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Preface

The present work, for which I tentatively suggest the abbreviation NGSL, is divided into two parts. Part I was conceived as a practical guide to the corpus of Greek sacred laws for the general classicist rather than a theoretical exposition. It is meant to introduce the evidence by means of the evidence itself, and I therefore had to limit the footnotes and the references to scholarship.

My primary aim in part II was to collect and republish the sacred laws from mainland Greece, the colonies, and the islands, with the exception of Cos, published after the appearance of Sokolowski’s Lois sacrées des cités grecques in 1969. I have, nevertheless, included two inscriptions (nos. 11 and 13) which were published in the 1960s. Inscriptions from Cos and Asia Minor are not included, but I have added checklists of significant new documents. I have left out any inscriptions included in Sokolowski’s corpus, even when they were enriched by new fragments or improved considerably in respect to readings. A list of some such inscriptions is to be found, however, in Appendix B 3. Also added are concordances for the various parts of the corpus (for which see Part I pp. 3 4).

The principles that guided me in making the present selection are stated in part I pp. 4 9. It suffices to note here that an occasional stipulation on the subject of religion or cult practice does not necessarily qualify a document as a sacred law. Some cases are admittedly undecided. On the whole, I have avoided including here a number of fragments where identification as sacred laws depends entirely upon inference or restorations and/or is not backed up by definite parallels.

1. N(ew) G(reek) S(acred) L(aws); this abbreviation was suggested to H.S. Versnel by A. Chaniotis; I am grateful to both.
2. IG I 230. Athens. Sacred Law?
3. SEG XXVI 137. Attica. Agrileza. A Calendar. With no trace of references to either offerings or events (see Part I pp. 65 69), the meaning of this address to Hermes with a list of months remains obscure in my opinion.
4. SEG XXXII 86. Athens. Even if this document is classed as festival regulations and this does not seem beyond question to me the treatment of actual cult perfor-
I have also avoided particularly small fragments which in and of themselves did not seem to justify a full commentary.

Like my predecessors, I have not included here documents that deal explicitly with the cult of the dead and those that deal with ruler cult. The exclusion is somewhat artificial; rectifying the situation must, however, await a revision of the entire corpus.

Format

Each chapter comprises the following parts: lemma, text, translation, restorations, epigraphical commentary, and commentary.

Lemma. The lemma contains a brief description of the stone, its findspot, including, when this is possible, the archaeological context, measurements, current location of the stone, and a list of publications of the text, relevant discussions, and published photographs of the stone. Derivative editions (i.e. those not based on an autopsy) are listed in parentheses.

I have done my best to find editions and discussions of the documents included here. I may have failed to do so in more than one case. As for discussions, I have listed only relevant discussions, be they short or long. I am afraid that I have not found an ideal way to treat reviews or short notices regarding works that discuss the inscriptions in question. On the whole, they are mentioned in the lemma if they add something to the discussion by opposing a given author’s point or by a reasoned endorsement of it or when the work cited cannot be considered readily available. The bulk of Part II was finished by early 2002. I

mance does not seem to me to justify its inclusion (see in this respect Part I p. 101).

SEG XL 123. Athens. Sacred Regulations?

SEG XXXVI 703 = SEG XL 624. Gorgippia. Financial Measures of a Cult Association?

SEG XLV 1876. Vani. Even if the object of this fragment was to protect a document inscribed above and now lost (J.G. Vinogradov, The Inscribed Bronze from Vani, JDI 1995, 3, 48 71 = Pontische Studien, Mainz, 1997, 577 601), I am not sure that this lost document was necessarily a sacred law.

T.B. Mitford, The Inscriptions of Kourion, Philadelphia, 1971, 83 84 no. 36: A Lex Sacra?

3 Agora XVI 57: fragment of an enactment concerning Eleusinian First Fruits. It is pointless to discuss this tiny fragment independent of the more substantial documents (see Part I p. 104) belonging to the First Fruits dossier.

SEG XXXII 150. Athens. Phratry decree. [τὰ δὲ ἱερὲ|ωσὺνα λαμβάνειν τὸν ἱερέα?] in lines 7 8 do not justify inclusion.
have tried to incorporate works covered by the *Bulletin Épigraphique* for the year 1999 and *SEG XLVII* (1997). Later bibliography has been cited only occasionally. This is probably most notable in such popular documents as nos. 1 and 27 which have generated a great deal of discussion.4

Works cited in the lemma are usually discussed in the appropriate place in the commentary. When this is not the case, and/or when the contents of the work cited are not immediately clear from its title, they are indicated in a footnote.

**Measurements.** All measurements are in meters.

**Editorial Conventions.** I have followed the Leiden system as revised by Sterling Dow in his *Conventions in Editing*, Durham, NC, 1969, 3–13.5

*Stoichedon* and *boustrophedon* inscriptions are clearly marked as ΣΤΟΙΧ. or ΒΟΥΣΤΡΟΦΗΔΩΝ (no. 6 is Schlangenschrift). The rubric NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. has only been used to mark non-stoichedon inscriptions, where the stoichedon order could be expected (the sides of no. 1; nos. 9, 13, 21). Otherwise, non-stoichedon inscriptions are not marked as such.

**Restorations.** When most of the restorations belong to the same person(s), it has seemed best to state this at the beginning (i.e. suppl(evit/everunt) X). It is to be understood that all unnamed restorations that follow belong to this primary authority. Otherwise, restorations are marked by the name of the restorer. Thus (e.g.) in no. 1, line 11 the reading Ω Daux would indicate that everything in line 11 was restored by Daux. My own restorations or comments, when this is not clear from the context, are marked by L. Restorations are traced to their origin. Obsolete restorations are generally avoided.

I have, on the whole, attempted not to indulge in gratuitous restorations only to note that they are doubtful and that alternatives are equally possible. One might complain that I have exercised too much caution with restorations and that, in certain cases, I print less text than previous editions, thus forcing the user to fish for restorations in the apparatus and reattach them to the text. It seems to me that

4 In this respect I particularly regret that I have not been able to use G. Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods* (*Kernos* Suppl. 12), Liege, 2002, of which I was informed as the present work was going to press.

5 I have not used Dow’s first/second text (ibid. 7–8) notation, printed above the line, for rasurae. The reader should consult the epigraphical commentary for text printed within double square brackets. I have also not followed Dow’s suggested system (ibid. 29–31) of question marks noting the level of certainty in restorations.
an editor should make a clear distinction between interpretation and restoration. On the whole, many sacred laws use identical, well-defined formulas much less frequently than certain kinds of decrees. In many cases, a correct restoration depends upon a correct understanding of a cultic context, where details are not always fully known. Even when several documents deal with one cult, sharing, perhaps, similarities in the way they regulate it, they may still formulate these regulations independently. Comparative evidence, which may prove invaluable for the interpretation of a certain fragmentary document, will thus not necessarily yield much help for the actual restoration of the text.

_Epigraphical Commentary_. When possible, the epigraphical commentary is based on my own autopsy. Otherwise, it is derivative and meant to serve little more than the reader’s immediate needs. I have normally not described letter forms when I was able to provide a readable photograph. Comments on dotted letters in a secure textual context (e.g. [μ]δέ in 4.9) have generally been avoided.

_Translations_. Translations are mine. I must, nevertheless, stress my debt to former translations (whenever these exist). I have attempted to make the translations literal yet readable. It may be claimed that in some cases my translation is too similar to a former one. It should, however, be noted that in some cases there are only so many ways to translate a word or a phrase literally. In such cases there seemed to be no point in attempting a different translation merely for the sake of variation. I have used square brackets ([ ]) only occasionally in the translations. Wholly restored words are included within square brackets, but I avoided using them in partially restored words when I found the restoration convincing. Interpretative additions to the translations are included in parentheses. The translations should be seen as an integral part of the commentary; they thus represent my interpretation of the texts. It cannot be overstressed that the translations should never be used without the text.

_Commentary_. In most chapters, the commentary includes general remarks followed by line-by-line commentary. On the whole, I tried to concentrate on the religious aspects of the documents. Nevertheless, when the context is less familiar, I have included comments on other aspects as well. Thus, it seemed proper to comment on references to (e.g.) Rhodian tribes or the Samian calendar, whereas similar comments on (e.g.) Attic archons or demes seemed superfluous.

_Date_. The date is discussed in the commentary at the end of the general remarks, where it is also noted if the date is discussed elsewhere.
Bibliography. To keep the general bibliography within reasonable limits, I have usually avoided incorporating into it works, mainly books but occasionally articles, which are cited only once or twice or those which are used in a limited context only. When a work is cited more than once in a particular context, I have sometimes referred to it by ibid. or op. cit. I have, however, done so only in consecutive or adjacent footnotes, so that tracing the original reference should not be difficult.

Short notes and reviews are ordinarily not cited in the general bibliography.

Bibliographical References. Reference in the commentary is given primarily to works that are included in the lemma and to those that I have used as the basis for my arguments. I have tried to refer to works that include further bibliographical references and mostly to works that are generally accessible but it seemed pointless to refer the reader constantly to standard works such as RE, or LIMC, which are referred to only when I relied on them myself.

I have attempted to credit works that referred me to relevant sources (ordinarily in parentheses). I do not doubt that I have failed to do so occasionally. Normally, I have not credited works in such a way when I reached my sources independently.

Epigraphical References. When reference is made to a restoration, it appears normally in square brackets (e.g. [LSCG 151 A 62]).

When the date cited for an inscription included in Sokolowski’s corpus differs from the date assigned to it therein, the source for the date is commonly cited in parentheses (e.g. LSCG 15 (IG 11 7; ca. 460–450)). Standard corpora references for inscriptions included in Sokolowski’s corpus are otherwise rarely cited in the text; they can be found in Concordance 1 below. Reference to one or more later editions is usually cited in Part I for inscriptions included in LGS but not in Sokolowski’s corpus.

Old Testament and Mishnaic References. All Old Testament and Mishnaic citations refer to the original texts.

In reference to the Mishnah I have, for the benefit of the uninitiated, cited both the tractate (in italics) and (in parentheses) the order, e.g. Mishnah (Qodashim) Midot 3.4.

Abbreviations. Abbreviations of works and periodicals are primarily those given in AJA 104, 2000: 10–24. Otherwise, for periodicals, abbreviations are those used in L’année philologique; for authors and works, those used in the OCD and, if they are not mentioned there, those used in LSJ. Abbreviations of epigraphical corpora are those used in

*Transliteration.* I make no exclusive claim to consistency. Regarding names, I have tried to follow the forms used in the second and third editions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Otherwise, names are usually transliterated. In such cases k is used for Greek \( \varkappa \), y for Greek \( \upsilon \), and ch for Greek \( \chi \). Greek words are, on the whole, transliterated, but I have tried to avoid discrepancies such as Hecate/Hekataion or even Dionysus Bromios. As for modern Greek diacritical marks, I have retained whatever system individual authors were using.
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PART ONE

GREEK SACRED LAW

An Introduction
The Corpus of Greek Sacred Laws

The first attempt to collect the Greek sacred laws into a corpus was undertaken by Hans1 von Prott and Ludwig Ziehen in the late nineteenth century. Prott was responsible for sacrificial calendars and laws governing the cult of the Hellenistic monarchs. The first fascicle containing the calendars was published in 1896, but the author died before completing the second; ruler cult has subsequently been kept out of the corpus. Ziehen, entrusted with all other documents, published a first volume containing the laws of Greece and the islands in 1906; a projected second volume, containing the laws of Asia Minor, was never published. Incomplete as it is and by now outdated in many respects, Prott and Ziehen’s *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* (*LGS* I and II) has never quite been surpassed and remains invaluable today.

In the second half of the twentieth century Greek sacred law came to be associated first and foremost with a single scholar, Franciszek Sokolowski. Sokolowski’s first undertaking was to supplement *LGS* by collecting the sacred laws of Asia Minor which resulted in the publication of *Lois sacrées de l’Asie mineure* (*LSAM*) in 1955. This volume was followed in 1962 by *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Supplément* (*LSS*), including new documents not included in *LGS* and *LSAM*, but excluding Coan documents. Seven years later, in 1969, Sokolowski published the last volume of his corpus, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (*LSCG*), constituting a revision of *LGS*, which it never meant to replace entirely,2 and including Coan documents.3

Sokolowski’s volumes, especially *LSCG*,4 have attracted much criticism. Though some of the points commonly raised are undeniably true, particularly the tendency to introduce into the text restorations which, as ingenious as they sometimes are, may (inter alia) be in disagreement with the stones, anyone who has tried to produce a corpus of his own cannot but admire the author for his unparalleled knowledge of Greek religion, his profound understanding of the documents

---

1 Latin Ioannes.
2 *LSCG* p. VII.
3 Among them those first published by Rudolf Herzog in *Die Heilige Gesetze von Cos*, though omitting no. 16, which had been liberally restored by Herzog, and nos. 13a-x which do not belong in the corpus.
and the skill shown in their selection, and his very ability to cope with
the vast undertaking and bring it to fulfillment in a relatively short
time. Sokolowski’s three volumes with their succinct indices are a useful
research tool.

The latest addition to the corpus is Georges Rougemont’s masterly
published as the first volume of the Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes (*CID* I).

The various editors have briefly accounted for the principles which
guided them in making their selections, in their introductions. It is
advisable to summarize such principles and discuss the definition of
sacred law here.

Since a set of rules governing Greek cult practice has not been hand-
ed over to us, an obvious way of getting closer to attaining it is to collect
the surviving individual documents, inscribed mainly on stone, which
record such rules directly. These documents, commonly classed as *leges sacrae* (vel sim.) in epigraphical corpora, may indeed form the core of
the corpus of Greek sacred laws, and relevance to actual cult practice is
usually a good criterion for the inclusion or exclusion of ambiguous cas-
es. But the corpus of Greek sacred laws is, in fact, much more diverse,
and the term sacred law itself, as it is used inclusively in this corpus,
transcends common epigraphical genres, being, to an extent, an arti-
craft modern construct, albeit drawing upon ancient precedents. The
corpus contains a diverse assortment of laws, decrees, statutes, regula-
tions, proclamations, treaties, contracts, leases, testaments, foundation
documents, and oracles. These may be issued by federations, states,
civic subdivisions and magistrates, royalty, sanctuaries, religious organi-
izations, or private individuals. The documents come from throughout
the Greek world, from around the beginning of the sixth century B.C. to
the Roman Imperial period, varying in length from a few words to
the 194 lines of the regulations of the ANDANIAN Mysteries, *LSCG* 65.

---

5 *LGS* I p. 1; *LGS* II pp. III-IV; *LSAM* p. 5; cf. 184; *LSS* p. 5; *LSCG* pp. VII-VIII; *CID* I pp. 1-4.
6 Documents which survived in one form or another in literary sources (such as *Athenaeus* 234e-f) have never been included in the corpus.
7 Lex sacra; cf. loi sacrée, heilige Gesetz, Kultusgesetz, vel sim.
8 A discussion of the contents of the modern corpus seems to me to be a prerequi-
site for a discussion (not pursued here) of ἱερος νόμος in antiquity.
9 As below no. 6.
Generally speaking, some of the inscriptions can be formally identi-
ed as legislation, usually decrees, or other legal documents of a deter-
nizable source.11 Others put forth customs, usages, rules, laws, all of
which are entailed in the term νόμος, directly and with little to no for-
mal mediation.12 Their source may be determinable; the term by which
they were referred to in antiquity is, in the majority of cases, conjec-
tural at best.13 Both types of documents govern cult performance and
religious activities, for the most part, of a recurrent nature.14 The sec-
ond type, which tends to be the rst to be associated with the term
sacred law, commonly regulates entry into sanctuaries and cult perfor-
mance; the rst may regulate such matters as well as others, including
the function of cult personnel or the management of sanctuaries; it
may also govern performance of occasional actions pertaining to reli-
gion and cult practice, such as sacred building activities and melting
down of dedications. What links all of these documents together is nei-
ther a formal de nition, let alone a formal de nition of law which in
and of itself has little bearing upon the nature of the evidence nor
of genre. It is rather their subject matter on the whole sacred and
the means for the most part of a tangibly legal character by which
it is handled. Even if ideally one would identify individual documents
according to their respective genres, a common term is bound to be
used. Sacred law may be misleading, and should not be taken at face
value in all cases; nevertheless, it has, for better or for worse, prevailed.
Coining a new term should any be coined at all is pointless.

The most basic requirements which documents ought to meet in
order to be classi ed as sacred laws can, on the whole, be reduced
to two, whether the term is used exclusively or inclusively: (1) The
documents must be prescriptive; they must set out rules and regulations,
syntactically, by means of imperative forms, written or implied.15 In

11 E.g. a state or an individual.
12 That is, not in the form of or through a (e.g.) decree.
13 The obvious case in which such a document (albeit introduced by a decree) is
actually entitled νόμος is LSCG 136.19 22 (discussed below pp. 14 15). LSS 59 evidently
refers to its predecessor as a public notice (πρόκρις[προκρίς]; see below p. 18).
14 Being recurrent is, of course, inherent in the concept of cult: Un culte, en effet,
ne pas simplement un ensemble de pr cations rituelles que l homme est tenu de
prendre dans certaines circonstances; c est un syst me de rites, de r monies
diverses qui pr sentent toute ce caract re qu elles reviennent p riodiquement: E. Durkheim, Les
formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse, Paris, Le Livre de Poche, 1991, 133 134 [originally
published 1912] (the italics are original).
practice imperative in nitives and imperatives are normal; the future indicative may also be used as may the present. Their subject matter, the object of their prescriptions, must be or pertain to religion and particularly to cult practice. When Greek sacred law is concerned, these must be Greek, and relevant documents such as the law from the Herodian temple in Jerusalem are to be left out.

These basic requirements are, however, not enough and deserve further qualification, as might be illustrated through an examination of two documents. Both are decrees regarding construction or repair of sanctuary fountain houses; one, LSCG 75, is included in the corpus; the other, I.Oropos 290, is not.

The third-century B.C. decree from Orchomenus, LSCG 75, very briefly prescribes the construction of a fountain house for the benefit of citizens offering sacrifice at a sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios. The much longer Athenian decree, I.Oropos 290 (369/8 B.C.), which honors Antikrates of Decelea, a priest of Amphiaraus, discusses several measures to be taken on the occasion of repair work to be made to the fountain and the baths at the Amphaiareum and the installation of a marble stele inscribed with syngraphai (appended in lines 29–77), and describes in great detail the work and the conditions according to which it has been leased out. The decree prescribes the use of sacred money, collected in the sanctuary’s thesaurus (treasury box), and money from shops for inscribing the stele, for an aresterion (a special sacrifice upon making alterations to divine property), and for reimbursing the neokoros; the remaining sums are to be transferred to a contractor through those in charge of the repair works (lines 13–25).

Both documents meet the two basic requirements outlined above: they contain prescriptions of, as it happens, occasional actions pertaining to religion and cult practice. Yet while the measures specified in LSCG 75 are the core of the document, the professed object of I.Oropos 290 is neither the allocation of sacred monies nor the offering of the

---

16 As in LSCG 133.3 (ca. 400 B.C.), 134.8 (fourth century B.C.), and the Roman Imperial LSCG 52:5, 21, 24 and LAM 88.4: 5; cf. IG XII 5, 15. For the future in leases and in sales of priesthoods see below p. 49.

17 This is characteristic of calendars and calendar extracts or comparable simple sacrificial regulations. See (e.g.) LSCG 20 B 39; LSS 10 A 30; 94; LGS I 25 (quoted below p. 93); LSCG 114 115 (both from Thasos). The calendar of Cos, LSCG 151, is notable for mixed constructions.

18 OGIS 598 and SEG VIII 169 quoted below.

19 See Stengel, 1920, 134; Rudhardt 1992, 269.
aresterion, but the works and more precisely the publication of the syngraphai. The religious measures, important as they are, consist of actions performed for this end, and thus occupy a secondary place in the entire document. The inscription is an indispensable piece of evidence for certain aspects of Greek cult practice; it is not, however, a clear-cut case of a sacred law but at best a borderline case. A line must be drawn somewhere, however, and Sokolowski is justified in leaving I.Oropos 290 out of the corpus.

To the basic principles discussed above one must therefore add that it is incumbent upon documents which are to be included in the corpus that matters pertaining to religion and cult practice be less a means to an end and more an end in their own right, occupying an indisputable first place. As a result, some of the documents included in the corpus (as traditionally constituted) are, in fact, excerpts from longer inscriptions. This was avoided in the present collection, out of the belief that an inscription is better presented and studied as a whole.

Another issue should also be observed, though its application is not quite consistent. Traditionally, not each and every document regulating cult performance is included in the corpus of sacred laws. The corpus usually avoids documents that regulate extraordinary sacrifices and even festivals which, divine sponsorship aside, do not assume the form of straightforward divine worship. A famous example (and one which is not beyond question in my mind) is the Coan decree of ca. 278 B.C., Syll.3 398, regarding a thanksgiving sacrifice to Pythian Apollo at Delphi and corresponding festivities for him, Zeus Soter, and Nike in Cos, on the occasion of the expulsion of the Gauls from Delphi.20 Another example is the Coan decree SEG XXXIII 675 (= Iscr.Cos ED 5; ca. mid rst half of the second century B.C.) on sacrifice to all the gods and goddesses, in particular Zeus Megistos, Homonoia, and Zeus Boulaioi (inter alios), for the safety of the demos and the Cappadocian royal couple, Ariarathes IV Eusebes and Antiochis, which I have not listed among new Coan sacred laws in Appendix B 2. On the other hand, LSAM 81 and no. 26 below have been included in the corpus, because they institute festivals to be incorporated into the local religious calendars; although these festivals commemorate events of a primarily civic impetus, they do so within the framework of the cult of Homonoia.

LSAM 15 (lines 31–61 of Syll. 3 694; Elaea;21 129 B.C.) is included despite regulating what appears to be an ephemeral celebration on an extraordinary occasion (the installation of plaques bearing a treaty with the Romans), because the celebration is subject to a form of ordinary worship (mainly the cult of Demeter and Kore, the tutelary goddesses of the polis: lines 48–51) rather than being subservient to an extraordinary occasion.22 Certain cult foundations may seem problematic in this respect. One notes, however, that all the cases included in the corpus, even those which bluntly commemorate the founders or their relatives,23 set the cult within a recognized framework of divine worship.24 Documents concerned with the straightforward cult of the living or of the dead,25 including all documents concerned with bona fide ruler cult,26 are left out of the corpus.

To sum up, to qualify as a sacred law, in the way this term is used in the existing corpus of Greek sacred laws, an inscription must be prescriptive; its subject matter and main focus must be or pertain to religion and particularly to cult practice, on the whole recurrent in nature, or at least set within the framework of ordinary worship. Reality is, however, more complex and leaves some room for interpretation. Though many cases are sufficiently clear, the final decision as to whether or not to admit a given document into the corpus may at times depend on a variety of factors, including personal judgment. LGS includes not less than seventeen documents which Sokolowski preferred, for better and for worse, to leave out.27 CID I includes two more such documents,28 and excludes ve others.29 I would have avoided

22 It may be easier to talk about religious and non-religious festivals or celebrations. The examples reviewed here indicate, however, how relative these terms can be. I suspect that if Syll. 3 398 had dealt with details of cult performance to the extent that LSAM 8t does, it would have been included in the corpus of sacred laws.
23 See below pp. 83–87.
24 One notes the heroization in the foundations of Kritolaos and more clearly of Epicteta (below pp. 85, 87). See also below p. 75 with n. 389.
25 Cf. below p. 75.
26 LSCG 106 is an obvious exception. For royal festival foundations see, however, below p. 84.
27 LGS I 16, 17, 19, 25, 27; II 31, 55, 60, 61, 64, 66, 103, 120, 126, 131, 136, 142; LGS II 15 A is also omitted from LSCG 16.
28 i and 11.
29 LSCG 79, 80, 81; LSS 43, 44.
LSCG 180 and probably LSAM 87, and I am not sure that everyone would subscribe to the selection I have made in part II.

The Contents and Forms of Greek Sacred Law

Even once a document has been identified as sacred law, further classification remains difficult, since, as we have seen, sacred law, in the way in which the term is used here, hardly constitutes a well-defined genre. A classification of the documents according to their respective genres may be justified, though misleading, as documents of different genres may deal with similar matters. Here we concentrate rather on the range of issues covered by the documents assembled in the corpus, on the whole adhering to the scheme of four main classes, namely sacred space (mainly sanctuaries), sacred officials (mostly priests), performance of cult (a particularly diverse class), and religious events (festivals and ceremonies). Admittedly, there are numerous cases in which more than one subject is handled by a single document, and much in the evidence defies clear-cut classification. We follow the sacred space—sacred officials—cult performance—religious events scheme here if only for the sake of a general review. Though we mainly aim at reviewing issues recurring in the documents, it is worthwhile, as far as possible, to attempt to consider the formal classification of the documents and, to an extent, the range of genres associated with the respective issues.

Sanctuaries and Sacred Space

Comprehensive and Specific Documents

A handful of documents have reached us which discuss the management of individual sanctuaries in a general and comprehensive way. The best example is the great set of regulations (the document does

30 See below pp. 34–35; on the other hand, I would have liked the corpus to be more inclusive in respect to documents prescribing the building and furnishing of sanctuaries and temples.

31 With some variations, this scheme is of course not uncommon; Stengel’s Die griechischen Kultusaltäler is particularly noteworthy; cf. also the arrangement used in the section on religion in the third volume of the Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.