

Introduction

Rituals, materiality, and the cultic honours for Hellenistic political leaders

INTRODUCING THE PROJECT

Practicalities of Hellenistic Ruler Cults (PHRC)

In his seminal work *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, which was destined to profoundly reshape the understanding of cultic honours granted by Greek cities to royal benefactors at the beginning of the Hellenistic age, the late Ch. Habicht dealt with ruler cults as a suitable perspective from which to study the processes of communication and negotiation between Greek cities and early Hellenistic dynasts. In the introduction to the book, he also outlined another aspect of the phenomenon which would, however, remain out of the scope of his research: “The present study deliberately forgoes any attempt to illustrate the specifically religious content of this divine worship in context.”¹

Largely drawing on Habicht’s results, later scholars have increasingly investigated cultic honours for Hellenistic political leaders with a focus on the diplomatic interaction between cities and kings. These studies have deepened our understanding of the ‘euergetic discourse’ underpinning the grant of cultic honours to prominent leaders in exchange for their political, economic and military benefactions.² This

-
1. HABICHT (2017³), p. xv (translated and augmented edition of *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, Munich 1956; 1970²).
 2. For an extensive discussion of the recent research trends on this subject, see A. CHANKOWSKI (2011); IOSSIF – LORBER (2011); GNOLI – MUCCIOLI (2014), p. 11-27 (*Introduzione*), CANEVA (2016a), with the previous references. In addition to the work of HABICHT, another fundamental contribution to the analysis of ruler cults in their socio-political contexts was offered by GAUTHIER (1985)’s investigation of honours for political leaders (including cultic ones) as part of the institutional history of the Hellenistic *polis*. GAUTHIER’S research has had a deep impact on further epigraphic studies of the Hellenistic honorific practice, both at the level of international city-king negotiations—for which see in particular MA (2002²) on the reign of Antiochos III—and of internal interactions between civic institutions and local elites in the second and first cent. BC: for the latter point, see WÖRRLE – ZANKER (1995); MANN – SCHOLZ (2012); MA (2013); FORSTER (2018).

renewed interest in Hellenistic ruler cults has progressively replaced a long-lasting judgement of cultic honours for mortals as an aberrant feature of Greek polytheism, a possible consequence of Oriental influence (with all the negative connotations accompanying this theory, now in any event proved wrong), and a mark of the decline of *polis* religion. A more neutral evaluation has found its way in the last decades, at least among specialists, acknowledging that for about 600 years, between the early Hellenistic age and the end of the third century AD, the evidence about Greek and Roman religions showcases countless examples of religious honours for political leaders and other public benefactors.³ Although with differences across time, space, and context, cultic honours allowed communities to express gratitude for benefactions by ritually equating their authors to the traditional gods and heroes.

However, various methodological issues still remain to be tackled. To begin with, only in a few cases has the growing interest in this long-neglected aspect of the cultural life of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods been accompanied by a study of the properly ritual dimension of ruler cults. By this I mean the practical features anchoring new cultic honours for human beings in the existing religious life of a community: these aspects comprise ritual gesture; the organization of sacred space and time; the definition of the honorands' divine names, cultic iconography, and competences; and the interaction of all these features with those contributing to the representation of the gods that a community builds up for its own use.⁴ In other words, if a famous passage of Herodotus (2.53.2-3) ascribes to Homer and Hesiod the definition of the genealogies, denomination, honours, competences, and iconographies of the gods composing the Greek pantheon, how could we fill these same categories for human beings once a community establishes them as recipients of cults and accordingly constructs, even if in a limited geographical context and for a short period, their religious *persona*?

3. On this point, see e.g. ERSKINE (2010).

4. See for instance WIKANDER (2005), CHANIOTIS (2007), BURASELIS (2003; 2010; 2012), CANEVA (2014a; 2015), PAUL (2016) on the Greek side; PFEIFFER (2008) for Greek and Egyptian cults in the Ptolemaic kingdom; GRADEL (2002), SCHEID (2006/7), KANTIREA (2007), CAMIA (2011) for the Roman imperial cult; see also the broad range of the contributions collected in IOSSIF – CHANKOWSKI – LORBER (2011); GÜNTHER – PLISCHKE (2011); GNOLI – MUCCIOLI (2014); CANEVA (2016a). A far-reaching impact on the 'ritual turn' in studies of Hellenistic and Roman cults for rulers must be recognized to the work of PRICE (1980; 1984a; 1984b), whose studies have cross-fertilized the analysis of the textual evidence with a strong knowledge of the methods of cognitive anthropology. PRICE's ground-breaking analysis of Roman imperial cult is, however, not paralleled by an equally convincing treatment of the Hellenistic precedents as the author often projects some distinctive trends of the Imperial period back onto Hellenistic ritual practice: on this point see the criticism by CANEVA (2016b). In comparison, the 'ritual turn' has already reached a further stage of refinement and interdisciplinarity in relation to the heroic cultic honours for civic benefactors and members of local elite families: see recently VON MANGOLD (2013) and especially the studies by EKROTH (2002; 2007; 2009; 2015), which have played an important role in the design of the PHRC methodology for the ritual analysis of ruler cults.

Much remains to be done in this direction. An inspiring example of the positive consequences of dealing with ruler cults beyond the narrow limits of power negotiation is provided by L. Bricault's analysis of the impact of cults for the deified Ptolemaic queen Arsinoe II on the characterization of Isis as a protectress of seafaring. The Egyptian goddess did not possess this competence in pre-Hellenistic times, but she acquired it from Aphrodite; this transfer was made possible by the fact that in Ptolemaic ruler cults, the two goddesses were both constantly associated with Arsinoe Philadelphos, so that the deified queen acted as a bridge between the two deities and as a catalyst for religious innovation.⁵ While not all Hellenistic cases of interaction between old and new (human) recipients of cult could enjoy the same long-lasting royal support and spread via the same efficient network of dissemination as the Ptolemaic Aphrodite-Arsinoe-Isis connection, a detailed analysis of the evidence may reveal more cases of cross-fertilization between new religious honours for human beings and existing cults at the level of divine names and competences, sacred topography, and ritual practice.

The second point to be discussed concerns the need for research on Hellenistic ruler cults to re-embrace a global perspective. Recent studies on the ritual dimension of cultic honours for political leaders and benefactors have privileged fine-grained analyses of local or regional documentary dossiers. On the one hand, this methodological choice should be praised for drawing attention to the importance of differentiation and contextualization, as a response to the generalizing results of some studies devoted to the theme of deification and heroization in the mid-20th century.⁶ A growing number of specific case studies soundly grounded in the analysis of the documentary dossier has corrected many long-lasting simplifications in the understanding of Hellenistic ruler cults, such as their assumed Near Eastern origins, which has been mentioned above, or the theory interpreting polytheistic deification as a coherent theological category first paving the way to, and then competing against, the different model of encounter between humanity and divinity proposed by Christianity. However, by privileging particularism, this approach has also resulted in diverting scholarly attention from the challenge of understanding the big picture of the religious mechanisms of cultic honours for human benefactors and of their contribution to the development of Greek polytheism as a whole.

A final problem that emerges from an overview of the existing bibliography is that the major reference works do not rely on an interdisciplinary method.⁷ Epigraphy has played a prominent role in the reassessment of ruler cults with regard to both their political and religious aspects, followed by literature and papyrology, yet studies based

-
5. BRICAULT (2006) and (2019). MINAS-NERPEL (2019) now draws attention to an Egyptian side of this process of cultic transfer from queens to Isis, showing that the epithet 'the perfect one of the ram', first attested for Isis under Ptolemy IV, already appears as a denomination of Arsinoe in Egyptian temples and it might have originated in Mendes, where the deified queen was venerated in association with the divine ram Ba-neb-djedet.
 6. See in particular CERFAUX – TONDRIAUX (1957); TAEGER (1957-1960).
 7. On this point, see my remarks in CANEVA (2017).

on the textual sources rarely take into account the contribution of archaeology and/or numismatics.⁸ While the study of specific regional cases has already considerably benefited from a research method combining textual, archaeological and visual evidence, a properly interdisciplinary approach remains a *desideratum* when it comes to the evaluation of the ritual dimension of Hellenistic ruler cults at a large geographical scale and in a chronological perspective of *longue durée*.⁹

Starting from these premises, in 2015, I designed a proposal for the project *Practicalities of Hellenistic Ruler Cults* with the purpose of repositioning the study of cultic honours for human beings within the broader context of ritual practice and of the social and economic processes related to the introduction, administration, and funding of cults in Hellenistic Greek religion. This project has received the financial support of a Marie Curie-Piscopia fellowship at the University of Padova (2015-2017), and then of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS) at the University of Liège (2017-2020). The methodological cornerstone of the project has been the attempt to combine the analysis of the written documentation with the contribution of archaeology, in order to flesh out the social, economic, and spatial contexts by which ruler cults were embedded in the ritual life of communities. The contribution of material analysis has been considered not only as valuable *per se*, but also as decisive to the broadening of the research scope to the whole spectrum of epigraphic sources: besides the long and detailed texts of civic decrees and royal letters, which even if taken alone may provide a rich and varied amount of data about the content, context and agents of cults, the data extracted from the study of the material support and its archaeological context can let brief, often personal dedications on small objects speak beyond the scarcity of information provided by their short and repetitive texts.

-
8. Together, BRINGMANN – VON STEUBEN (1995), BRINGMANN (2000), SCHMIDT-DOUNAS (2000), and KOTSIDU (2000) provide an interesting exception, as they often combine the textual (epigraphic and literary) sources with the archaeological evidence. However, KOTSIDU's work only provides a catalogue of sources concerning honours for Hellenistic rulers, without offering a general discussion; moreover, her work lists cases in which political leaders receive ritual honours together with more traditional ones which only consist in the grant of honorific statues. On the other hand, MA (2013) offers an inspiring combination of epigraphic and archaeological analysis of the honorific practice of erecting statues of benefactors and elite members in Hellenistic cities, but his work does not comprise a discussion of ritual honours. Some more specific studies can also be mentioned here as useful examples of the combination of written and archaeological analysis: SCHWARZER (1999) and MICHELS (2011) on ruler cults in Pergamon; PFEIFFER (2008) on Ptolemaic Egypt; MITTAG (2011) on Kommagene; on texts and coins, see e.g. IOSSIF (2011) and ERICKSON (2018; 2019).
9. An overview of the current debate in Greek epigraphy, at least in the English-speaking scholarship, reveals a renewed attention for the material aspects of writing and support and for the development of cross-disciplinary methodologies drawing on the toolkits of both philology and archaeology: see the methodological introduction by PETROVIC (2019) to PETROVIC – PETROVIC – THOMAS (2019); among the papers collected there, see in particular MYLONOPOULOS (2019) on dedicatory texts on Hellenistic sacred buildings and altars. Part of the purpose of the current book is to bridge the gap between this methodological trend and the study of Hellenistic cults for rulers.

A part of the development of the *PHRC* project has consisted in the organization of the conference *The Materiality of Hellenistic Ruler Cults*, held at the University of Liège on 31 May – 1st June 2018. The majority of the chapters of this book are reworked versions of papers presented at this conference, to which a few others (Chapters 6 and 8) have been added at a later stage.¹⁰ Both the conference and the book have been conceived in three sections, respectively focusing on 1) the material dimension of the sources, their support, and contexts of circulation; 2) the organization of the ritual space and actions; 3) the role of the various agents involved in the activities related to the funding, organization and celebration of cultic honours for rulers and benefactors.

If this volume will not yet provide comprehensive answers to the broad spectrum of questions raised by *PHRC*, yet we hope that it will achieve its purpose of delivering to the scholarly community new interdisciplinary perspectives of research that can be applied to other case studies and tested at a broader scale, in order to build up a more encompassing interpretation of the ritual practicalities of ruler cults and of their social agency in the Hellenistic Eastern Mediterranean world.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUNDS AND METHODS

This book deals with the practical and material aspects of cultic honours granted to Hellenistic rulers, a broad social category by which we embrace both international political leaders (usually of royal status) and local elite members acting as benefactors for their communities. The studies collected here focus in various ways on the ritual activities, agents, contexts, strategies of funding, and methods of administration related to these honours. The purpose of this choice is to remove all barriers that could prevent us from investigating ritual honours for human beings with the same set of questions and methods by which we would study the *timai* that the same communities granted to their traditional gods and heroes. But before we go any further, it is necessary that we define here what we mean by ‘ritual’.

In this respect, we will share the broad definition proposed by twentieth-century-anthropologists and performance theorists identifying ritual as the performance of a formalized sequence of actions bearing a symbolic meaning for a person or group.¹¹ The choice of such a wide-ranging definition responds to the need to set up a methodological framework enabling us to rule out any *a priori* separation between ‘religious’ and ‘non-religious’ rituals in the life of a community. Religious rituals, or rituals

10. Conversely, the paper by S.G. CANEVA, “Incense in Hellenistic Ruler Cults”, which was presented at Session II of the conference, will appear in BRADLEY – GRAND-CLÉMENT (forthcoming). A study of animal offerings to human recipients is in preparation by S.G. CANEVA and Z. PITZ; the latter presented a preliminary communication on this topic at the Liège conference, Session II.

11. For the anthropological approach, see e.g. BELL (1992; 1997). From the point of view of performance theory, see SCHECHNER (1988; 1993).

related to the ‘sacred’,¹² can therefore be understood as a sub-category of rituals and therefore defined as formalized sequences of actions bearing a symbolic meaning for the relationship of an individual or group with the super-human sphere. This broad definition of ritual in the sphere of communication between human and divine provides a particularly suitable hermeneutic tool for exploring the entanglement between the socio-political and religious life of communities in the ancient Greek world. In ancient polytheisms, the interaction with the super-human sphere permeates any aspect of personal and communal life, making limits between ‘sacred’ and ‘profane’ rituals very porous, if existing at all.¹³ With regard to the honorific rituals that concern us here, this general statement can be better specified by recalling that in Greek, the semantic field of the verb *timaō* (“to honour”) embraced the spheres of cults for the traditional gods, of cultic honours for human recipients, and even of non-religious privileges bestowed upon human beings. From this perspective, the theoretical distinction between ‘sacred’ and ‘non-sacred’ honorific rituals needs to be discussed from a dynamic rather than from a static point of view. This will help us investigate cultic honours for human benefactors as part of the ritual life of ancient Greek communities, while also paving the way to the study of the administrative and financial aspects of ruler cults as a constituent part of the administration and economy of the sacred.

Another fundamental methodological point to be discussed concerns the embeddedness of social agency, political discourse, and representations of the divine in material culture and in sequences of ritual action. Cognitive anthropology has shown that traditional arguments against ritualistic religions as poor in theoretical representations of the divine are deprived of any historical ground because ritual *per se* incorporates statements about the divine and encapsulates potential narratives, which from case to case may (but need not) be accompanied by discursive statements in the form of narrative, description, interpretation, prescription.¹⁴ In the recent decades, the sphere of application of this approach has considerably broadened by replacing a specific focus on discourse with a perspective embracing material culture as well. Cognitive archaeology, with its various ramifications among which the archaeology of ritual currently stands out as one of the liveliest trends, fruitfully contributes to

-
12. I align myself with an interpretation of ‘sacredness’ as a socially constructed (and often legally regulated) status by which an object, a place, or a person is considered as an effective instrument of communication with the super-human sphere. For a brief overview of the 20th-century-debate concerning the understanding of ‘sacred’ as an inherent (and possibly universal) or socially-constructed (and therefore context-related) property of things, see TAROT (2009); for a linguistic study based on ancient Greek literary sources, see RUDHARDT (2008), p. 151-154, with a brief bibliographical update by the editors of the book at p. 154.
 13. In this respect, see PEELS (2016) for a linguistic analysis of the semantic domain of *bosios*, broadening the limits of sacredness in social life beyond the more restricted sphere related to *hieros*.
 14. A fundamental reference in this respect is provided by GEERTZ (1973), which directly influenced the study of Roman emperor worship by PRICE (1980; 1984a; 1984b). For a broader application to ancient polytheisms, see in particular SCHEID (1999) on the case of Roman sacrificial rituals.

the purpose of this book as it argues for the possibility of studying the way cultic objects, structures, and spaces are produced, consecrated, used, and preserved as a reflection of the behaviour of ritual agents, and to some extent, of their socio-cultural background as well as of their intentions,¹⁵ even though the degree of optimism about the possibility of inferring ritual practice from purely material data may vary from scholar to scholar.¹⁶

Admittedly, developing a sound methodology to distinguish ritual spaces of Hellenistic ruler cults on purely archaeological grounds proves to be a particularly complex challenge. In addition to the importance of the diplomatic discourse of euergetism in decrees and letters, a part of the reason why Hellenistic ruler cults are mostly known via textual evidence is that no specific and distinctive type of ritual space existed for the celebration of ritual honours for political leaders. While heroic and dynastic cults were often associated with funerary monuments,¹⁷ ritual practice addressed to living political leaders was usually nested within various types of existing public structures (sanctuaries, agorai, administrative buildings, gardens, gymnasia, etc.) rather than enjoying a distinctive space of its own. For this reason, purely archaeological identifications of sacred structures of Hellenistic ruler cults often remain hypothetical.¹⁸ However, there are still many opportunities to refine and fully exploit a cross-disciplinary methodology for the study of the spatial organization of ruler cults in contexts providing a satisfactory combination of written and material information.

-
15. See recently MYLONOPOULOS – ROEDER (2006); MALONE – BARROWCLOUGH – STODDART (2007); KYRIAKIDIS (2007); ELSNER (2012); RAJA – RÜPKE (2015a); VAN ECK – VERSLUYS – TER KEURS (2015) as well as the content of the online *Material Agency Forum* (MAF) on <https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/en/events/series/material-agency-forum>. For the relationship between material culture, agency, and embedded discourse, see also VAN DYKE – ALCOCK (2003); ROBB (2005). The papers published in RAJA – RÜPKE (2015b) provide useful introductions to the archaeological study of various types of ritual spaces and related actions.
16. For a recent state of the question see ELSNER (2012).
17. For an overview of the archaeological markers of heroic cults, see EKROTH (2009) and VON MANGOLD (2013). On the importance of tombs in dynastic cults established in royal capitals, see MUCCIOLI (2014), underlining the partial overlap with traditions of hero cults.
18. The case of Pergamon is revealing of these issues. The traditional interpretation of the peristyle building situated in front of the entrance of the citadel as a ‘*Temenos für den Herrscherkult*’ ultimately only relies on similarities with the plan of Hellenistic and Roman *heroa*: BOEHRINGER – KRAUSS (1937); SCHWARZER (1999), p. 272-278 and (2011), p. 114-115; COARELLI (2016), p. 162-167 prefers to interpret this building as a *heroon* of Pergamos with an annexed gymnasium. A similar issue is related to the *Nischenbau* located at the southern edge of the theatre terrace: its traditional interpretation as the meeting house of a cultic association has been influenced by an arbitrary match with the epigraphic documentation concerning the association of the *Attalistsai*, which in fact more probably had its seat in Teos: SCHWARZER (1999), p. 265-272 and (2011), p. 115. See also the case of the Great Altar—interpreted as a site of ruler cult by QUEYREL (2002)—with the underlying *Apsidenbau*, which is considered as a *heroon* of Telephos or of Pergamos: SCHWARZER (1999), p. 278-286 and (2011), p. 111-114, and, on the other hand, COARELLI (2016), p. 158-169.

The fields of application of this research range from the small scale of single artefacts functioning as instruments of ritual (altars, statues, etc.) to the environmental dimension of anthropic landscape as a broad framework of religious experience (the sacred landscape of ruler cult in Karia, Kommagene, Fayum, etc.),¹⁹ passing through the middle ground of the spatial and functional organization of private and public spaces (sanctuaries, tombs, gymnasia, dining halls of cultic associations, etc.).²⁰ A careful analysis of the material aspects of ruler cults will enable us to make inferences about the way the members of a community would construct, embed in their ritual life, and ritually experience the religious *persona* of political leaders and benefactors. It will also allow for a methodological reflection on the specific point of view showcased by different kinds of material support, thus helping us overcome narrow interpretations in favour of a more encompassing, inter-media understanding of a complex phenomenon.

Objects and structures are only static when we consider them out of their performative setting, that is, apart from the ritual environment which they frame (e.g. sanctuaries, processional streets, royal courts), or by which they are framed (altars, statues; sanctuaries too, when we scale up our focus to the cityscape or the regional landscape level). Therefore, the study of specific aspects of ritual practice through written and archaeological evidence will help us achieve a more dynamic understanding of the place cultic honours for human beings were given in relation to existing cults for gods and heroes. Particular attention will be paid to offering rituals as they constitute a major instance of the communication between human agents and the divine. When the evidence allows for it, we will zoom in on the components of the complex and multi-sensory performative sequence that constitutes a sacrificial ritual, each of which (e.g. libations, singing, incense offering) provides ritual agents with specific occasions to embed honours to human honorands and to manifest internal hierarchies between old and new recipients of offerings.²¹

-
19. For a recent overview of the objectives and methodologies of ‘landscape archaeology’, see the case study of sanctuaries in Hellenistic Cyprus in PAPANTONIOU (2012) and the reflections on the role of landscape in the *longue durée* analysis of socio-economic trends in VIONIS – PAPANTONIOU (2019). For an application of the landscape scale to the study of cultural identity via visual material supports, see VERSLUYS (2017a) on Hellenistic and Roman Kommagene. In addition, BONNET (2015) provides an inspiring example of the combination of textual and archaeological data for the reconstruction of the culturally hybrid ‘religious-scapes’ of Hellenistic Phoenician communities.
 20. This level of analysis is defined by VERSLUYS (2017b) as ‘object-scape’, which refers to the interaction of cultic and other types of objects within the framework of a sanctuary. See also VEYMIERS (2018), p. 50-51 for an application of this concept to the study of Isiac sanctuaries. Concerning Hellenistic and Roman ruler cults, this scale of analysis is related to the category of ‘temple-sharing god’ (*synnaos theos*), for which see STEUERNAGEL (2010) for a useful reassessment combining textual and archaeological evidence. On this topic, see more in the *Afterword*, p. 229.
 21. On the multi-sensory dimension of offerings, see GRAND-CLÉMENT – UGAGLIA (2017). On offering rituals expressing hierarchies between the recipients of cult within a certain ritual context, see PARKER (2011), p. 103-116, with the previous references, on the relationship between gods and heroes in local sanctuaries; SCHEID (1999) provides an inspiring application of this discussion to

The last fundamental question related to the material features of ruler cults concerns the financial dimension of agency. Who pays for what? The fact that, in some cases, the recipients of cultic honours would contribute to their payment could be seen as a confirmation of the narcissistic nature of such honours, and testify to a certain degree of reluctance on the side of groups granting them. However, a more attentive analysis of the documentation can overturn this inference by revealing that by financially contributing to the establishment of their own honours, the honoured persons were not forcing the hand of the honouring community, but simply relieving it from an economic burden, thus making proof of their euergetic attitude at yet a further level of efficacy.²² Once again, the study of cultic honours for human benefactors requires that we overcome arbitrary separations between ‘proper’ and ‘instrumental’ manifestations within the *continuum* of the religious life of a community. Rather, we should consider the funding of cultic honours for human beings as a specific case—but not an alien one—within the broader framework of interaction between the ritualized communication of a group with the divine sphere (what we can briefly label as ‘religion’) and its non-sacred ritual expressions (formalized social habits and political rituals). By avoiding a-priori moral judgements about ruler cults as expressions of political flattery or narcissism, the funding of cultic honours for political leaders can be more neutrally dealt with as a distinctive but complementary manifestation of the administration of the sacred within a community; this constantly entails a dynamic balance between public and private support to the broad variety of social activities in which religion and politics are combined in ancient societies.²³ Embracing this approach will help us investigate the different layers of agency implied in the funding and administration of cults for human beings, their complementary agendas, and the interaction between these cults and the mechanisms activated for the funding and administration of cults for traditional gods and heroes, taking into account a variety of geographical and social milieus: the *polis* level, the supra-city level (leagues; city-king or league-king relationships) as well as those social frameworks which do not directly depend on civic or supra-civic institutions, like private associations and elite clubs.



the Roman sacrifice, reflecting upon the interaction between traditional gods and worshipped emperors at Rome.

22. See, for instance, the case of Eumenes II announcing that he will personally fund the honours that the Ionian League has decreed to him: *IMilet* I 306, lines 51-58 (*OGIS* II 763, Welles, *RC* 52; Kotsidu [2000], p. 296-297, no. 200[E]); see also *IGR* IV 293, lines 69-73, with Chankowski (1998), p. 187-188, for the 1st-century-political leader and benefactor Diodoros Paspáros proposing to finance the erection of his cultic statue in the gymnasium of Pergamon.
23. On the financial and administrative mechanisms underpinning the religious life of Greek cities, see for instance Dignas (2002), Migeotte (2006), and V. Chankowski (2011) on the role of sacred finances in the interaction between civic and sanctuary administration; Papazarkadas (2011) on sacred and public land in Athens.

Ancient literary sources are cited using the list of abbreviations provided by the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (OCD²; <http://oxfordre.com/classics/page/abbreviation-list>). For Greek inscriptions, we follow the abbreviations provided by *L'Année Philologique* and the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, also available online (<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/supplementum-epigraphicum-graecum>). For Egyptian inscriptions, see the list of sigla of the *Egyptologists' Electronic Forum* (<http://www.egyptologyforum.org/EEFrefs.html>). For Greek and Egyptian papyri and ostraka, we follow the *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets* (<http://papyri.info/docs/checklist>). Sigla not included in these lists at the time of publication are expanded in the *Index*.

Stefano G. CANEVA

Liège, June 2019