107. My initial research on *ἐναγίζειν* was conducted before I found her work, and so the selection of examples here was, for the most part, made on the basis of my own research. However, my interpretation of certain examples has been influenced by Ekroth, and where this is the case it will be indicated.

Plutarch for instance mentions in his discussion of Solon's reform of Athenian funerary customs that he forbade the ἐναγίζειν sacrifice of an ox.⁹⁸ Plutarch in fact makes many references to ἐναγίζειν in the context of ancestral and funerary ritual, although only the aforementioned instance concerns Greek ritual, for he mostly uses ἐναγίζειν to describe Roman customs. For instance, in his nineteenth Roman question he notes that in February the Romans τοῖς φθιμένοις ἐναγίζουσι since it is the end of the year.⁹⁹ He makes similar observations of the February ritual elsewhere, perhaps most significantly in the thirty-fourth Roman question where he twice pairs ἐναγισμός with χοαί in a similar way to Isaeus above.¹⁰⁰ Plutarch does not say that these Roman sacrifices to the dead are specifically ancestral, but this can be inferred from the fact that he is almost certainly referring to the rituals of the Feralia and Parentalia.¹⁰¹ What is important here is simply to observe that a Greek of Plutarch's time found ἐναγίζειν to be an appropriate word with which to describe these annual ancestral sacrifices.

Before proceeding, it should be noted that ancestral and funerary cult have been conflated above: while Isaeus' mentions of ἐναγίζειν and Plutarch's mentions of Roman ἐναγίζειν all appear to be annual sacrifices to one's own ancestors, the sacrifice of an ox forbidden by Solon seems to be performed on the occasion of a funeral. In what follows it may be important to distinguish between the regular sacrifices made to one's ancestors on the one hand and the rituals performed upon the occasion of a funeral on the other, for it has been seen that heroes of cult may be distinguished from θνητοί by the regularity of their worship. The use of ἐναγίζειν in ancestral cult, then, has been briefly considered above. It remains to consider its use in funerary ritual and other sorts of offerings to θνητοί.

⁹⁸ ἐναγίζειν sacrifice is only rarely mentioned in the context of funerary

98 Plutarchus, *Solon*, in *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, 4th ed., ed. K. Ziegler (Leipzig, Germany, 1969), 21.6.

99 Ibid., *Aetia Romana et Graeca*, in *Plutarchi moralia*, ed. J. B. Titchener (Leipzig, Germany, 1935), 268.b.

100 Ibid. 272.d-e.

101 Harrison, 49-52.

ritual, and it often appears in relation to funerary ritual which is unusual. It was seen above that Solon prohibited such a sacrifice of an ox at funerals, presumably because it was indicative of the sort of aristocratic excess which he was seeking to limit, something distinguishing it from more common funerals.¹⁰² Plutarch uses ἐναγίζειν elsewhere to describe other kinds of inappropriate funerary sacrifice. For instance, he relates that Brutus had executed a number of individuals who were seen laughing shortly after the death of Cassius: Publius Casca had complained to him that it was not fitting to sacrifice to Cassius with laughter.¹⁰³ Besides Plutarch, Parthenius describes another sort of uncommon funeral in his tale of Polycrite, saying that αὐτὴν δημοσίᾳ θάπτουσιν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ πάντα ἑκατὸν ἐναγίσαντες αὐτῇ: her funeral is unusual simply because it is a grand public occasion.¹⁰⁴ Even more marked is the use of ἐναγίζειν to describe a funerary human sacrifice of sorts: Appian relates that Spartacus made a sacrifice of three-hundred Roman prisoners to his slain general Crixus.¹⁰⁵ Such uses of ἐναγίζειν in a funerary context are not simply unusual: extraordinary public burials and sacrifices to the recently slain recall certain features associated with hero cult, as does the annual regularity of the ancestral offerings described above. While it is possible that the use of ἐναγίζειν to describe hero cult somehow indicates the hero's mortality through its connection to funerary ritual, it may be supposed that the converse could also be true, that the use of ἐναγίζειν in funerary cult serves to exalt the deceased through an association with the rituals of hero cult.¹⁰⁶ It is however necessary to turn to the use of ἐναγίζειν sacrifice in hero cult as described

102 Plut. *Sol.* 21.6.

103 Ibid., *Brutus*, in *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, 2nd ed., ed. K. Ziegler (Leipzig, Germany, 1964), 45.5.

104 Parthenius, *Narrationes amatoriae*, in *Parthenii Nicaeni quae supersunt*, ed. E. Martini (Leipzig, Germany, 1902), 9.8.7. Ekroth finds a similar usage of the term in early inscriptions; see Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," 62.

105 Appianus, *Bellum civile*, ed. P. Viereck, in *Appian's Roman history*, ed. H. White (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1913), 1.14.117.12.

106 For the ability of ἐναγίζειν sacrifice to indicate the mortality of its recipient, see Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," especially 270-274.

outside Pausanias who, after all, never uses the word in relation to simple funerary and ancestral offerings.¹⁰⁷

Whatever the precise relationship between ἐναγίζειν, hero cult, and funerary and ancestral cult, the existence of such a relationship is implied by a number of sources, including among the earliest Plutarch. For instance, in commenting yet again on the ancestral offerings of February he remarks that the Romans set aside the first month for the gods but the second for the χθόνιοι during which they perform ἐναγίζειν sacrifice to the κατοιχόμενοι: similarly, the Greeks set aside the first day of the month for the gods but the second for the heroes and δαίμονες.¹⁰⁸ This parallel suggests some sort of relationship in at least Plutarch's mind between the Roman dead on the one hand and the Greek heroes and δαίμονες on the other, whether on the basis of their own nature or the rituals performed for their sake.¹⁰⁹ Of course, it should also be noted that Plutarch does not here say that heroes receive ἐναγίζειν sacrifice. He does, however, say this elsewhere, in criticizing Herodotus' discussion of Heracles. Herodotus, in what is one of the earliest surviving references to the rituals of hero cult, says that καὶ δοκέουσι δέ μοι οὗτοι ὀρθότατα Ἑλλήνων ποιέειν, οἱ διὰ Ἡράκλεια ἰδρυσάμενοι ἔκτηνται, καὶ τῷ μὲν ὡς ἀθανάτῳ, Ὀλυμπίῳ δὲ ἐπωνυμίην θύουσι, τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ ὡς ἥρῳ ἐναγίζουσι.¹¹⁰ Plutarch takes exception to this, saying that since Herodotus recognizes the divinity of the Egyptian Heracles and Dionysus but numbers their Greek counterparts only among the heroes, he does not think it fitting for the Greek Dionysus and Heracles to receive θύειν sacrifice as gods but only ὡς φθιτοῖς

107 It should be noted now that we will return in the fourth chapter to the further implications of being ἐναγής to our understanding of the one who performs ἐναγίζειν.

108 Plut. *Aetia Romana et Graeca*, 270.a.

109 Returning to the scholarship on “chthonian religion” mentioned in the last chapter, it is this passage, among others, that Harrison cites in elaborating her own conception of chthonian religion. (See Harrison, 50.) For a summary of the disagreement as to the relationship between the “character of the recipient” and the ritual performed see Scullion, “Olympian and Chthonian,” 75-79.

110 Hdt. 2.44.5.

καὶ ἥρωσιν ἐναγίζειν.¹¹¹ This again suggests an analogy between the dead and the heroes, but this time it also specifies that ἐναγίζειν sacrifice is appropriate to both. Likewise, just as Isaeus taken together with Plutarch suggests a long-standing association between ἐναγίζειν and ancestral cult, Herodotus taken together with Plutarch suggests a similar association between ἐναγίζειν and heroic cult, whatever might precisely be its nature.

Plutarch is among the only ancient writers to make such general statements as those above about ἐναγίζειν and its suitability to the cult of heroes as named class of beings. There are also a few scattered references to this kind of sacrifice being made to individual beings named as heroes. Strabo, for instance, says that Calchas receives such sacrifice at his hero-shrine in Daunia.¹¹² Arrian also mentions the ἐναγίζειν sacrifice made by Alexander to the hero Amphilochus at Mallus; Strabo records the same incident, although he doesn't identify Amphilochus as a hero.¹¹³ However, it is not clear whether this sacrifice is indicative of regular cult. Perhaps even more difficult is Arrian's record that Alexander ἐναγίζειν τε ὅτι αἰὲς ὡς ἥρω ἐκέλευεν Ἡφαιστίωνι.¹¹⁴ While there is the suggestion here that Alexander established a regular hero cult for Hephaestion, the context of the passage is the latter's recent death: we are not shown the ritual of hero cult itself but instead its establishment within a funerary context. It is thus impossible on the basis of this passage alone to say that ἐναγίζειν sacrifice is properly heroic or properly ancestral or funerary. Returning to the question posed above concerning the relation of these aspects of the ritual, it may be that it would be misguided to attempt to disentangle them. Although this discussion concerns

111 Plutarchus, *De Herodoti malignitate*, in *Plutarch's moralia*, ed. L. Pearson (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965), 872.f. That the divine Heracles is Egyptian is said by Herodotus shortly before his discussion of his cult in Greece, at Hdt. 2.43.

112 Strabo, *Geographica*, in *Strabonis geographica*, ed. A. Meineke (Leipzig, Germany, 1877), 6.3.9.32.

113 Ibid. 14.5.17.5; Arrianus, *Alexandri anabasis*, in *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia*, eds. A. G. Roos & G. Wirth (Leipzig, Germany, 1967), 2.5.9.4.

114 Arr. *Ana.* 7.14.7.1.

primarily hero cult in Pausanias and as such ἐναγίζειν sacrifice will be more relevant through its ability to emphasize the mortality of the hero via its association with funerary and ancestral cult than its ability to somehow exalt the deceased via its association with hero cult, it should be kept in mind that the ritual associations which can be made through ἐναγίζειν are complicated in the ways here described.

Beyond the examples cited above, there are no further mentions of ἐναγίζειν and explicit hero cult made in the ancient sources preceding or contemporary with Pausanias. There are of course a number of other references made to the cults of beings who could very well be heroes but aren't specified as such. However, since it is the subject of such beings in Pausanias that is the main object of investigation here, it would not be fitting to consider these now. Nevertheless, it should be remarked that the difficulties presented by Pausanias as regards these beings are also present in other sources. Such difficulties include the specification of certain beings as gods who look very much like heroes and even receive ἐναγίζειν sacrifice.¹¹⁵

2.2. Ἐναγίζειν Sacrifice, Sacrifice ὡς ἥρω, and Specified Heroes

As mentioned above, Pausanias never uses the word ἐναγίζειν with reference to ancestral or funerary offerings: however, the word abounds with reference to hero cult, and we have some reason to expect it to be capable of indicating the mortality of the hero and thereby his distinction from the gods. In most cases, these mentions of ἐναγίζειν are only made to specific heroes, but a few mentions may be understood as general statements about the suitability of ἐναγίζειν sacrifice to heroes. The most detailed of these is the description of the cult of Heracles at Sicyon, a passage which has been cited as paradigmatic in

¹¹⁵ For this see Strab. 13.1.32.9-16. The case of divinized mortals in Pausanias and their distinction from heroes will be further discussed in the next chapter.

discussions of hero cult.¹¹⁶ Pausanias relates that the Sicyonians explain the origin of their ritual thus: Φαῖστον ἐν Σικυωνίᾳ λέγουσιν ἐλθόντα καταλαβεῖν Ἡρακλεῖ σφᾶς ὡς ἥρω ἐναγίζοντας: οὐκ οὐκ ἡξίου δρᾶν οὐδὲν ὁ Φαῖστος τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεῷ θύειν. καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἄρνα Σικυώνιοι σφάξαντες καὶ τοὺς μηρούς ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ καύσαντες τὰ μὲν ἐσθίουσιν ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερείου, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἥρω τῶν κρεῶν ἐναγίζουσι.¹¹⁷ What is most significant here is the contrast between the hero and the god: Heracles receives ἐναγίζειν sacrifice as a hero but θύειν sacrifice as a god. As was discussed in the previous chapter, one of the defining characteristics of heroes is their distinction from the gods, and at Sicyon the form of the sacrificial rituals performed, which are clearly differentiated in terms of their procedure, indicates this distinction. Of course, this passage immediately recalls Herodotus' own mention of the Greeks who sacrifice to Heracles both as a hero and a god, which also uses the phrase ὡς ἥρω.¹¹⁸ Parker's remarks on the episode in Herodotus are equally appropriate to Pausanias: the passage gives us strong reason to suppose that ἐναγίζειν sacrifice is suitable to heroes, but it would be a mistake on this basis to assume that it is a necessary feature of their cults.¹¹⁹ Indeed, the reasons why this is not the case will be examined further below. However, it is important for now to note the ability of ἐναγίζειν sacrifice to distinguish heroes from gods at the level of ritual.

Of course, to make such a generalization on the basis of Heracles alone would be problematic, since the case of Heracles is extremely atypical.¹²⁰ However, there are other explicit oppositions made between ἐναγίζειν and θύειν in Pausanias. At Titane, shortly after seeing the temple of Heracles at Sicyon, Pausanias sees the sanctuary of Asclepius, the foundation of which is attributed to the god's son, Alexanor: the latter receives ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω, while Euamerion,

116 See for instance Harrison, 57.

117 Paus. 2.10.1.

118 Hdt. 2.44.5.

119 Robert Parker, "ὡς ἥρωι ἐναγίζειν," 40-41.

120 Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," 68.

whom Pausanias speculates is a divinity of healing worshipped elsewhere under other names, receives $\thetaύειν$ $ὡς$ $θεῶν$.¹²¹ There is thus again a contrast between these two rituals made on the basis of their recipient, distinguishing between gods and heroes. Although the phrase $ὡς$ $ἥρω$ occurs elsewhere in Pausanias, nowhere else does it mark such an explicit distinction between gods and heroes than in the two cases described above, both of which link it to $ἐναγίζειν$ sacrifice. Such a distinction is however made in a very similar way between Dionysus and the associated hero who guided him to Sparta, but here Pausanias says only that $τῶ$ $δὲ$ $ἥρω$ $τούτῳ$ $πρὶν$ $ἢ$ $τῶ$ $θεῶ$ $θύουσιν$.¹²² Regarding the choice of verb made by Pausanias in this passage, Ekroth suggests that he uses $\thetaύειν$ in this construction because it is appropriate to both Dionysus and the hero, unlike $ἐναγίζειν$ which would only suit the hero.¹²³ While quite possible since Dionysus is not among the very few gods to receive $ἐναγίζειν$ sacrifice in Pausanias, this does not account for the choice of grammatical construction in the first place. However, that the rituals' being both described as $\thetaύειν$ diminishes the distinction between the god and the hero through their form cannot be inferred from this choice. Conversely, sacrifices to heroes are often found to proceed sacrifices to gods, as is the case of this hero and Dionysus, and this may instead serve to emphasize their distinction.¹²⁴ In any case, it is clear from these few statements about $ἐναγίζειν$ $ὡς$ $ἥρω$ that it serves to indicate the distinction between gods and heroes at the level

121 Paus. 2.11.7. Specifically, Pausanias identifies Euamerion with the one called Telesphorus at Pergamum and Aceso at Epidauros. Frazer discusses their relation to the cult of Asclepius and their healing function at Pausanias, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 2nd ed., ed. & trans. J. G. Frazer (London, England, 1913), *Commentary on Books II-V*, 70-72.

122 Paus. 3.13.7.

123 Ekroth, "Pausanias and the Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults," in *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, ed. Robin Hägg (Stockholm, Sweden, 1999), 156 n. 39, henceforth to be cited as "Pausanias." It should be mentioned now that this article contains a valuable chart on page 149, listing all the heroic recipients of sacrifice in Pausanias. However, Ekroth includes certain figures, to be discussed in the next chapter, designated by Pausanias as gods and receiving $\thetaύειν$ sacrifice although appearing in certain respects to be like heroes. As was discussed in the previous chapter, it may be problematic to list such figures as heroes.

124 For the phenomenon of heroic sacrifice preceding divine sacrifice in a particular cult see Harrison, 338.

of ritual.

As mentioned above, Pausanias' few remaining mentions of ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω do not make this same ritual distinction: the fallen Oresthasian troops simply receive such sacrifice at their πολυάνδριον in Phigalia, as does Iphicles at his μνημα in Pheneus.¹²⁵ In the latter case there is however another kind of contrast made between heroes and gods, for Pausanias says that Ἴφικλεῖ μὲν δὴ καὶ ἐς τόδε ἔτι ἐναγίζουσιν ὡς ἥρω, θεῶν δὲ τιμῶσιν Ἑρμῆν Φενεᾶται μάλιστα καὶ ἀγῶνα ἄγουσιν Ἑρμαία, καὶ ναός ἐστιν Ἑρμοῦ σφισι καὶ ἄγαλμα λίθου.¹²⁶ There a contrast here at the level of cult: ἐναγίζειν sacrifice, as has been mentioned, is used primarily for heroes in Pausanias, and Hermes' possession of a ναός is, with the likely exceptions of Hippolytus at Troezen and the Hero of Temesa, an honour not received by Pausanias' heroes but one commonly received by gods.¹²⁷ However, this is not as explicit a ritual contrast as the ἐναγίζειν ὡς ἥρω / θύειν ὡς θεῷ one above. The main contrast seems rather to be one directly concerning the status of

125 Paus. 8.14.10, 8.41.1. There are thus four references to such sacrifice made by Pausanias, these concerning Heracles and then Euamerion in the second book, and then the cults at Phigalia and Pheneus much later in the eighth.

126 Ibid., 8.14.10.

127 For the listing of heroic cult-places see Ekroth, "Pausanias," 149. Note that Trophonius is also listed as having a ναός at Paus. 9.39.4. However, Pausanias states at 1.34.2 that Trophonius receives the honours of a god, and at 4.32.5 refers to Trophonius as τὸν ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ θεόν and again with the phrase χρησόμενον τῷ θεῷ at 9.39.12. Moreover, at no point does Pausanias call Trophonius a hero or refer to his sanctuary as a hero-shrine. As will be seen in the next chapter, Pausanias is elsewhere inconsistent and calls certain figures at some times gods and at other times heroes, but such is not the case of Trophonius, who is clearly a god. As for Hippolytus, Pausanias mentions his ναός and θύειν sacrifice at 2.32.1; Ekroth's 2.31.1 and 2.23.1 seem to be errors. Although Pausanias does not specify in this passage that Hippolytus is a hero, he says at 3.12.9 that he has a hero-shrine at Sparta. Given that he is a hero at Sparta and that he is not specified as being a god at Troezen, it seems best to conclude that he is more likely a hero than a god to Pausanias at Troezen. Incidentally, Pausanias mentions at 2.32.1 that the people of Troezen do not indicate the grave of Hippolytus, and Ekroth supposes that this was not of importance to his cult; see Ekroth, "Pausanias," 148, 148 n. 18. In contrast, Frazer suspects in such cases that the place of burial was kept secret as a kind of defence of the land and thus that the grave was of great importance: see Frazer, *Commentary on Books II-V*, 281; *Commentary on Book I*, 366-367. Oddly enough, Pausanias refers a few lines later at 2.32.4 to the Ἰππολύτου μνήματος near Phaedra's grave, but what he means by this is unclear in light of his preceding remarks. Given his lack of specificity and this confusion regarding the body of Hippolytus and its importance to his cult, it is difficult on the basis of Pausanias to say whether Hippolytus is a hero or a god to the people of Troezen themselves.

the two beings, for Hermes is contrasted to Iphicles in that the former is one of the gods: Pausanias' syntax of Ἰφικλεῖ μὲν ... θεῶν δὲ makes this apparent.¹²⁸

The remaining instances of ὥς ἥρω involve τιμαί, but make no mention of ἐναγίζειν. Two of these are in the book on Messenia: the great Aristomenes holds honours there ὥς ἥρω, and in Messene the statesman Aethidas receives honours ἅτε ἥρω.¹²⁹ Both of these heroes are interesting in that they are among the minority of Pausanias' heroes who are too recent to belong to the age of heroes, and Aethidas in particular is almost without peer as heroic statesman from as late as the Hellenistic period.¹³⁰ The scarcity of heroes from Pausanias' Hellenistic period and beyond is especially interesting in light of the fact that these periods are generally thought to have introduced an increase in the heroization and even divinization of mortals.¹³¹ As such, it is right to ask whether Aethidas receives his τιμαί of exceptional sacrifice as a hero or simply *as though* a hero, especially since he alone is described as being honoured ἅτε ἥρω instead of ὥς ἥρω, which might indicate precisely such a distinction.¹³² A useful comparison may be provided through Pausanias' treatment of Hellenistic ruler cult and Roman imperial cult: as will be discussed more fully elsewhere, Pausanias is notably disdainful of these, declining to refer to these gods as such, and he remarks that in his own degenerate era men no longer become gods πλὴν ὅσον λόγῳ καὶ κολακείᾳ πρὸς τὸ ὑπερέχον.¹³³ It may be significant that both of Pausanias' Hellenistic heroes are

128 Paus. 8.14.10. Of course, the contrast of ἐναγίζειν ὥς ἥρω / θύειν ὥς θεῶ implies this same basic distinction, but the explicit contrast is at the level of ritual.

129 Ibid., 4.14.7, 4.32.2.

130 For the case of another heroic Hellenistic statesman, Aratus of Sicyon, see *ibid.*, 2.8.1.

131 Dennis D. Hughes, "Hero Cult, Heroic Honors, Heroic Dead: Some Developments in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," in *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, ed. Robin Hägg (Stockholm, Sweden, 1999), 168, 172; Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," 6, 6 n. 17; Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. John Raffan (Malden, Massachusetts, 1985), 206.

132 For the argument that the phrase ὥς ἥρω is generally best rendered "as a hero" and not "as to a hero" see Scullion, "Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinous," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132 (2000) : 169. Scullion argues however that this is only the case for the earlier period, since by the Imperial period it had become a way of marking "chthonian" sacrifice.

133 Christian Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, California, 1985), 105;

Greek patriots who resisted the Macedonians: as Christian Habicht has argued, one of the unifying themes of Pausanias' work is the Greeks' resistance against barbarians, and Pausanias shows his great approval of those individuals and cities that resisted the Persians, Macedonians, Gauls, and even Romans.¹³⁴ Since Pausanias does not describe most of the Hellenistic heroes and gods as such, quite possibly and at times explicitly because of a certain contempt of his for them, it is entirely possible that his exceptional mention of Aethidas really is meant to mark his distinction, and as such Pausanias' description of his being honoured ἄτε ἥρω may very well indicate that he is a hero.¹³⁵ Of course, even if Pausanias instead considers Aethidas to be a mortal who receives cult as though a hero, there is still for the aforementioned reasons cause to suppose that he receives this cult with the marked approval of Pausanias for his τιμαί.¹³⁶

The final hero to receive the τιμαί of sacrifice ὡς ἥρω is also a particularly interesting case. Pausanias relates that when the Astypalaeans consulted Delphi regarding the strange disappearance of the athlete Cleomedes they were told by the Pythia that he was the ὕστατος ἥρώων whom they were to honour with θυσίαι, and so for him they τιμάς ὡς ἥρω νέμουσιν.¹³⁷ Cleomedes has influenced the study of hero cult from Rohde onwards, but what is of significance to us here is the form of his explicitly heroic sacrifice, a form of θύειν.¹³⁸ It has already been said that

Paus. 8.2.5.

134 Habicht, 104-105, 120-122.

135 On the other hand, it should be noted that at 3.15.5 Pausanias sees a ναός where Hipposthenes the athlete, by command of an oracle, receives honours ἄτε Ποσειδῶνι. In this case ἄτε would seem most likely to mean 'as though.' Additionally, since the possession of a ναός was seen above to be uncharacteristic of heroes in Pausanias, and since Hipposthenes is not called a hero by Pausanias, it may be that Hipposthenes' ναός is indicative of the divine nature of his cult.

136 More remains to be said of the holding of heroic τιμαί, but for now it should be noted that Pausanias speaks again of Alexanor and his cult at 2.23.4 without reference to its sacrificial ritual of nocturnal ἐναγίζειν, saying of him there that he παρὰ Σικυωνίοις ἐν Τιτάνη τιμάς ἔχοντος.

137 Paus. 6.9.8. Pausanias quotes the oracle thus: ὕστατος ἥρώων Κλεομήδης Ἀστυπάλαιεύς, / ὃν θυσίαις τιμά<θ' ἄ>τε μηκέτι θνητὸν ἔοντα.

138 Erwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, 8th ed., trans. W. B. Hillis (London, England, 1925), 129. This association of θυσία with θύειν is made following Ekroth; see "Pausanias," 147. Of course, θυσίαι could arguably be understood in a

many of Pausanias' heroes receive such sacrifice, but what is unique about Cleomedes is that he receives it ὥς ἥρω: as has been seen above, the other heroes who receive sacrifice ὥς ἥρω all do so by means of ἐναγίζειν.¹³⁹ The use of θύειν instead of ἐναγίζειν is also interesting because of the emphasis on Cleomedes' surpassing of mortality. In the cases of ἐναγίζειν ὥς ἥρω there is often a contrast made between the hero and the god, and specific mention is made of the graves of the Oresthians and Iphicles. Ekroth has argued that ἐναγίζειν sacrifice and the presence of graves emphasize the mortal aspect of the hero while θύειν emphasizes the divine aspect, and additionally the general association between ἐναγίζειν and the cults of the dead has been described above, and so it may be significant that Cleomedes, the one no longer mortal whose miraculous disappearance renders him without the grave so typical of hero cult, receives θύειν sacrifice.¹⁴⁰ As such, it is possible that the ritual of his cult, unlike those of the heroes receiving ἐναγίζειν ὥς ἥρω, serves to emphasize an especially divine aspect of him. In any case, it is apparent that what is indicative of these aspects of a hero's cult in Pausanias are the term used to describe the sacrifice made to the hero and the overall context of the passage, while phrases such as ὥς ἥρω convey little in their own right.¹⁴¹

Before turning to the other specified heroes who receive θύειν sacrifice it must be mentioned that there is one final case of specifically heroic ἐναγίζειν sacrifice in Pausanias, the only case not to involve the phrase ὥς ἥρω, that of the Children of Oedipus. Pausanias says that they are among τῶν καλουμένων ἡρώων

general sense simply as a sacrificial festival. However, it would in this case be remarkable that Pausanias never uses the term θυσία to describe a festival which includes ἐναγίζειν sacrifice, but does use the term on three occasions when the word θύειν is used to describe the sacrifice made. (A listing of Pausanias' usage of θυσία may be found in Ekroth, "Pausanias," 149.)

139 It should again be noted that while Aristomenes and Aethidas are honoured ὥς ἥρω, Pausanias makes no mention of the sacrificial rituals of their cults.

140 Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," 270-274; "Pausanias," 148.

141 By "context" is meant such things as the type of monument where the cult is located, any connections to the cults of a god, the mythology of the cult, etc.

by the Thebans and that they receive ἐναγίζειν at their μνήματα there.¹⁴² There is nothing particularly exceptional about them for our purposes, although it should be mentioned that their case, like that of many of Pausanias' heroes who receive ἐναγίζειν sacrifice, supports Ekroth's thesis that for these heroes in Pausanias the place of their cult is of importance in emphasizing their mortality.¹⁴³

2.3. Θύειν Sacrifice and Specified Heroes

It has been seen above that Pausanias often mentions θύειν sacrifice as something made to gods, even contrasting it to the ἐναγίζειν sacrifice received by heroes.¹⁴⁴ However, there are five cases of specifically heroic θύειν sacrifice in Pausanias, which is in fact the same as the number of such ἐναγίζειν cases. Two of these have already been mentioned: Cleomedes of Astypalaea and the Hero who guided Dionysus to Sparta, and it has been found of the cult of the former that there may be an emphasis on his divine aspect through the form of his sacrificial ritual, while the cult of the latter is more difficult to understand in this regard because of Pausanias' choice of language. Of the remaining three heroes, Pelops at Olympia is the most paradigmatic, having informed many important studies of hero cult.¹⁴⁵ Although Pausanias says that the Eleans θύουσι to him annually at his τέμενος there is a notable indication in the description of his cult on his distinction from the gods.¹⁴⁶ This distinction is present from the start of Pausanias' relatively lengthy description of the cult, which begins thus: ἔστι δὲ ἐντὸς τῆς Ἀλτεως καὶ Πέλοπι ἀποτετμημένον τέμενος· ἡρώων δὲ τῶν ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ τοσοῦτον

¹⁴² Paus. 9.18.3.

¹⁴³ Ekroth, "Pausanias," 148.

¹⁴⁴ The word θύειν, in contrast to ἐναγίζειν, is an unmarked term for sacrifice generally. See Ekroth, "Sacrificial Rituals," 57.

¹⁴⁵ See for instance Harrison, 337; Arthur Darby Nock, "The Attic Orgeones and the Cult of Heroes," *The Harvard Theological Review* 37, no. 2 (April, 1944) : 143. I owe recognition of the θύειν sacrifices to Pelops and to Ino, whose cult will be discussed afterwards, to Ekroth, "Pausanias," 149.

¹⁴⁶ Paus. 5.13.1-2.

προτετιμημένος ἐστὶν ὁ Πέλοψ ὑπὸ Ἡλείων ὁδὸν Ζεὺς θεῶν τῶν ἄλλων.¹⁴⁷ The distinction here made is present at the level of ritual, for Pausanias mentions that those who eat the meat from the sacrifice made to Pelops cannot enter the temple of Zeus, which he likens to a similar prohibition in the cult of Asclepius at Pergamum, wherein those who sacrifice to Telephus must first purify themselves before entering the sanctuary of Asclepius.¹⁴⁸ Interestingly, the verb for this sacrifice is again θύειν: it would not appear that Pausanias finds the specification of ἐναγίζειν necessary to enforce the distinction between gods and heroes. The distinction between Pelops the hero and Zeus the god is also present in the legends of the foundations of their cults. Pausanias says of Pelops that Heracles the son of Amphitryon was the first to perform the sacrifice to him, while shortly after this he says that the altar of Olympian Zeus is attributed by some to Heracles the Idaean Dactyl.¹⁴⁹ This latter Heracles is a complicated figure of importance to Pausanias who will be discussed in the next chapter. However, it can be said of him now that he is the eldest of the Curetes who founded the Olympic games, which were in their first instance a race between his four brothers, although Pausanias adds that others attribute the foundation of the Olympics to Zeus himself.¹⁵⁰ Given his antiquity and accomplishments, there is, as will be discussed, some reason to consider Heracles the Idaean Dactyl to be a more august figure to Pausanias' imagination than the son of Amphitryon. This would create an opposition between the lesser Heracles who founds the cult of the hero Pelops and the greater Heracles who largely founds the cult of the god Zeus, further serving to indicate the distinction between gods and heroes in Pelops' cult. Of course, it should not be overlooked that this emphasis is not necessarily equivalent to an emphasis on Pelops' mortality, of which there appears to be little at Olympia: Pausanias does not mention a grave, although he relates that the Eleans brought

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 5.13.1.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 5.13.3.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 5.13.2, 5.13.8.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 5.7.6-10.

the shoulder of Pelops there at the behest of Delphi, but that it had disappeared by his own time.¹⁵¹ Such nuances are to be expected in light of the distinction between heroes and θνητοί, and they may even suggest that θύειν sacrifice can occur in cults which emphasize the difference between the hero and the god in a similar way as seen in the cults featuring ἐνχαγίζειν sacrifice but without the latter's more likely although not inevitable emphasis on the mortality of the hero.¹⁵²

Of the two remaining cases of specifically heroic θύειν sacrifice, each indicates one of the aspects discussed above, namely the distinction of the heroic from the divine or the mortality of the hero. The first case is that of Ino at Megara, who receives annual θύσια at her ἡρῶον.¹⁵³ Pausanias remarks that the local tradition, in which it is related that her corpse washed ashore at Megara and was buried there and that the Megarians were the first to offer her regular sacrifice and call her by the name of Leucothea, is unique among the Greeks.¹⁵⁴ Indeed, under the name Leucothea he sees her worshipped elsewhere simply as a goddess, such as near Corone in Messenia, where there is again a local emphasis that it was here Ino became Leucothea, although in this case she emerges from the sea as a living goddess and not a corpse.¹⁵⁵ In the case of Ino's cult at Megara it seems that there is an emphasis on her mortality, and furthermore that this too is compatible with θύειν sacrifice to her in the mind of Pausanias. The second case is more obscure. Pausanias tells of the Arcadian hero Fly-catcher, to whom the people of Aliphera offer prayers and προθύουσιν for the aversion of flies during the festival

151 Ibid., 5.13.4-6.

152 This is to be expected from Ekroth's model, as discussed in the previous chapter. See Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," 271.

153 Paus. 1.42.7.

154 Ibid. (Nagy argues on the basis of this passage in Pausanias among others that it is the Megarian Ino to whom Theognis refers in his lines 1229-1230 thus: ἤδη γάρ με κέκληκε θαλάσσιος οἴκαδε νεκρός, / τεθνηκώς ζωῶ φθεγγόμενος στόματι. See Gregory Nagy, "Theognis and Megara: A Poet's Vision of his City," in *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, eds. Thomas J. Figueira & Gregory Nagy (Baltimore, Maryland: 1985), 75-78.)

155 Paus. 4.34.4.

of Athena, the goddess most revered among them.¹⁵⁶ This festival appears to follow the common pattern, already mentioned, of a sacrifice to a hero made at the start of the festival of a god, and indeed it is likely that this is here indicated by the prefix *προ-*. As such, it may contain an element of emphasis on the distinction between the hero and the goddess. Interestingly, this function of pest control is seen elsewhere in Pausanias, where the Eleans at Olympia sacrifice to Zeus the Averter of Flies, following the practice established by Heracles the son of Alcmena.¹⁵⁷ Frazer notes with regards to this passage that there were other divinities besides these to whom offerings were made for the aversion of pests, namely Apollo and Heracles himself.¹⁵⁸ Whether or not this latter Heracles is best understood to be a hero or god, Apollo and Zeus are plainly gods, and so this may make Fly-catcher an unusual hero in that his function is more commonly divine. As such, his possible divine aspect might be of significance to his cult, perhaps explaining Pausanias' description of his ritual as a kind of *θύειν* sacrifice. In any case, these further examples support what has already been said: the cults of heroes said to receive *θύειν* sacrifice too may feature an emphasis on the distinction between the hero and the god, and while the nature of this distinction may be related to the mortality of the hero, it need not be so by necessity and is indeed less likely to be so than it is in the case of cults featuring *ἐναγίζειν*. Moreover, there is no apparent incompatibility between cults involving *θύειν* sacrifice and an emphasis on the similarity of the hero to the gods and/or his difference from *θνητοί*. It would, however, be straining this argument to say that these effects are brought about by *θύειν* sacrifice itself, for, with the possible exception of an indication of the similarity of the hero to the gods, these effects would all appear to be brought about by other features of a hero's cult. This is indicative of one of the basic differences between *ἐναγίζειν* and *θύειν*, as noted at

156 Ibid., 8.26.7. The name of the hero is *Μυταγρος*.

157 Ibid., 5.14.1. The god is surnamed *Ἀπομύιος*. As for this Heracles, Pausanias refers to him variously as the son of Amphitryon, as seen above, or the son of Alcmena, as seen here.

158 Frazer, *Commentary on Books II-V*, 558-559.

the beginning of this section: *θύειν* is an unmarked term for sacrifice, only taking on more specific associations with divinity when contrasted with a marked sacrificial term such as *ἐναγίζειν*.¹⁵⁹ It is therefore not surprising that the word *ἐναγίζειν* itself may indicate more about the nature of its recipient than *θύειν*, and that the latter word is apparently more flexible in its application, able to describe the rituals of cults which construct the nature of their sacrificial recipients in diverse ways.

2.4. Other Forms of Sacrifice, Heroic Honours, and Specified Heroes

Of the remaining forms of sacrifice to Pausanias' specified heroes there are two: libation and human sacrifice. Of the three cases of libations, the first two do not particularly seem to indicate the mortality of the heroes or their distinction from gods or *θυητοί*: these are Aristomenes, mentioned above, and the 'heroes and wives of heroes' who receive libations and other *τιμαί* from the Eleans and Aetolians.¹⁶⁰ More interesting is the founder hero at Tronis in Daulis said to be Xanthippus, whose daily sacrifice at his hero-shrine Pausanias describes thus: *ἔχει δ' οὖν ἐπὶ ἡμέρᾳ τε πάσῃ τιμὰς καὶ ἄγοντες ἱερεῖα οἱ Φωκεῖς τὸ μὲν αἷμα δι' ὁπῆς ἐσχέουσιν ἐς τὸν τάφον, τὰ δὲ κρέα ταύτῃ σφίσιν ἀναλοῦν καθέστηκεν*.¹⁶¹ Xanthippus' *ἥρωον* is thus identified as a *τάφος*, and in this capacity it appears to be of great importance to his cult since there is such an effort made to see to it that his remains receive their daily libation of blood. As such, this libation can be understood to emphasize the mortality of the hero. As for human sacrifice, Pausanias of course sees no such thing in his travels through Greece, but it features prominently in the legend of Euthymus the athlete. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, Euthymus is said to have fought with the Hero at his *τέμενος* and driven the wrathful *δαίμων* into the sea, thus putting an end to the Temesan

¹⁵⁹ Ekroth, "Sacrificial Rituals," 57.

¹⁶⁰ Paus. 4.14.7-8, 5.15.12.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 10.4.10.

custom of making an annual maiden sacrifice to the Hero, a cult originally established among them at the behest of Delphi in order to ἰλάσκεσθαι the murdered Hero and thereby save them from his wrath.¹⁶² This story is unique in Pausanias in that its hero is regularly called a δαίμων, and he is the only specified hero to possess a νᾱός, with the possible exception of Hippolytus as discussed above. Although the death of the Hero is important to the myth, there is no mention of the Hero's remains, but rather a focus on his life-like potency after death. The apparent lack of the remains accords with Ekroth's claim that burial is not of importance to the cult of a hero at a νᾱός, but otherwise there is still present a focus on the Hero's mortality, besides his strange daemonic nature.¹⁶³ In any case, since the form of sacrifice offered to the Hero is unique in Pausanias, and since it must be remembered that the myth of the Hero is more properly the myth of Euthymus since there is no reason to suppose that the Hero actually receives cult, it would be difficult to make generalizations as to how such sacrifice constructs Pausanias' heroes.

Before proceeding to discuss the sacrificial rituals offered to beings who appear in some ways heroic in Pausanias but are rather called gods, it should be noted that sacrifice is not the only indication of cult for Pausanias' specified heroes. For instance, it has already been said that Pausanias may mention the presence of a ἡρώων or other place of cult without mentioning the nature of the rituals performed there. In other cases he may mention the presence of the cult through the verb σέβεσθαι, such as in the cult of the dead Greek soldiers designated as heroes at Marathon or the cult of Hector at Thebes, established at the behest of an oracle to bring his remains thither and to ἡρώα σέβεσθαι.¹⁶⁴ These are in fact the only two instances of σέβεσθαι used for specified heroes, and in both

162 Ibid., 6.6.7-11. This pattern of death requiring propitiation is paradigmatic, although heroes more typically exact their revenge by means of an impersonal plague rather than in person. See for instance Rohde, 128-129; Ekroth, "Sacrificial rituals," 75-76.

163 Ekroth, "Pausanias," 148, 148 n. 18.

164 Paus. 1.32.4, 9.18.4.

there is an emphasis on the mortality of the heroes through their graves, although this emphasis is not made through the term σέβεσθαι itself. Pausanias also mentions the possession of τιμαί or γέρα by four heroes not already mentioned here: of these, a grave is only mentioned for Pandion, and it is located elsewhere than the ἡρώων where he receives honours in Megara.¹⁶⁵ Of the other three Pausanias mentions no remains. Firstly, he says that the Athenians honour Echetlaeus at the behest of Delphi, having made the consultation in response to the sight of an ἀφανής man fighting with a plough and slaying many Persians at Marathon, and he does not even mention the site of the hero's cult.¹⁶⁶ In the case of Peruses' cult near Argos, he mentions only his ἡρώων and reception of τιμὰς παρὰ τῶν προσχωρίων, and of Messene he says only that she has the γέρα...τὰ νομιζόμενα ἡρώσιν.¹⁶⁷ It is, however, difficult to make generalizations about how Pausanias constructs his heroes in these cases, outside of their shared receipt of τιμαί or γέρα.

Thus far only beings specified as heroes by Pausanias have been discussed, but as is clear from the case above of Hippolytus, who is described as a hero in certain passages while only mentioned by name in others, that Pausanias does not always specify that his heroes are such.¹⁶⁸ Likewise, it was seen in the case of Trophonius briefly mentioned above that certain figures may possess heroic qualities and appear arguably to be heroes save for the fact that Pausanias makes it clear they are gods.¹⁶⁹ There remain then two sorts of “heroic” beings to discuss: those like Hippolytus who are arguably heroes and those divinized mortals who, while they may appear to be heroes for reasons similar to those by which heroes appear as such, are in fact specified by Pausanias as being gods. It is therefore necessary to establish why to Pausanias the former are probably heroes and also

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 1.41.6.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 1.32.5.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 2.18.1, 4.3.9.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 2.32.1, 3.12.9.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 1.34.2, 4.32.5, 9.39.12; Rohde, 121.

why the latter are clearly not, which shall be the topic of the next chapters.

Becoming a God

To better understand those who are Pausanias' heroes it is necessary next to give attention to those mortals who are said by him to have become gods, for by their comparison to heroes it may be possible to gain a more precise knowledge of the distinction between god and hero. It will be found by this investigation that gods are largely more panhellenic figures than heroes, but also that their divinity can be constructed internally in their cults by means such as ritual contrast with a hero or, in the specific case of divinized mortals, an emphasis on their apotheosis. In other respects they resemble heroes: they are former mortals from the distant past who now receive cult.

3.1. Gods and the Age of Apotheosis

In a way somewhat like his discussion of the heroic age as described in section 1.4, Pausanias speaks also of an age in which mortals could become gods. There is a hint of this notion in his first chapter when he describes the oracular sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropus, speaking thus of the divinity of Amphiaraus: θεὸν δὲ Ἀμφιάραον πρῶτοις Ὠρωπίοις κατέστη νομίζειν, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ οἱ πάντες Ἕλληνες ἡγῆνται καταλέξειν δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἔχω γενομένους τότε ἀνθρώπους, οἱ θεῶν Ἕλλησι τιμὰς ἔχουσι, τοῖς δὲ καὶ ἀνάκεινται πόλεις, Ἐλεοῦς ἐν Χερρονήσῳ Πρωτεσιλάῳ, Λεβάδεια Βοιωτῶν Τροφωνίῳ.¹⁷⁰ Pausanias does not say here that such ones as Amphiaraus, Trophonius, and Protesilaus are gods, but rather that they are called gods and receive the honours of gods. The case for their divinity will be discussed below: for now this passage is to be noted simply for introducing ambiguously the idea that mortals might become gods.¹⁷¹ Indeed, in

¹⁷⁰ Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*, ed. M. H. Rocha-Pereira (Leipzig, Germany, 1973), 1.34.2

¹⁷¹ A similar such instance appears at Paus. 3.16.6, where Pausanias indicates that Lycurgus receives the νόμοι customary to a god at Sparta, including a ἱερόν and a ναός. He may even be paired with a 'hero' in the form of his son Eucosmus, whose tomb is beside his temple, although the graves of many other legendary Spartans are also found at the same site. However, we cannot say on this basis whether Pausanias himself considers Lycurgus to be a

individual cases presented later by Pausanias it becomes clear that many of these figures are actual gods. However, Pausanias makes a more detailed statement on this subject much later in his work, while discussing the tale of Lycaon and his reasons for believing it. As this passage is of great importance to both the topic at hand and the understanding of Pausanias generally, it shall be quoted here in full.

καὶ ἐμέ γε ὁ λόγος οὗτος πείθει, λέγεται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀρκάδων ἐκ παλαιοῦ, καὶ τὸ εἶκός αὐτῷ πρόσσεστιν. οἱ γὰρ δὴ τότε ἄνθρωποι ξένοι καὶ ὁμοτράπεζοι θεοῖς ἦσαν ὑπὸ δικαιοσύνης καὶ εὐσεβείας, καὶ σφισιν ἐναργῶς ἀπὴντα παρὰ τῶν θεῶν τιμὴ τε οὔσιν ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἀδίκησασιν ὡσαύτως ἡ ὀργή, **ἐπεὶ τοι καὶ θεοὶ τότε ἐγίνοντο ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, οἱ γέρα καὶ ἐς τότε ἔτι ἔχουσιν ὡς Ἀρισταῖος καὶ Βριτόμαρτις ἢ Κρητικὴ καὶ Ἡρακλῆς ὁ Ἀλκμήνης καὶ Ἀμφιάραος ὁ Ὀικλέους, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς Πολυδεύκης τε καὶ Κάστωρ.** οὕτω πείθοιτο ἂν τις καὶ Λυκάονα θηρίον καὶ τὴν Ταντάλου Νιόβην γενέσθαι λίθον. ἐπ' ἐμοῦ δέ — κακία γὰρ δὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἡὔξετο καὶ γῆν τε ἐπενέμετο πᾶσαν καὶ πόλεις πάσας — οὔτε θεὸς ἐγίνετο οὐδεὶς ἔτι ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, πλὴν ὅσον λόγῳ καὶ κολακείᾳ πρὸς τὸ ὑπερέχον, καὶ ἀδίκους τὸ μήνιμα τὸ ἐκ τῶν θεῶν ὀψέ τε καὶ ἀπελθοῦσιν ἐνθένδε ἀπόκειται.¹⁷²

Now Pausanias states unambiguously that certain mortals, including Amphiaraus whom he mentioned earlier, have become gods, and to this number may be added Aristaeus, Britomartis, Heracles, and the Dioscuri. Moreover, these former mortals belong to an age of the legendary past, one distinguished from the degenerate present by its δικαιοσύνη and εὐσέβεια, resulting in a communion with the gods long since lost. It was mentioned in section 1.4 in the context of the age of heroes that Pausanias is deeply engaged with Hesiod in his understanding of the figure of the hero. This engagement is again apparent in this discussion of mortals who become gods, for Hesiod's ages end with the departure of Aidos and Nemesis and a similar description of wickedness triumphant among mortals.¹⁷³

god, since he does not provide his own opinion.

172 Ibid., 8.2.4-5.

173 Hesiodus, *Theogonia – Opera et dies – Scutum – Fragmenta selecta*, 3rd ed., eds. Friedrich Solmsen, R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (Oxford, England, 1990), *Opera et dies*, 174-201. There is also apparent a similarity to Aratus' own telling of this tale: not unlike Pausanias, Aratus begins by saying that in the ages of gold and silver Dike still associated with mortals,

Additionally, this age of apotheosis clearly coincides at least in part with the Hesiodic age of heroes, for Amphiaraus is one of those who fought at Thebes, a great war of the heroic age in the accounts of both Hesiod and Pausanias.¹⁷⁴ Yet at the same time, heroes are not gods, and so these mortals who become gods cannot themselves be heroes. While they share their mortal origins with heroes, something must distinguish them from heroes to make them into gods.

To understand what separates heroes from gods, it may be helpful to consider exactly what is a god to Pausanias, at the levels of both myth and cult. This may be seen through a brief look at the unambiguously divine figure of Zeus at Olympia, whom Pausanias discusses in some detail. To begin, it is significant that Olympia was a sanctuary of great and indeed panhellenic importance. Upon reaching Olympia, Pausanias first remarks upon the Alpheus but then turns immediately to the subject of the Olympic games and their history.¹⁷⁵ Two significant details emerge. The first is that the founding of the Olympic games was an ancient event of cosmic significance. By some accounts the games were founded by the Idaean Heracles when he organized a race between his four younger brothers: these were according to Pausanias the Idaean Dactyls or Curetes, who had come from Crete to guard the infant Zeus at Rhea's behest.¹⁷⁶

having not yet fled the earth on account of human degeneracy. See Aratus, *Phaenomena*, ed. Douglas Kidd (Cambridge, England, 1997), 1.96-136. However, the case for Aratus' influence on Pausanias is less easy to make than it is for Hesiod's: while Pausanias makes frequent mentions of Hesiod, he names Aratus but once, and that only when listing poets who lived together with kings. See Paus. 1.2.3. At the same time, Pausanias was well read and it is certainly not improbable that he was familiar with Aratus' writings, and in any case, he is clearly writing within a tradition that looked back to the distant past as a better time when gods and humans associated much more closely, a tradition hearkening back to Hesiod and to which Aratus has contributed. (For the education of Pausanias see Christian Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, California, 1985), 17.)

174 Paus. 2.20.5, 9.9.1; Hes. *Op.* 161-163. By 'age of apotheosis' it is not meant that an additional age to Hesiod's five is implicit in Pausanias. All that is being indicated with this term is a time when mortals could become gods, which could even be considered by Pausanias a mere attribute of the heroic age.

175 Paus. 5.7.1, 5.7.6-5.9.6.

176 Ibid., 5.7.6-9. It is also noteworthy that Olympia is already an important site of cult at this mythical time, for Pausanias mentions that the first temple at the site was built for Cronus by the people of the golden race. (See Paus. 5.7.6.)

By other accounts the first Olympic contest was between Zeus and Cronus themselves, who wrestled at Olympia to determine who would rule the universe, while by still other accounts the games were founded by Zeus as a friendly contest of the gods to commemorate his victory over Cronus.¹⁷⁷ Despite their differences, these narratives all connect the games with the universal supremacy of Zeus. The other detail, which mirrors the mythological significance of the games and their connection to the king of the gods, is their panhellenic importance: even in the legends of the early Olympics they are portrayed as panhellenic contests bringing together athletes not just from nearby Elis and Pisa but also from the more distant Thebes, Sparta, Syracuse, Crannon, and Smyrna.¹⁷⁸ Just as Zeus is foremost among the gods, so too is his cult at Olympia, together with its great panhellenic games, of pre-eminent religious importance. Indeed, Pausanias considers Olympia to be one of the two most important religious centres in Greece.¹⁷⁹

The panhellenic importance of the cult of Zeus at Olympia itself is manifest in many other ways than through the Olympic games. The great image of the temple is for instance the work of Phidias, an Athenian.¹⁸⁰ The temple itself also contains offerings from across the Greek world and beyond: Pausanias notes in particular the offerings of the Spartan Cynisca, Arimnestus of Etruria, Nicomedes of Bithynia, and numerous Roman emperors.¹⁸¹ Speaking of the great altar of Zeus before the temple, Pausanias mentions that it is used for θύειν sacrifices both during the festival, by private persons, and by the Eleans daily: this suggests that private persons from outside Elis regularly perform sacrifice to Zeus at Olympia, which further indicates the panhellenic nature of Zeus' cult there.¹⁸² It

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 5.7.10.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 5.8.7-8.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., Interestingly, the other great religious centre he names is Eleusis, which might seem surprising in light of the continual importance of Delphi throughout his work.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 5.10.2.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 5.12.5-8. It should be recalled that Cynisca has been mentioned already as being a heroine at Sparta; see Paus. 3.15.1.

¹⁸² Ibid., 5.13.10.

is therefore apparent that, through panhellenicism, the highest of Greek gods in myth is also one of the highest at the level of cult. More generally, it seems that panhellenicism and divinity are associated. Zeus at Olympia is a great god in part because he is worshipped by people from across Greece, and Zeus more generally is a god in some way because he is worshipped in various forms across Greece.¹⁸³

There is of course something that should be said about the internal logic of the divinity of Zeus before proceeding. Something has in fact already been said of this in section 2.3: the systematic contrast between Zeus the god and Pelops the hero in their cults at Olympia as described by Pausanias constructs not only the heroic status of Pelops but also the divinity of Zeus. As has already been seen in section 2.2, there are numerous such pairings of gods and heroes described by Pausanias, and in these too the status of the hero and the god are constructed in part through their contrast in ritual. The iconography of Zeus at Olympia also emphasizes his pre-eminence: he has a suitably magnificent image made of gold and ivory which is enthroned and appropriately surrounded by subordinated images of other gods and heroes.¹⁸⁴ Likewise, the place and form of his cult are important, for he has a *ναός* and receives *θύειν* sacrifice at his altar: we have seen in sections 2.2 and 2.3 that such sacrifice is commonly divine, and the possession of a *ναός* is almost always something reserved for a god in Pausanias.¹⁸⁵ It would be beyond the scope of our discussion to examine the development of the cult of Zeus at Olympia and how these various features developed in relation to one another. However, their association by the time of Pausanias helps indicate to us the basic features of this divinity.

If panhellenicism is important in informing the divinity of a god, then we would perhaps expect heroes to be more local in the scope of their cults. Indeed, this is what we generally find, with heroes such as Alexanor at Titane and

183 (See Rocha-Pereira, *Indices*, 214-215 for a complete listing of Pausanias' references to Zeus.)

184 Paus. 5.11.1-9.

185 Ibid., 5.10.2, 5.13.10.

Astrabacus at Sparta being of primarily local concern.¹⁸⁶ As such, we might expect Pausanias' deified mortals to have cults which are panhellenic in a way which distinguishes them from those of mortals who become merely heroes. The locality of heroes and the panhellenicism of gods is indeed important with regards to these mortals who become gods, and it has been argued that heroes who somehow advance beyond the local sphere in terms of the scope of their cults are prone to becoming recognized as gods.¹⁸⁷ Additionally, since heroes are thought to be of local concern primarily because their graves attach them to a particular locale, we would expect the cults of divinized mortals to lack this emphasis on a grave, which would simultaneously arise from and facilitate both their divinity and their panhellenicism.¹⁸⁸ Therefore, we will next examine a few of these deified mortals to see what makes them gods and different from heroes, and to consider at the same time how they might resemble heroes and more generally how a hero might be thought to *become* a god at the level of cult.

3.2. Mortals Who become Gods: Trophonius

Among Pausanias' mortals said in the first book to receive the honours of gods, Trophonius is absent from the longer list given in the eighth book. This is interesting because, as was seen in section 2.2, Trophonius is clearly divine to Pausanias: he is at one point in the fourth book called τὸν ἐν Λεβαδείᾳ θεόν, is again called a god in the later description of his oracle and its consultation procedure, and is never described as a hero.¹⁸⁹ In considering the reasons for his divinity, it is significant that he is in various ways a figure of panhellenic

186 Ibid., 2.11.7, 3.16.6.

187 Erwin Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, 8th ed., trans. W. B. Hillis (London, England, 1925), 132; Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, England, 1922), 346-347.

188 For the locality of heroes in Pausanias and in relation to their graves see section 1.5 and Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. John Raffan (Malden, Massachusetts, 1985), 206.

189 Paus. 4.32.5, 9.39.12.

importance. Firstly, local traditions across Greece credit him and his brother Agamedes with the construction of many important buildings: Pausanias says that they built ἱερά for the gods and βασιλεια for humans.¹⁹⁰ Of these, near Mantinea he sees the ἱερόν of Poseidon said to have been originally built of oak by them, and at Thebes he sees the bridal-chamber in the ruined house of Amphitryon bearing an inscription declaring it to be the work of ἀγχιθεός Trophonius and Agamedes.¹⁹¹ To their work he also attributes the treasury of Hyrieus in Boeotia and the fourth ναός of Apollo at Delphi, the first said to have been built there of stone.¹⁹² That the attribution of such buildings as these to Trophonius and Agamedes is a matter of conflicting local traditions is perhaps most clear in the case of the house of Amphitryon at Thebes. The reason for this is that the construction of this house by Trophonius and Agamedes is chronologically at odds with an account given elsewhere by Pausanias, where he says that Trophonius and Agamedes were the sons of king Erginus of Orchomenus, who had long before their birth made peace with the Theban Heracles: Pausanias in fact rejects this account to an extent which is unclear, but for the reason that he says Trophonius was the son of Apollo and not Erginus, as is clear to those who consult the oracle.¹⁹³ Therefore, it is possible that Pausanias is describing various traditions of Trophonius from Lebadea, Orchomenus, and Thebes in just this account, in addition to the legends of construction at Mantinea and Delphi previously mentioned. To these may be added one further legend of Trophonius mentioned by Pausanias, that of the shield of Aristomenes of Messene dedicated by the latter to Trophonius at Lebadea: the oracle is said to have advised the Thebans to bring the shield to Leuctra and to there let it fall into the hands of the Spartans in order to assure a Theban victory, and having done so, the Thebans restored the shield to Lebadea where it would

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 9.37.5.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 8.10.2, 9.11.1.

¹⁹² Ibid., 9.37.5, 10.5.13. The first temple was built of laurel, the second of wax and feathers by bees, and the third of bronze by, according to some accounts which Pausanias does not credit, Hephaestus; see Paus. 10.5.9-13.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 9.37.2-5.

later be seen by Pausanias.¹⁹⁴ Thus we have seen in Pausanias numerous local traditions concerning Trophonius from across Greece, although especially from Boeotia and its surroundings. This suggests that Trophonius is to some extent a panhellenic figure.

Of course, one of the most notable attributes of Trophonius is his oracular cult, and in this respect too he is panhellenic. This point need not be belaboured: the descent into his underground oracle was apparently proverbial already by the time of Aristophanes and is mentioned by many writers, and indeed Pausanias seems to refute a common notion that those who visit the oracle are rendered permanently unable to laugh.¹⁹⁵ Moreover, the oracle is sufficiently renowned to draw visitors, such as Pausanias, from across the Greek world.¹⁹⁶ It is thus clear that Trophonius and his oracular cult have the panhellenic stature appropriate to a god. Of course, other aspects of his cult appear divine as well. For instance, he receives θύειν sacrifice at a ναός: as was said above about Zeus at Olympia, in Pausanias such sacrifice can be divine or at least help to convey a divine aspect to a heroic recipient, and such a cult site is almost exclusively divine.¹⁹⁷ On the other hand, one aspect of his ritual is considerably different from that of Zeus at Olympia: this Zeus receives sacrifice atop a high altar, while the main ritual of Trophonius takes place deep beneath the earth.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, almost the entire procedure of consultation, with its nocturnal sacrifice of a black ram into a βόθρος and its fearful unworldly aspect, recalls the “chthonian” form of religion and its opposition to the Olympian form described in section 1.3.¹⁹⁹ While it has been

194 Ibid., 4.16.7, 4.32.5-6. This legend would presumably be Theban and Messenian.

195 Paus. 9.39.14; Pausanias, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 2nd ed., ed. & trans. J. G. Frazer (London, England, 1913), *Commentary on Books IX., X., Addenda*, 204; Aristophanes, *Nubes*, in *Aristophanis Comoediae*, 2nd ed., ed. F. W. Hall & W. M. Geldart (London, England, 1906), 506-508.

196 Frazer, *Commentary on Books IX., X., Addenda*, 200.

197 Paus. 9.39.4-5.

198 Ibid., 5.13.9-10, 9.39.9-11.

199 Ibid., 9.39.6. Burkert calls the consultation of Trophonius “a veritable journey into the underworld,” and Harrison similarly discusses the unworldly and “Orphic” significance of the

seen that this distinction can be problematic, it remains that Trophonius may not be the sort of god whom one might find on Olympus: Pausanias says that he was swallowed by the earth at Lebadea, and there, it seems, he remains.²⁰⁰ In this respect Trophonius has the sort of locality one might associate with a hero, despite the lack of even the possibility of physical remains to bind his cult to a particular location: as a divinized mortal who is meaningfully chthonian he partakes to some extent in both the divinity of a god and the mortality more usually associated with heroes.²⁰¹ That he is an oracle may be significant in this regard, for his oracular function provides a mechanism by which his local cult may be panhellenic and he thereby divine in spite of his mortal origin.²⁰²

There remain a few additional things about Trophonius which ought to be considered before proceeding. While he is not mentioned in the passage from the eighth book quoted above which associates apotheosis with a more pious era, this theme is still present in the legends concerning Trophonius. For instance, Pausanias says of the ἱερόν of Poseidon near Mantinea that Trophonius and Agamedes demarcated it with a simple woollen thread, which was effective in keeping people out either because of its own power or because of the piety of the people of that age.²⁰³ Additionally, the succession of Delphic temples described above may recall the succession of Hesiodic ages, with the work of Trophonius and Agamedes belonging to a still distant and therefore better age. This would be the age of both apotheosis and of heroes, and so the mixture of these temporal categories in Pausanias' chronology as mentioned above is interesting in light of

procedure, particularly as regards drinking from the rivers of Lethe and Mnemosyne before the consultation is made. See Burkert, 115; Harrison, 578-580.

200 Paus. 9.37.7. In particular, the place where this occurred is at the βόθρος of Agamedes, which Frazer suggests is probably the same one into which the final sacrifice before the consultation of Trophonius was made. See Frazer, *Commentary on Books IX, X, Addenda*, 201.

201 It is notable that, despite the panhellenic stature of his cult at Lebadea and his attestation in local traditions across Greece, nowhere else does Pausanias mention any cult activity directed toward Trophonius. In this respect he is obviously quite different from a god like Zeus, who receives cult elsewhere than at Olympia alone.

202 For the panhellenicizing nature of oracles see Burkert, 114.

203 Paus. 8.10.3.

the similar mixture of divinity and mortality in the figure of Trophonius. Since the mixture of divine and human in Trophonius is recognized by other ancient writers, it may be then that the conflation of the age of apotheosis and of heroes in Pausanias is itself reflective of both cult practice and of the larger set of Greek traditions about the past.²⁰⁴

Finally, it was mentioned above that the divinity of a god may be established in cult through contrast with a hero, as in the case of Zeus and Pelops at Olympia. This would appear to be an element largely absent in the cult of Trophonius. While clearly divine, he is nevertheless a divinized mortal and so a different sort of god than Olympian Zeus, and perhaps one who would not be well served by the comparison to a hero. On the other hand, something remains to be said of that one with whom Pausanias so frequently pairs Trophonius, Agamedes.²⁰⁵ Unfortunately, Pausanias does not tell us precisely what sort of being Agamedes is, except that he is the brother of Trophonius, and manifestly mortal since he is slain by him.²⁰⁶ What is most notable about Agamedes at Lebadea is his close association with Trophonius: the sacrifices made before consulting the oracle culminate with a sacrifice to him which is more auspicious than all the others.²⁰⁷ Moreover, it is curious that the pit into which Trophonius was consumed is called the βόθρος of Agamedes and not of Trophonius: this may be because it is the same βόθρος into which Agamedes receives sacrifice, but it may also suggest a certain conflation of Trophonius and Agamedes, in which the

204 Regarding the divine and human aspects of Trophonius seen in other writers, Frazer mentions in particular Lucian. See Frazer, *Commentary on Books IX., X., Addenda*, 201; Lucianus, *Dialogi mortuorum*, in *Lucian*, ed. M. D. Macleod (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1961), 3.1-2.

205 While Trophonius is sometimes mentioned without Agamedes, Agamedes is never mentioned without Trophonius. This pairing is of course not unique to Pausanias. For instance, the Homeric hymn *In Apollinem* credits Trophonius and Agamedes the sons of Erginus with the construction of the stone threshold of the temple of Apollo at Delphi. See Hymni Homerici, *In Apollinem*, in *The Homeric Hymns*, 2nd ed., ed. T. W. Allen et al. (London, England, 1936), 295-7.

206 Paus. 9.37.3-7. While Trophonius may belong to a more pious past, his fratricidal treachery among other things suggest that this past was still well after the golden age, which is not to be unexpected.

207 Ibid., 9.39.5-6.

mortal aspect of the pair is more pronounced in the dead θνητός Agamedes while the divine aspect is more apparent in the ἀθάνατος Trophonius.²⁰⁸ It is therefore apparent that the divinity of a god like Trophonius need not be constructed in entirely the same way as that of Olympian Zeus, although there are similarities in their cults. At the same time, it remains that Zeus and Trophonius are both panhellenic figures in the ways described and that this too is important to their divinity.

3.3. Mortals Who become Gods: Amphiaraus and Heracles

Of the divine mortals mentioned by Pausanias in the passages cited from the first and eighth books, it has been seen that Amphiaraus is unique in that he is the only figure to appear in both lists. As a god he is in many ways very similar to Trophonius: as one of those who hunted the Calydonian boar and later fought at Thebes he too is a figure of panhellenic myth, and Pausanias sees monuments associated with him or commemorating his exploits at Athens, Oropus, Philus, Argos, Lerna, Sparta, Amyclae, Olympia, Tegea, Delphi, and two roadside sites in Boeotia where he was claimed to have been consumed by the earth.²⁰⁹ It is not only in his mythical consumption by the earth that he resembles Trophonius, for as the oracular god of Oropus he too receives cult which could be panhellenic for the same reasons as any oracle.²¹⁰ Admittedly, it is not obvious from Pausanias' account that the oracle at Oropus is of anything more than local significance.

208 Ibid., 9.37.7. As concerns the mortal aspect, Harrison sees in Agamedes "the old hero" of Lebadea. See Harrison, 580. As concerns the divine aspect, it is noteworthy that Trophonius is also conflated with Zeus outside Pausanias, for certain inscriptions found at Lebadea and the ancient writers Strabo and Livy all mention a 'Zeus Trophonius' at Lebadea. See Frazer, *Commentary on Books IX., X., Addenda*, 199-200; Strabo, *Geographica*, in *Strabonis geographica*, ed. A. Meineke (Leipzig, Germany, 1877), 9.2.38; Livius, *Ab urbe condita*, ed. R. S. Conway et al. (London, England, 1914), 45.27.7.

209 Paus. 1.8.2 (Athens), 1.34.1-5 (Oropus), 2.13.7 (Philus), 2.20.5 (Amphiaraus as one of those who fought at Thebes), 2.23.2 (Argos), 2.37.5 (Lerna), 3.12.5 (Sparta), 3.18.12 (Amyclae), 5.17.7-9 (Olympia), 8.45.7 (Tegea, and the hunt for the Calydonian boar), 9.8.3 (Boeotia), 9.19.4 (Harma, Boeotia), 10.10.3 (Delphi).

210 Ibid., 1.34.1-5.

However, there is some hint of this provided by Pausanias' mention of the recognition of Amphiaraus' divinity, as was quoted at the start of this chapter: the Oropians claim to be the first of the Greeks to have worshipped Amphiaraus as a god.²¹¹ This is of course a familiar theme in the cults of divinized mortals: similar claims are made of Heracles at Marathon and Sicyon, and so it may be implicit that such figures were thought to have once been revered only as heroes before eventually being recognized as gods.²¹² Such a claim may also indicate at least the panhellenic ambition of the cult, if not its actual panhellenic stature, through the emphasis on being the first to engage in a practice later made universal. Indeed, the panhellenic nature of the oracle can also be inferred from other sources as early as Herodotus.²¹³

Besides the panhellenic stature befitting a god, there are other features in the cult of Amphiaraus at Oropus which indicate his divinity. Again, he receives *θύειν* sacrifice at a *ναός*, with all that this entails.²¹⁴ What is particularly interesting though is the relation his cult has to the landscape: Pausanias indicates that Amphiaraus was consumed by the earth not at Oropus but at Harma, and it is rather at the spring in Oropus that he ascended as a god.²¹⁵ This hints at what is perhaps the most obvious difference between the oracles of Trophonius and Amphiaraus: there is no descent into the earth by the consultee at Oropus, and

211 Ibid., 1.34.2.

212 Ibid., 1.32.4, 2.10.1.

213 Herodotus, *Historiae*, ed. Carolus Hude (London, England, 1927), 1.46.2, 1.49.1. According to Herodotus it was one of the two oracles consulted by Croesus to be found truthful. Furthermore, there is much about the history of the claim to Amphiaraus' divinity that Pausanias does not mention known from other sources, both literary and epigraphic. It is known for instance that Sulla had provided benefactions to the sanctuary, including the tax revenues of Oropus to the god Amphiaraus: when the Roman tax collectors failed to honour the agreement because Amphiaraus, being born a mortal, could not be a god, the Oropians appealed successfully to Rome where, among others, Cicero argued on their behalf that Amphiaraus was a god. See Frazer, *Commentary on Book I*, 471-472; Cicero, *De natura deorum*, 2nd ed., ed. Otto Plasberg & Wilhelm Ax (Stuttgart, Germany, 1933), 3.49 (where the question of Amphiaraus' divinity appears side by side with that of Trophonius).

214 Paus. 1.34.2, 1.34.5.

215 Ibid., 1.34.2, 1.34.4.

indeed no reason for one, since the god is not beneath the earth but ascended from it. In this respect Amphiaraus certainly appears divine with less ambiguity than is present in Trophonius, through the emphasis on his apotheosis apparent in the cult.²¹⁶ At the same time, he shares with Trophonius his descent into the earth with the impossibility of leaving behind physical remains that this entails, but with another kind of direct connection to the physical landscape serving to anchor his cult in a particular place. It is also important that, like Trophonius, he comes from an age in the legendary past associated with both heroes and mortals becoming gods: as has already been said, his fighting at Thebes places him in the Hesiodic heroic age, and so in his case too it is clear that the ages of heroes and of apotheosis coincide to some extent.²¹⁷ The extent to which this means that certain figures from this past can be understood variously as gods or heroes is revealed at Sparta, for it is there that Pausanias sees ἥρῶα belonging to, among others, Amphiaraus.²¹⁸ Nowhere else does Pausanias say that Amphiaraus is a hero and he rather refers to him elsewhere as a god; however, he does not comment on the inconsistency posed by his heroic status at Sparta. It is possible that he is himself being inconsistent, but it is also possible that Amphiaraus is simply a hero at Sparta while a god at Oropus and elsewhere.²¹⁹ Both these possibilities will be important to consider when examining the cults of beings unspecified as heroes or gods: just because one is called a hero at one place does not mean that one is not a god elsewhere.²²⁰

216 Interestingly, he too could be conflated with Zeus as 'Zeus Amphiaraus'. See Frazer, *Commentary on Book I*, 472-473.

217 Paus. 2.20.5, 9.9.1; Hes. *Op.* 161-163.

218 Paus. 3.12.5.

219 It may also be worth considering what has been said already the Oropians' claim to have been the first to worship Amphiaraus as a god: if he was thought to have been previously worshipped elsewhere as only a hero, then Pausanias would find no contradiction between an old ἥρῶον said to have been built by the Dioscuri and the later divinity of Amphiaraus. See Paus. 3.12.5. On the other hand, it is not explicit from his description of the spread of Amphiaraus' divinity that Pausanias supposes there ever was such a phase of Amphiaraus' cult as a hero, and this cannot simply be assumed on the basis of his apparent similarity to Heracles.

220 Indeed, in section 2.2 this possibility was considered in the case of Hippolytus at Troezen,

As oracular gods, Trophonius and Amphiaraus form a special category among Pausanias' divinized mortals, one in which the oracular function helps to account for the panhellenicism of a cult that is still very much grounded locally. Another sort of panhellenicism, present of course to some extent in the cases of Trophonius and Amphiaraus, is present above all in the figure of Heracles. This is same kind as has been seen of Zeus, that of a god well known and widely worshipped in various forms across Greece.²²¹ As would be expected from the comparison to Zeus, Heracles too is frequently mentioned by Pausanias, who sees various shrines and sanctuaries throughout Greece dedicated to him in his travels, and no elaborate argument is needed here to demonstrate the panhellenic stature which contributes to his divinity.²²² However, a number of the internal reasons for divinity described above are present in the myths and cults of Heracles and require comment. Most importantly, it is significant that Heracles is the paradigmatic example of a mortal who becomes a god.²²³ Pausanias generally speaks of Heracles in terms of his present status as a god. For instance, he remarks of Gythium that no human was the founder of their city, but rather Heracles and Apollo in common: there is a certain anachronism in these descriptions, since Heracles was still human at the time of the events described.²²⁴ That Pausanias does indeed think in such terms is clear from those occasions when he speaks explicitly of Heracles' ascent to divinity and of his mortality before then. One of the main passages to discuss the twofold nature of Heracles has already been discussed in section 2.2, where it is seen that at Sicyon he receives *ἐναγίζειν* sacrifice as a hero and *θύειν* sacrifice as a god, and another such passage is the one

who may be a god there despite being only a hero at Sparta.

221 Burkert, 208.

222 (See Rocha-Pereira, 216-217 for a complete listing of references to Heracles.)

223 Burkert, 211.

224 Paus. 3.21.8. Γυτεᾶται δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἀνθρώπων μὲν οὐδένα οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι λέγουσιν, Ἡρακλέα δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα ὑπὲρ τοῦ τρίποδος ἐς ἀγῶνα ἐλθόντας, ὥς διηλλάγησαν, μετὰ τὴν ἔριν οἰκίσαι κοινῇ τὴν πόλιν.

quoted at the start of this chapter.²²⁵ It would appear that, because of his apotheosis, the divinity of Heracles can be constructed by means of comparison to his earlier mortal and 'heroic' state, since neither of these states are compatible with divinity. Additionally, there is an important discussion of Heracles' mortality and divinity as regards his cult at Thespieae: Heracles himself is said to have founded this cult to himself and, as a punishment, commissioned the first of its lifelong virginal priestesses.²²⁶ Pausanias rejects this account, stating that πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἡνίκα ἔτι ἦν μετ' ἀνθρώπων, τιμωρούμενός τε ἄλλους ὑβρίζοντας καὶ μάλιστα ὅσοι θεῶν ἀσεβεῖς ἦσαν, οὐκ ἂν αὐτός γε κατεστήσατο αὐτῷ ναόν τε καὶ ἱέρεيان ὥσπερ δὴ θεός.²²⁷ It is apparent here that Pausanias believes Heracles became a god, and that there was an earlier time when he was a human and not a god. This is not surprising, but it is interesting that the internal logic of the cult seems to regard Heracles purely in the terms of his divinity, as though he were always a god. Pausanias recognizes this, and noting also the apparent age of the ἱερόν, supposes that it was really established by Heracles the Idaean Dactyl.²²⁸ By implication, this Heracles was perhaps always a god, and his ambiguous divinity has also been seen in the discussion of Zeus at Olympia in section 2.3 and above. While Pausanias does not explicitly state that the Idaean Heracles is a god, he does identify him here with the Tyrian Heracles.²²⁹ The Tyrian Heracles is said elsewhere by him to be worshipped from of old at Thasos, joined more recently by the son of Amphitryon: keeping in mind the distinction made earlier between ἐναγίζειν and θύειν in the cult of Heracles at Sicyon, this passage of course recalls Herodotus' description of these rituals as regards Heracles and his ancient divine cults at Tyre and Thasos.²³⁰ From this, it can be more confidently inferred that

225 Ibid., 2.10.1.

226 Ibid., 9.27.6.

227 Ibid., 9.27.7. It is also notable here that a ναός and attendant priestess are here defined as possessions of a god outrageously inappropriate for a human.

228 Ibid., 9.27.8.

229 Ibid.

230 Ibid., 2.10.1, 5.25.12; Hdt. 2.43-44. For the identification of the Tyrian Heracles with

Heracles the Idaean Dactyl is a god to Pausanias. As such, the ability to found one's own cult is also an activity which separates gods from heroes and mortals who will only later become gods.²³¹

3.4. Becoming a God in the Time of Pausanias

Heracles, Trophonius, and Amphiaraus are all for the most part straightforward examples of mortals who become gods. However, there are other mortals whose divinity is in various ways problematic to Pausanias. One of the most interesting examples of these is seen in the cult of Antinous at Mantinea. From the outset, the context of this cult's description must be considered: Pausanias makes clear in the passage quoted at the start of this chapter that humans do not become gods any longer except in the flattering words addressed to the powerful.²³² Shortly thereafter he speaks of the cult of Antinous, as follows.

ἐνομίσθη δὲ καὶ Ἀντίνοῦς σφίσις εἶναι θεός· ναῶν δὲ ἐν Μαντινείᾳ νεώτατός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ Ἀντίνου ναός. οὗτος ἐσπουδάσθη περισσῶς δὴ τι ὑπὸ βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ· ἐγὼ δὲ μετ' ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἔτι αὐτὸν ὄντα οὐκ εἶδον, ἐν δὲ ἀγάλμασιν εἶδον καὶ ἐν γραφαῖς. ... τούτων ἕνεκα ὁ βασιλεὺς κατεστήσατο αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν Μαντινείᾳ τιμάς, καὶ τελετὴν τε κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον καὶ ἀγῶν ἐστὶν αὐτῷ διὰ ἔτους πέμπτου.²³³

On the one hand, it is clear that Antinous' cult at Mantinea is divine: he is called a θεός and is worshipped at a ναός, in addition to his possession of other honours and the fact that he is more generally a panhellenic divinity.²³⁴ On the other hand,

Melcarth see Frazer, *Commentary on Books II-V*, 642.

231 It must be recalled that, as has been seen in section 1.5, cult foundation is an activity commonly attributed to heroes. However, these heroes found cults to the gods and not to themselves.

232 Paus. 8.2.5.

233 Ibid., 8.9.7-8.

234 Pausanias later mentions that the gymnasium contains paintings of Antinous in the likeness of Dionysus; see Paus. 8.9.8. While Pausanias says little of it, Antinous was worshipped variously as a god or hero in many other places. For instance, a funerary votive found at Mantinea mentions Ἀντίνοος θεός, which confirms Pausanias' attribution of divinity to Antinous at Mantinea. See Caroline Vout, *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*, (Cambridge, England, 2007), 62.

Pausanias does not actually call Antinous a god, since he only goes so far as to say that Antinous is called a god by the Mantineans. Furthermore, he carefully explains that this cult was established at Mantinea by Hadrian himself. While it has been seen above of Amphiaraus that someone described by Pausanias as receiving the honours of a god may indeed be a god as far as Pausanias is concerned, this is less likely here under the peculiar circumstances described: Pausanias has just explained that no mortals in his day become gods except in the flattery of the powerful, and he has made it clear that Antinous lived as a human in his own day and receives worship now at the behest of the king. Returning to the difference between gods and heroes, the case of Antinous helps to reveal a certain distinction between the ages of heroes and of apotheosis. It was seen in sections 1.4 and 2.2 that, while most of Pausanias' heroes belong to the heroic age of epic poetry, there are at least some heroes from as recent as the Hellenistic period. However, of those mortals who become gods Pausanias names only figures belonging to the epic past, and furthermore he appears to distinguish his position from that of those who say that mortals such as Antinous become gods even in the present.²³⁵ The time of mortals becoming gods is thus clearly stated to be over in a way that the time of heroes is not, despite their shared antiquity.

Having considered the cases of the figures described above, it is apparent that Pausanias' gods are separated from his heroes in a number of ways. Gods are less bound to a particular locale than heroes, taking on a more panhellenic significance. They are clearly separated from mortality, whether by having always been immortal or by apotheosis. Their rituals may involve θύειν sacrifice at a ναός; while heroes too may receive the former, their receipt of the latter is almost unheard of. Gods may also enjoy the privilege of founding their own cults, which

235 As would be expected, Pausanias appears to be altogether dismissive of the cults of Roman emperors. His remarks of a temple on the main approach to Delphi are typical: ὁ μὲν τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ βασιλευσάντων εἶχεν οὐ πολλῶν τινῶν εἰκόνας; see Paus. 10.8.6. He does not even describe these images with the religious term ἀγάλματα, as he does for the Greek Antinous. (For ἀγάλματα of Antinous as opposed to non-religious images see again Vout, 62.)

would be inappropriate behaviour on the part of a mortal hero or even divinized mortal while still among mortals. While the birth of new gods and heroes both belong to the remote past, new heroes appear to Pausanias from as late as the Hellenistic period, and in this respect Pausanias would appear to be passing judgement on the religious practices of his own age in which much more recent apotheosis is considered possible by some. With these distinctions between gods and heroes more clearly defined, it is now possible to return to the ambiguous figures mentioned in section 1.5 to consider whether they should be called heroes as far as Pausanias is concerned, which shall be the subject of the final chapter.

Conclusion: Heroes and Their Worshippers

Having examined some of the basic distinctions between Pausanias' heroes and his divinized mortals, it is now possible to return to the topic of sacrificial ritual, turning from the objects of cult to the subject of the ritual performer, someone who has not yet been considered in any great detail. It will be found that one of the main distinctions between heroes and divinized mortals may actually be the danger of ἄγος to the worshipper commonly involved in the cult of heroes. Specifically, it is possible to understand the ritual of ἐναγίζειν as making the one who sacrifices to a hero ἐναγής in the sense of being ritually polluted to the gods. Moreover, there is much indication that this state of impurity is of particular concern to the hero's god: the effect of this is to distinguish the 'hero-worshipper' from the 'god-worshipper.' Moreover, the idea common to the theory of chthonian religion that hero cult is largely a matter of propitiation may be supported with the qualification that this only explains certain forms of hero cult. From here we may then return at last to those named recipients of cult whose precise nature is not specified by Pausanias to consider whether they may be called heroes by his implicit criteria. It will be found that this is often so, by means of contrasting them to ἄθάνατοι and θνητοί in addition to considering the potential implications of the ἐναγίζειν sacrifices sometimes made to them.

4.1. The Ἐναγής Subject of Hero Cult

It was seen in section 2.3 that one of the ways in which the hero Pelops and the god Zeus at Olympia are distinguished through ritual is that those who eat the meat of the black ram sacrificed to Pelops may not enter the temple of Zeus.²³⁶ In

236 Pausanias, *Descriptio Graeciae*, ed. M. H. Rocha-Pereira (Leipzig, Germany, 1973), 5.13.1-3.

It should be noted that Burkert's analysis of the Olympic footrace reveals further aspects of this ritual contrast between the hero and the god. The race itself is a kind of movement from the pit into which Pelops receives sacrifice before the race towards the high altar at which Zeus receives sacrifice after the race. Burkert also notes that the recipients of each sacrifice are contrasted by their victims, a bull for Zeus but a black ram for Pelops. See Walter Burkert,

order to better understand this distinction between hero and god, something more must be said about the one who actually performs the sacrifice to Pelops. Firstly, it is important to consider that Pausanias compares the prohibition at Olympia to a similar one at Pergamum, wherein those who sacrifice to Telephus must purify themselves before being permitted to enter the temple of Asclepius.²³⁷ The comparison makes it clear that when Pausanias speaks of those who eat the meat of the ram he probably has in mind, at least among others, those having made the sacrifice itself, for his comparison explicitly concerns those who sacrifice to Telephus. Additionally, the comparison suggests that those who make the sacrifice to Pelops may be able to purify themselves afterwards in order to be able to enter the temple of Zeus.²³⁸ To say though that the bath taken before entering the temple of Asclepius is indeed for the purpose of purification, and by extension that there must be a comparable purification for those who sacrifice to Pelops, is of course to suppose that there must be something polluting about sacrificing to these heroes.

The basic fact of this pollution seems evident enough. In his commentary

Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth, trans. Peter Bing (Berkeley, California, 1983), 97-98.

237 Paus. 5.13.3. ὅς δ' ἂν ἡ αὐτῶν Ἡλείων ἢ ξένων τοῦ θυομένου τῷ Πέλοπι ἱερείου φάγῃ τῶν κρεῶν, οὐκ ἔστιν οἱ ἐσελθεῖν παρὰ τὸν Δία. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ Περγᾶμῳ τῇ ὑπὲρ ποταμοῦ Καΐκου πεπὸνθασιν οἱ τῷ Τηλέφῳ θύοντες. ἔστι γὰρ δὴ οὐδὲ τούτοις ἀναβῆναι πρὸ λουτροῦ παρὰ τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν. As for Asclepius, it is true that modern scholars often understand him to be a kind of hero, or at the very least a god who could not entirely escape his heroic origins. See for instance Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, England, 1922), 340-344; Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. John Raffan (Malden, Massachusetts, 1985), 214-215. While he does seem to recognize that the divinity of Asclepius can be questioned, Pausanias says quite explicitly that Asclepius has always been a god, based on his interpretation of a passage from Homer; see Paus. 2.26.10. While we may not be convinced by his argument, we should nonetheless treat Asclepius here as a god, for it is as such that Pausanias understands him.

238 This is also likely in light of the description of Pelops' cult at Olympia given in the scholia on Pindar, where it is stated that athletes follow the custom of Heracles by offering θύειν sacrifice to Pelops before sacrificing to Zeus. See Scholia in Pindarum, *Scholia in Olympia et Pythia*, in *Scholia recentia in Pindari epinicia / Scholia in Pindari epinicia ad librorum manuscriptorum fidem*, ed. Eugenius Abel (Budapest, Hungary, 1891), *Schol. Pind. O.* 1.149; Pausanias, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 2nd ed., ed. & trans. J. G. Frazer (London, England, 1913), *Commentary on Books II-V*, 550-551.

on the passage in Pausanias, Frazer understands the prohibition in light of the “ceremonial defilement” inevitable in the worship of heroes and the dead.²³⁹ This is a familiar idea which we have seen already in the discussion of 'chthonian' ritual, and it has also been seen that while it would be a mistake to attempt to understand all of hero cult in terms of chthonian ritual, it remains that the cults of some heroes seem to have been in accordance with this pattern. However, more remains to be said about the specific pollution involved. It may be significant that Pausanias, unlike Frazer, says nothing about the one who sacrifices to Pelops being made unfit to enter the sanctuaries of the gods generally, for the prohibition as he describes it specifically concerns entrance to the temple of Zeus. This is true also in the case of those who sacrifice to Telephus and their entrance to Asclepius' temple. On the one hand, it does seem likely that Greek sanctuaries generally if not universally prohibited the entrance of persons on the basis of such things as the polluting effect of recent contact with the dead.²⁴⁰ As such, it cannot be assumed that one requiring purification in order to enter Olympia's temple of Zeus would still be fit to enter, for instance, the temple of Hera at the same site. On the other hand, it may nonetheless be significant that Pausanias describes these prohibitions in terms of god-hero pairs, for there may be a sense in which the pollution of one who sacrifices to the hero renders that one contaminated above all to the hero's god.

If we understand such prohibitions in light of the hero's worshipper being not only generally polluted but also particularly polluted to a specific god, we will find ourselves on familiar ground. As was seen in section 2.1, this is of course how the word ἐναγής is often used: Pausanias for instance says that the Alcmaeonidae were called the ἐναγεῖς τῆς θεοῦ on account of their sacrilegious murder of suppliants at Athena's temple.²⁴¹ It seems then that sacrifice to a hero

239 Frazer, *Commentary on Books II-V*, 550-551.

240 Robert Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion* (New York, New York, 1983), 37.

241 Paus. 7.25.3. For sacrilege as a crime that makes one ἐναγής to a god, see Parker, 145-146.

may make the worshipper ἐναγής to the hero's god.²⁴² Such an understanding allows us more fully to understand the ritual of ἐναγίζειν so common to the cults of heroes. This form of sacrifice not only serves to create the distinction between hero and god at the level of ritual, but it also serves to distinguish the hero's worshippers from the god's: the one who performs ἐναγίζειν to a hero is made ἐναγής to a god, at least until purified from the ἄγος.

As for why such a polluting ritual would be performed in the first place, this should by now be fairly evident. As has already been mentioned, the *aetia* of many hero cults prominently feature the motif of a calamity besetting the community from which deliverance is to be found through the propitiatory establishment of a hero cult, an oracle having previously revealed that the calamity's cause was heroic or divine wrath on account of the community's crime against the hero. The foundation of the cult thus serves as a form of purification for the community, in myth.²⁴³ The ritual of the hero's cult, typically the sacrifice of an animal, is itself a reperformance of the mythical polluting act and simultaneously the purification from it.²⁴⁴ In our example of the Olympian cult of

242 It is presumably by extension of this that the worshipper is polluted in the more general sense as one unfit to enter the temples of the gods.

243 For such stories in relation specifically to murder, and their strictly mythical nature, see Parker, 128-130.

244 For sacrifice as a reperformance of the original act in which the performers are implicated and therefore guilty, see Walter Burkert, "Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966) : 106-113. For the capacity of ritual to be both commemorative and anticipatory see also Jane Ellen Harrison, *Themis: A Study in the Social Origins of Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, England, 1927), 42-45.

Explaining the meaning of the shrines of the Maniae and Eumenides and of the tomb of the Finger on the road from Megalopolis to Messene, Pausanias relates the following story about the wandering Orestes' vision of the goddesses. ταύτας τὰς θεάς, ἥνικα τὸν Ὀρέστην ἔκφρονα ἔμελλον ποιήσῃν, φασὶν αὐτῷ φανῆναι μελαίνας· ὥς δὲ ἀπέφαγε τὸν δάκτυλον, τὰς δὲ αὖθις δοκεῖν οἱ λευκάς εἶναι, καὶ αὐτὸν σωφρονῆσαι τε ἐπὶ τῇ θεᾷ, καὶ οὕτω ταῖς μὲν ἐνήγισεν ἀποτρέπων τὸ μῆνιμα αὐτῶν, ταῖς δὲ ἔθυσσε ταῖς λευκαῖς. ὁμοῦ δὲ αὐταῖς καὶ Χάρισι θύειν νομίζουσι. (Paus. 8.34.1-3.) This story explicitly demonstrates what is only implicit in many of the cult *aetia* seen above: ἐναγίζειν sacrifice may function to propitiate wrathful entities, in addition to its function as a form of purification. (For the release from madness as a form of purification see Parker, 208, 288-289.) Pausanias describes numerous shrines associated with this myth of Orestes and the goddesses before he relates the myth itself, and so it is not entirely clear where and even to whom the contemporary θύειν sacrifice is performed. The most obvious interpretation is that the white goddesses receive this sacrifice at the last of the shrines

Pelops above, it is significant that the ones who perform the sacrifice are the annual magistrates of the city: they are well positioned to represent their community at the sacrifice and so to expiate its old crime, simultaneously anticipating the hero's renewed wrath and maintaining his propitiation.²⁴⁵ However, in their annual deliverance of the community from his wrath, they become ἐναγείς to the god and so must be purified before they can properly rejoin in the rites of the community.

The mention of one minor but not insignificant detail has been deliberately avoided until this point: Pausanias repeatedly describes the sacrifice to Pelops as θύειν, and at no point does he call it ἐναγίζειν.²⁴⁶ However, this does not present any significant challenge to the view that those who sacrifice to Pelops become ἐναγείς by their deed, which is in any case already apparent. We have seen in section 2.3 that the mythology and ritual of Pelops' cult clearly distinguishes this hero from the god Zeus in a way similar to the function of ἐναγίζειν, and furthermore that θύειν is an unmarked term of sacrifice which can be applied in diverse ways. It is therefore possible that the description Pausanias provides of Pelops' cult may give us reason to suppose that he could have just as well described it with the word ἐναγίζειν.²⁴⁷ This does nothing to reduce the distinction

he describes; this is, for instance, how Frazer translates the passage. If so, it is tempting to speculate that Pausanias sees no need to remark on the ἐναγίζειν sacrifice perhaps performed to the black goddesses at the first of the shrines, as this would clearly indicate the need felt for their annual propitiation. Incidentally, Orestes' sacrifice to the black goddesses is the only occasion in Pausanias in which deities explicitly receive ἐναγίζειν sacrifice.

245 Paus. 5.13.2. θύουσι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ νῦν ἔτι οἱ κατὰ ἔτος τὰς ἀρχὰς ἔχοντες· τὸ δὲ ἱρεῖόν ἐστι κριὸς μέλας.

246 Ibid., 5.13.2-3.

247 The claim that the sacrifice received by Pelops at Olympia may be called ἐναγίζειν is in fact made by a scholiast on Pindar in describing the cult, associating it apparently with offerings made to the dead. (Βοιωτικὴ φωνὴ τὸ αἵμακουρίας· οὗτοι γὰρ αἵμακουρίας τὰ τῶν νεκρῶν ἐναγίσματα λέγουσιν.) See *Schol. Pind. O.* 1.146.

On the other hand, it may be significant that the sacrifice to Pelops apparently involved some sort of dining: as Ekroth has argued, the idea that the meat from victims of ἐναγίζειν was generally not eaten is well supported at the time of Pausanias' writing, although with some exceptions in other sources. (See Gunnel Ekroth, "The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods," (Ph.D. diss., Stockholm University, 1999), 82.) This too could explain why Pausanias uses θύειν to describe the ritual. Even if so, this fails to

between these terms: ἐναγίζειν remains a marked term which would be absurd if applied to such rituals as those of a god like Zeus at Olympia or even a divinized mortal like Amphiaraus. While it may also be objected that there is no obvious propitiation involved in Pelops' cult as Pausanias describes it, there is in fact some indication of this in the story of the cult's foundation. Significantly, the Eleans who providentially happened to be at Delphi upon Damarmenus' arrival there with Pelops' shoulder bone were there seeking deliverance from a plague.²⁴⁸ Pausanias tells us nothing further about this plague, but it would not be improbable were a wrathful hero yet again to blame.²⁴⁹ What we are seeing, therefore, appears to be a particular pattern of myths and rituals which can be indicated through the mention of ἐναγίζειν. However, this should not be taken to imply that all ἐναγίζειν sacrifice must necessarily fit into this pattern, for there is a haphazard quality to our evidence which prohibits such universal conclusions, and in any case we have already seen that there is some flexibility in Pausanias' own use of the word.²⁵⁰

4.2. Rituals of the Unspecified Hero

We return now to the problem seen in the first chapter of the identity of a certain set of those beings whom Pausanias does not specifically call heroes but who may arguably be well described as such. Among these are those mortals who are somehow paired with a god and receive sacrifice, frequently by ἐναγίζειν. We have already seen these hero-god pairs in such cases as that of Pelops and Zeus above, where Pausanias specifies that Pelops is a hero and Zeus a god. In many other such pairs it is implicit that the mortal is a hero, which is indicated through

negate the danger of ἄγος which is plainly present in the cult, since it remains that those who eats the meat of the ram apparently become ἐναγεῖς.

248 Paus. 5.13.6.

249 It may be significant that he describes the plague as a νόσου λοιμώδους, for this itself seems to further imply divine anger and the need for propitiation and purification. See Parker, 257.

250 For the same reasons, it would be excessive to suggest that those heroes who do not receive sacrifice of a kind that could be called ἐναγίζειν are not properly heroes. Again, it is necessary in an undertaking of this sort to accurately describe the complex usage of the word ἐναγίζειν and not to prescribe a certain aspect of its usage as necessary to all others.

certain aspects of the cult's myth and/or ritual as described by Pausanias. For instance, in section 1.5 we mentioned the murdered children at Caphyae who receive annual propitiatory ἐναγίζειν sacrifice and whose cult is bound closely to that of Artemis.²⁵¹ In their case, there is an obvious pattern of polluting crime and purificatory propitiation, and the annual sacrifice to the children surely follows the pattern described above, wherein the crime and its purification are re-enacted through ritual in order to again deliver the community. The combination of this motif so common to hero cult with an ἐναγίζειν ritual and the pairing of mortals and a goddess strongly suggests that these children are heroes. Furthermore, the story of the children appears to take place in the distant past, perhaps in the heroic age itself, and in any case surely within the era of heroization. Finally, there is no better explanation of the children than that they are heroes: there is after all no indication given by Pausanias that they are in fact divinized mortals, nor is there a better reason to number them among θνητοί than heroes.

There are a number of other pairings which can similarly be argued to be of heroes and gods. The case of Eurypylus was described in section 1.5 and needs little further comment: the same argument as was made for the children at Caphyae can be made for him, although in his case the motifs common to hero cult are largely of the different sorts discussed when he was mentioned earlier, and concerning his 'paired' divinity it is interesting that he seems to be tied to Artemis almost as much as he is to Dionysus. Other noteworthy examples may include those of Hyacinth and Apollo at Amyclae and Myrtilus and Hermes at Pheneus: both cases involve the wrongful death of one who was close to their god and are otherwise similar to those examples given already.²⁵² What deserves further comment is rather the fact that the sacrifice performed in many of these hero cults is performed as a preliminary to the god's sacrifice. While this has been seen already, it has not been considered in light of the theory of ἐναγίζειν described

251 Paus. 8.23.6-7.

252 Ibid., 3.19.3, 8.14.10-11.

above, wherein the one who sacrifices to a hero on the behalf of the community becomes ἐναγής to the god until purified: sacrificing thus to a hero as a preliminary to the god's sacrifice may seem problematic if indeed it places one in a state of ἄγος both generally and also particularly to that god. If our theory is correct, then what seems most likely is that a purification would be performed after the sacrifice to the hero before performing the sacrifice to the god.

Unfortunately, Pausanias does not provide the necessary details required in order for this to be verified as a point of general sacrificial procedure, which is exactly what would be expected in light of his methodological statement that he only reports on what is most noteworthy: there would be no need for him to describe a commonplace ritual procedure.²⁵³ However, the unusually detailed account of the consultation procedure of Trophonius' oracle discussed in section 3.2 may provide the needed details. Pausanias mentions a series of sacrifices culminating in a θύειν sacrifice made to Agamedes preceding the descent to Trophonius.²⁵⁴ We have seen that Agamedes is a difficult figure: while Trophonius seems to be conflated with him to some extent, at the same time his mortality is more pronounced than that of Trophonius, who is a god. Agamedes too may be a hero paired with a god: among other things, the story of his murder by Trophonius is compatible with the aetiological myth of a propitiatory hero cult, and the sacrifice received by him may be like that received by Pelops, where ἐναγίζειν is called by the more general term θύειν. If so, then the bath which seems to follow the sacrifice to Agamedes but precede the descent to Trophonius may serve to purify the ἐναγής worshipper of the hero.²⁵⁵ Of course, another possibility may simply be

253 Ibid., 3.11.1; Christian Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley, California, 1985), 22-23.

254 Paus. 9.39.5-9.

255 Of course, one who consults the panhellenic oracle of Trophonius cannot be assumed to be a representative of the Lebadean community, and so this situation is not immediately applicable in terms of our theory. What is of relevance here is only that the consultee was apparently purified after the sacrifice to the hero and before the descent to the god, for this may indicate more general aspects of hero-worship and god-worship. Moreover, the sacrificial procedures of a consultation might be analogous to those of the community's worship, since both concern the

that, since not all ἐναγίζειν sacrifices can be assumed to contaminate the worshipper, the sacrifices to a hero performed as preliminaries to those of a god do not necessarily make the worshipper ἐναγής to the god. Again, our evidence is too sparse for such possibilities to be set aside. However, this possibility would occasionally be problematic since at least some of these preliminary sacrifices involve hero cults of purificatory propitiation where we would for the reasons discussed above expect the hero's worshipper to become ἐναγής, such as the cult of Hyacinth. Thus there is reason to suppose that at least some of these preliminary hero cults did indeed pollute the hero's worshipper and so required some form of purification before the god's sacrifice was made.

These god-hero pairs demonstrate some of the ways in which heroic identity may be implicit in Pausanias' descriptions of cults: the contrast between divine and heroic figures, in addition to other heroic attributes which might be mentioned, spares Pausanias from the need always to specify tediously that his heroes are indeed heroes. Such a contrast is in fact itself a kind of heroic attribute, common but not by definition necessary to hero cult, and indeed other heroic attributes can function similarly to indicate that a certain figure is a hero. The bulk of Pausanias' heroes are probably such figures as these. We can consider a fairly typical instance in the form of Aristocrates, whose grave Pausanias sees on the road from Arcadian Orchomenus to Mount Trachy.²⁵⁶ Pausanias says here of this Aristocrates only that he once raped the virgin priestess of Artemis Hymnia. A slightly fuller explanation is provided earlier in his history of Arcadia. Pausanias relates that Aristocrates was an Arcadian king at the time of the first Messenian wars: having been found out for his rape of the priestess of the most ancient goddess in her very sanctuary he was consequently stoned to death by the Arcadians.²⁵⁷ Furthermore, Pausanias relates that afterwards the Arcadians

same gods and heroes at the same site. (For this kind of analogy, in the case of Zeus and Pelops at Olympia, see Burkert, *Homo Necans*, 96.)

256 Paus. 8.13.5.

257 Ibid., 8.5.10-12.

changed the custom of the cult so that its priestess was not to be a virgin.²⁵⁸ The tale of Aristocrates is thus of a familiar aetiological sort. Given its motif of someone's death at the hands of the community, it is not difficult to imagine a propitiatory hero cult's establishment playing an unmentioned role in this aetiological myth, following perhaps the appropriate plague and Delphic consultation. If it did exist, it is possible that Pausanias simply did not find such a part of the tale noteworthy for whatever reason, or perhaps the grave had long since ceased to be the site of hero cult and so this aspect of the myth had lost the bulk of its aetiological purpose.²⁵⁹ In any case, the story of Aristocrates' violation of Artemis' priestess involves the common mythical antagonism of a paired hero and god, and in this case it seems rather simple to observe the logic underlying how the propitiation of Aristocrates through ἐναγίζειν would make one ἐναγής to Artemis and in need of purification.²⁶⁰ Moreover, Aristocrates is also sufficiently antique to be a hero, despite not hailing from the heroic age itself, and his possession of a grave is quite compatible with hero cult. Again, we may consider the alternatives to his being a hero in order to determine what is most likely. The first of these, that he is a divinized mortal, is altogether without support. Alternatively, he could be a θνητός whose grave is simply one of the many that might line the road from a city. This, however, would seem unlikely in light of the many heroic elements of his myth: he is clearly a hero of myth and, while it cannot be proven from Pausanias, may very well have been a hero of cult as well, and so Pausanias surely considers him a hero.

There are indeed many such figures as these in Pausanias, although often even less is said of them than is said of Aristocrates. Since the argument that they

258 Ibid., 8.5.12. ἀντὶ γὰρ παρθένου διδόασι τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ἱέρειαν γυναῖκα ὁμιλίας ἀνδρῶν ἀποχρώντως ἔχουσιν.

259 However, it is significant that Artemis Hymnia's cult, with its particular priesthood, was clearly still active in Pausanias' day. This does not mean that its associated hero cult, if any, must have survived as long, but similarly it indicates that this would not have been impossible. (For the contemporary activities of the cult see Paus. 8.13.1.)

260 For the mythical antagonism of heroes and gods, mirrored by their assimilation in ritual, see Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans*, rev. ed. (Baltimore, Maryland, 1999), 289-308.

too may be heroes would look largely like that given above, perhaps instead it would be fitting to say something about the working of other possibilities. An interesting example of the difficulties involved in this is provided on the Athenian Sacred Way, where Pausanias sees the tomb of the courtesan Pythionice and remarks that it is the most *θέας ἄξιον* of all ancient tombs in Greece.²⁶¹ There is no indication given that this is the site of heroic or indeed any other sort of cult, and there is no mythological information provided of the sort which would place Pythionice among the number of Pausanias' heroes or divinized mortals: she seems to Pausanias to be a relatively ordinary *θηητός* in possession of a very fine tomb. However, we know from other sources that her lover Harpalus, responsible for the tomb's construction, is said to have elsewhere dedicated a temple to Pythionice Aphrodite upon her death.²⁶² We have already seen that Hellenistic dynasts are not mortals worthy of divinization to Pausanias, but it remains that Pythionice's tomb may have been dedicated to a divinized mortal; it is tempting to suppose that Pausanias' *θέας ἄξιον* hints ironically at this.²⁶³ In any case, it remains that Pausanias' own opinions may not reflect a builder's intentions, and this adds difficulty to the task of distinguishing between the temples of gods and the graves of mortals and heroes in Pausanias.²⁶⁴

It may be possible to assert with some confidence that the graves of figures from the heroic age are likely those of heroes even when Pausanias does not say this, since although other mortals also have graves, only heroes have distinguished graves of such antiquity: the only other possibility, that they are the graves of divinized mortals, would be almost nonsensical. Similarly, we have seen that

261 Paus. 1.37.5.

262 Frazer, *Commentary on Book I*, 495-496.

263 The phrase *θέας ἄξιον* is of course that which recurs throughout Pausanias and means simply "worth seeing." However, in appearance it is scarcely distinguishable from *θεᾶς ἄξιον*, which would here refer paradoxically to a tomb "worthy of a goddess."

264 Similarly, it was seen in section 2.2 that to Pausanias, Hippolytus at Troezen is probably a hero, even though there is some possibility that he is a god to the people of Troezen themselves.

Pausanias names almost no heroes from the Classical era onwards, and none at all after the Hellenistic era, and so it seems most likely that any later grave would not belong to anyone whom he would call a hero. Ambiguity is more present in the graves and other monuments of mortals bounded by each terminus, since it cannot be certain whether they belong to heroes or to other mortals when Pausanias tells us nothing of rituals performed at these sites, if any. As for divinized mortals, we have seen that to Pausanias these are figures of great antiquity: historical individuals such as Pythionice surely cannot qualify. The difficulty in understanding them is rather caused by the similarity they sometimes have to heroes, although this may be largely remedied by the fact that, as was seen in the previous chapter, Pausanias on occasion draws up lists of those mortals who have become gods, something he does not do for the apparently much larger category of heroes.²⁶⁵ Simply put, the scarcity of information provided by Pausanias means we cannot confidently say whether the owner of a certain grave who may or may not receive cult is a hero when he tells us little more than this. However, our identification of various heroic motifs allows us identify many figures as heroes on those occasions when he does tell us more about them. Indeed, even if he says little more than that a certain one receives ἐν αἰθέρι sacrifice it can be enough for us to recognize the hero.

4.3. Conclusion

Having examined the general characteristics of Pausanias' heroes, their distinctions from other recipients of cult, and the implications of their sacrificial rituals as regards both themselves and their worshippers, we will hopefully have

²⁶⁵ This is especially true of figures from the semi-historical period. For instance, Pausanias mentions that Lycurgus receives the rites customary to the gods at Sparta, and that there too Hipposthenes the athlete is worshipped with honours ἄτε Ποσειδῶνι. (See respectively Paus. 3.16.6, 3.15.7.) Nowhere does he say that such individuals as Lycurgus and Hipposthenes are gods, and so it seems more likely that he is indicating the difference between those mortals whom he agrees have become gods and those who are merely recognized by others as being gods. Whether they then are heroes to Pausanias is something that he does not say.

found ourselves with a clearer understanding of where we were at the beginning of this study. Considering again the contradiction at the heart of the hero's nature, that of being both godlike and dead, we have seen how this inevitably results from the hero's simultaneous distinction from both θνητοί and ἄθάνατοι, and how the emphasis of these distinctions can be constructed in cult through sacrificial ritual, especially the choice of ἐναγίζειν or θύειν sacrifice. This ritual diversity of hero worship has led us to consider the heroes' worshippers themselves: what we have surely seen reflected in the diversity of Pausanias' heroes are the various religious needs felt in Greek cities at the time of Pausanias. For instance, ἐναγίζειν ritual in hero cult commonly indicates the feeling of a need for purification, and indeed the aetiological myths of many of these hero cult suggest that this need was the very cause of their foundation. However, our findings have raised new questions: there remains more to be said about Greek religion *in the age of Pausanias* and the role of hero cult within it. For instance, in section 3.4 we have seen Pausanias' dismissal of Roman imperial cult, yet much more remains to be said about imperial cult's relation to contemporary cults of heroes and divinized mortals. We have also seen consultation of the Delphic oracle recur in many myths of cult foundation related by Pausanias: to consider in greater detail the role of Delphi in such cults not only at the semi-legendary times of their foundation but also in the age of Pausanias would be critical to gaining a fuller understanding. Moreover, while Pausanias is one of our best sources of information on religious matters for his age and even those preceding it, it remains that a thorough understanding of the religion of that era requires us to look beyond the writings of one man, however wonderful they may be.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Aeschylus. *Supplices*. In *Aeschyli Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias*. Edited by D. L. Page. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Appianus. *Bellum civile*. Edited by P. Viereck. In *Appian's Roman history*, vols. 3-4. Edited by H. White. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1913.
- Aratus. *Phaenomena*. Edited and translated by Douglas Kidd. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Aristophanes. *Fragmenta*. In *The fragments of Attic comedy*, vol. 1. Edited by J. M. Edmonds. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1957.
- . *Nubes*. In *Aristophanis Comoediae*, 2nd ed., vol. 1. Edited by F. W. Hall and W. M. Geldart. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1906.
- Arrianus. *Alexandri anabasis*. In *Flavii Arriani quae exstant omnia*, vol. 1. Edited by A. G. Roos & G. Wirth. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1967.
- Cicero. *De natura deorum*, 2nd ed. Edited by Otto Plasberg and Wilhelm Ax. Stuttgart, Germany: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1933.
- Herodotus. *Historiae*. 2 vols. Edited by Carolus Hude. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1927.
- Hesiodus. *Theogonia – Opera et dies – Scutum – Fragmenta selecta*, 3rd ed. Edited by Friedrich Solmsen, R. Merkelbach and M. L. West. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Hymni Homerici. *In Apollinem*. In *The Homeric Hymns*, 2nd ed. Edited by T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday and E. E. Sikes. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Isaeus. *De Apollodoro*. In *Isée. Discours*, 2nd ed. Edited by P. Roussel. Paris, France: Les Belles Lettres, 1960.
- . *De Menecle*. In *Isée. Discours*, 2nd ed. Edited by P. Roussel. Paris, France: Les Belles Lettres, 1960.

- , *De Philoctemone*. In *Isée. Discours*, 2nd ed. Edited by P. Roussel. Paris, France: Les Belles Lettres, 1960.
- Livius. *Ab urbe condita*. 6 vols. Edited by R. S. Conway, C. F. Walters, S. K. Johnson, A. H. McDonald and P. G. Walsh. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1914.
- Lucianus. *Dialogi mortuorum*. In *Lucian*, vol. 7. Edited by M. D. Macleod. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Parthenius. *Narrationes amatoriae*. In *Parthenii Nicaeni quae supersunt*. Edited by E. Martini. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1902.
- Pausanias. *Descriptio Graeciae*. 3 vols. Edited by M. H. Rocha-Pereira. Leipzig, Germany: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1973.
- , *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, 2nd ed. 6 vols. Edited and translated by J. G. Frazer. London, England: MacMillan and Co., 1913.
- Plutarchus. *Aetia Romana et Graeca*. In *Plutarchi moralia*, vol. 2. Edited by J. B. Titchener. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1935.
- , *Brutus*. In *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, 2nd ed., vol. 2. Edited by K. Ziegler. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1964.
- , *De Herodoti malignitate*. In *Plutarch's moralia*, vol. 11. Edited by L. Pearson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- , *Solon*. In *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, 4th ed., vol. 1. Edited by K. Ziegler. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1969.
- Scholia in Pindarum. *Scholia in Olympia et Pythia*, in *Scholia recentia in Pindari epinicia / Scholia in Pindari epinicia ad librorum manuscriptorum fidem*. Edited by Eugenius Abel. Budapest, Hungary: S. Calvary, 1891.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus Tyrannus*. In *Sophoclis fabulae*. Edited by H. Lloyd-Jones & N. G. Wilson. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Strabo. *Geographica*. In *Strabonis geographica*. 3 vols. Edited by A. Meineke. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner, 1877.

Suidas. *Suidae Lexicon*. 5 vols. Edited by Ada Adler. Stuttgart, Germany: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1928-1938.

Thucydides. *Historiae*. 2 vols. Edited by Henricus Stuart Jones. London, England: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Secondary Sources

Antonaccio, Carla M. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*. London, England: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1995.

Auffarth, Christoph. "How to Sacrifice Correctly – Without a Manual?" In *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, eds. Robin Hägg & Brita Alroth, 11-22. Stockholm, Sweden: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 2005.

Bremmer, Jan N. "The Rise of the Hero Cult and the New Simonides." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 158 (2006) : 15-26.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Translated by John Raffan. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 1985.

-----, "Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 7 (1966) : 87-121.

-----, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*. Translated by Peter Bing. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1983.

Clay, Diskin. *Archilochus Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Ekroth, Gunnel. "Pausanias and the Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults." In *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, ed. Robin Hägg, 145-158. Stockholm, Sweden: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1999.

-----, "The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early

- Hellenistic periods.” Ph.D. diss., Stockholm University, 1999.
- Habicht, Christian. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1985.
- Harrison, Jane Ellen. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, 3rd ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1922.
- , *Themis: A Study in the Social Origins of Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- Hughes, Dennis D. “Hero cult, heroic honors, heroic dead: some developments in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.” In *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*, ed. Robin Hägg, 167-175. Stockholm, Sweden: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1999.
- Malkin, Irad. *Colonization and Greek Religion*. Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1987.
- Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans*, rev. ed. Baltimore, Maryland: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- , “Theognis and Megara: A Poet's Vision of his City.” In *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the Polis*, eds. Thomas J. Figueira & Gregory Nagy, 22-81. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *A History of Greek Religion*, 2nd ed. Translated by F. J. Fielden (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1949).
- Nock, Arthur Darby. “The Attic Orgeones and the Cult of Heroes.” *The Harvard Theological Review* 37, no. 2 (April, 1944) : 141-174.
- Parker, Robert. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- , “ὥς ἥρωι ἐναγίζειν.” In *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, eds. Robin Hägg & Brita Alroth, 37-45. Stockholm, Sweden: Svenska

Institutet i Athen, 2005.

Rohde, Erwin. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*, 8th ed. Translated by W. B. Hillis. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1925.

Schlesier, Renate. "Olympian versus Chthonian Religion." *Scripta classica Israelica* 11 (1991-1992) : 38-51.

Scullion, Scott. "Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinous." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 132 (2000) : 163-171.

-----, "Olympian and Chthonian." *Classical Antiquity* 13, no. 1 (April, 1994) : 75-119.

Vout, Caroline. *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2007.