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 characteristically 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 Kultusaltäiter* is particularly noteworthy; cf. also the arrangement used in the section on religion in the third volume of the *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 
not refer to itself by a more specific term)\(^{32}\) from the Amphiareum at Oropus, \textit{LSCG} 69.\(^{33}\) As comprehensive as it is, it still takes into account through cross-reference a law which, judging from the context, expounded upon (perhaps inter alia) the activity of a cult official, namely the \textit{neokoros}. The priest of Amphiaraus, who is required (lines 2–6) to visit the sanctuary from the end of the winter until the period of the ploughing, missing no more than three days at a time\(^{34}\) and staying at the sanctuary for not less ten days per month, is instructed (lines 6–8):

\[
\text{ἐπαναγκάζειν τὸν νεοκόρον τὸν ἱεροῦ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ τῶν ἁρμανεμένων εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν:}
\]

to compel the \textit{neokoros} (sanctuary attendant) to take care of the sanctuary and of the visitors to the sanctuary according to the law.\(^{35}\)

The document goes on to discuss (lines 9–20) offences committed on the premises, related fines for offenders, their payments, cases tried at the sanctuary and presided over by the priest, and those tried elsewhere. There follow (lines 20–24, 36–48) some basic rules for incubation, the staple cult activity of the Amphiareum, including a stipulation regarding the publication of the names of the incubants; in between (lines 25–36) there is a discussion of public and private sacrifice, including a reference to the local festival; the function and prerogatives of the priest are considered and on the spot consumption of the meat is prescribed. Little can be made of the remains on the stone past line 48, but the scope of the surviving part suggests that the document was envisioned, and doubtless functioned, as a general code touching upon most, if not all, aspects of day-to-day administration of the activities at the Amphiareum.

The decree of Demetrias concerning the oracular sanctuary of Apollo at Korope in Magnesia (\textit{LSCG} 83; ca. 100 B.C.) gives a similar im-

\(^{32}\) Unless the νόμος in line 39 refer back to the regulations of lines 20–24.

\(^{33}\) Cf. the fragmentary \textit{LSS} 35.

\(^{34}\) This νόμος is probably an actual written law (or an injunction in a law) although, as A.B. Petropoulou has noted (commentary ad loc. in ‘The \textit{Eparche} Documents and the Early Oracle at Oropus,’ \textit{GRBS} 22, 1981, 39–63 at 51), this may not be mandatory. The νόμος in line 39 are evidently ‘regulations’ (Petropoulou ibid. 56). B. Le Guen-Pollet, \textit{La vie religieuse dans le monde grec du V au IIe siècle avant notre ère. Choix de documents épigraphiques traduits et commentés}, Toulouse, 1992, 131 maintains that the νόμος is a regulation featured in \textit{LSS} 35.