

Associations and Place

Regulating Meeting-Places and Sanctuaries*

*Stella Skaltsa***The Spatial Turn and Associational Space**

Associations were variably anchored in space and place.¹ Being active in different spheres of life, associations carved their own space into the urban fabric or in the countryside to accommodate their multifaceted activities. Associations were emplaced in civic, sacred and funerary space, enriching and expanding it through their dedicatory, honorific, religious and commemorative practices.² In these respects, their activities informed the built environment, which in turn framed social interaction.

This chapter sets out to explain the ways in which meeting-places of associations came into being, how the identity of associations was embedded in space and how these places were regulated. In particular, it draws on spatial theory, following a resurgence of interest by ancient historians in the 'spatial turn'. By this, one designates the study of space not as a mere physical form but as a social construct, which is being informed by and informs human behaviour.³ The present objective is manifold: first, to address the importance of space in construing the group's identity; second, to assess the regulations that pertained to the management and/or use of associational space as a mechanism that informed the nature of the association in question (that is to say, its exclusivity or inclusivity).

* I am very grateful to Vincent Gabrielsen and Mat Carbon for fruitful discussions and their valuable comments. My thanks also extend to the anonymous reviewer for his/her thorough comments.

¹ According to geographers, the terms 'space' and 'place', though often used interchangeably, are interrelated, yet distinct from each other (Price 2013: 120). The literature on space and place as distinct concepts is massive; for an overview, see Price 2013.

² The sociologist Thomas Gieryn (2000: 466) has shown that all social life is 'emplaced'; in other words, social life exists in space. For the multifarious activities of associations, see for example Gabrielsen 2007 and 2017.

³ The concept of space as a social construct has been taken up recently in ancient Greek as well as Roman history; see Scott 2013; De Angelis 2010. In the past decade, the notion of space and its importance in humanities has been thoroughly investigated by the Cluster 'Topoi' in Berlin, which produced a number of relevant publications, notably Paliou et al. 2014; Hofmann et al. 2017.

Social theorists and urban geographers have long pointed out that space is not static but the product of social interaction in that ‘space can be shaped from the social meanings of people’s lives’.⁴ According to sociologists, place, as a concept, is characterised by three distinct features: a fixed geographical location, a material form and meaning – with all three features being closely interconnected to one another.⁵ These features can readily apply to the meeting-places of associations. As physical entities, they provided a concrete locale where collective action unfolded. Through decision-making processes, the organisation of celebrations and other festivities that helped cement bonds of membership and togetherness, place took on specific meaning and became a point of reference for the collectivity.

Attachment to a specific place mattered a great deal, especially in societies witnessing an influx or outflow of people. Often a toponym or a geographical indication features as part of the official name of an association. In light of its name, an association appears tied to a specific city, area or even structure, on a physical just as much as on a perceptual level. Naming practices, thus, strongly suggest that attachment to a specific place was embedded in the identity of the group.⁶ In the case of the Poseidoniasts on Delos, the adjectival ethnic ‘Berytians’ (Βηρυτίοι) features as one of the constituent elements of their official name.⁷ The link with Beirut, the motherland, works on a mnemonic level, as the physical setting of their activities was far away from home, on the island of Delos in the Aegean. The association was well grounded on Delos as a trading society involved in maritime trade and seafaring, with its clubhouse being fully integrated into the urban fabric of the city, located in the heart of one of the residential quarters.⁸ Yet, the notion of origin and the link with the mother city played an important role in the self-representation of the association, which was in turn embedded in the articulation of sacred space within the clubhouse.⁹

⁴ Unwin 2000: 11. For an overview of the contribution of Henri Lefebvre and Michel Foucault to the concept of space as a social construct, see Warf and Arias 2009.

⁵ Gieryn 2000; Price 2013; Cresswell 2015: 12–13.

⁶ In the field of geography, Price designates attachment to a place as ‘intimacy of place’ (Price 2013: 125).

⁷ *I.Délos* 1520. The full name of the association is τὸ ἐν Δήλῳ κοινὸν Βηρυτίων Ποσειδωνιαστῶν ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐγδοχέων ‘the *koinon* of the Berytian Poseidoniasts merchants and shippers and forwarding agents on Delos’.

⁸ For the most comprehensive analysis of the use of space in the clubhouse of the *Poseidoniastai* on Delos see Trümper 2002, 2006, 2011.

⁹ The clubhouse was dedicated to the *theoi patrioi* (*I.Délos* 1774) as indicated by the inscribed architrave of the peristyle. Already from the first building phase (153/2 BC) the clubhouse

For other associations, affiliation to a place was directly related to the physical setting. In a few instances, the meeting-place became a metonym for the association itself: the most characteristic example is that of the Athenian *Bakcheion*, denoting both an association as well as its meeting-place.¹⁰ Moreover, spatial elements that were constituent parts of the name of an association certainly helped to distinguish between homonymous associations active in the same city. For instance, in Rhodes, where an abundance of associations co-existed in Hellenistic times, the reference to place seems to function on a multiple level: it demonstrates origin and/or place of action, while it can also reveal the interests of associations in a certain place, which often transcended the physical borders of a fixed locale.¹¹

The objective of this chapter, however, is not to discuss the role of toponyms and other spatial features in the composition of the names of associations, despite the important insights into their self-representation which they can yield. Instead, this investigation focusses on the role of space as an element that grounded associations to a specific place, to a greater or lesser degree. By jointly discussing the membership profile of associations, their attachment to a specific meeting-place and the varied evidence about regulations that directly or indirectly pertained to the management and/or use of space, it will be demonstrated that the exclusivity or the inclusivity of the spaces corresponded with the exclusivity or the inclusivity of the association in question.

In most cases, the materiality of associational space largely escapes us. The multifarious activities of associations could be housed in a wide array of architectural forms. As a result, associational space as a physical entity does not necessarily present distinct architectural features (layout, articulation of space).¹² It is commonly accepted that, in the absence of

contained a shrine with two cult rooms for the *theoi patrioi* that flanked the west side of the courtyard as one entered the building. Additions and modifications in the shrine took place in later times (see Trümper 2002: 327–30).

¹⁰ This is the case of the *Iobacchoi*: *IG II² 1368 = CAPInv. 339*. For the different meanings of the term *Bakcheion* – i.e. the association, the meeting-place and the festival – see Baslez 2004: 113.

¹¹ In a recently published inscription from Rhodes, four out of five associations bear a composite name with a reference to a place, e.g. Ἀσκληπιασταὶ οἱ ἐν Σαλάκῳι, Σωτηριασταὶ Φειδιανάκτειοι οἱ ἐν Φάναις, Ἀσκληπιασταὶ Βουκοπιῆσαι οἱ ἐν Αἰγυλῆαι, [...]δαλιασταὶ οἱ ἐν Φάναις. For a thorough analysis, see Gabrielsen 2017: esp. 15 (text), 18, 20, 34–5.

¹² Bollmann 1998: 48–57 suggests some typological criteria for the identification of buildings used or frequented by associations, with a focus on architectural remains from the Italian peninsula and the Roman West. The topic has been extensively treated recently by Nielsen 2014, with a strong focus on the architectural setting of mystery groups and religious associations. Nielsen distinguishes three different spaces for the meeting of religious groups: a ‘temple-type’, a ‘cave/grotto-type’ and a

inscriptions found *in situ*, architectural remains can hardly be identified as meeting-places of associations.¹³ In cases of safely identified clubhouses, a combination of factors, from architectural features and the articulation of space to artefacts and other material remains, helps to considerably illuminate the organisation and the use of space.¹⁴

Inscriptions, however, can shed significant light onto issues directly related to the concept of space, understood less as a physical entity and more as a social and cultural one.¹⁵ Indeed, the activities that took place within a space – such as rituals, assemblies and the like – can often be traced in the epigraphic record. Collective action took place at a specific locale: this constituted the setting for social interaction (physical space) and the product of social interaction (social space).

Here, my focus will be on the articulation of sacred space and the ways in which the latter was regulated. Drawing on associations whose *raison d'être* differed substantially from one another, this chapter aims to elucidate differing attitudes towards the regulation of space. The analysis will focus first on three familial associations in the Aegean (Cos and Thera) and coastal Asia Minor (Halicarnassus) with a view to evaluate the degree of exclusivity in terms of membership profile and access to a place. The discussion will then move to NW Asia Minor in the Augustan period: an inscription from Cyme offers unique glimpses into a case of dislocation. The last part of the chapter will draw on material from Attica and the hinterland of Pergamum. It will be argued that regardless of the special interests an association had in a place, shrines managed by associations could be open to a wider community of worshippers, as this allowed the revival or the continuity of cult. In other words, bringing the 'spatial turn' into the study of associations, space is examined as a dynamic entity, often the object of close regulation. In light of

'banqueting/house-type' (Nielsen 2014: 241–53). However, her study fails to provide strict definitions of the groups under discussion, and in this respect it should remain open to what extent the architectural spaces discussed were indeed used and frequented by associations. Another recent study that discusses the architectural settings of associations is that of Steinhauer 2014: 110–40. Her observations are based on those cases where inscriptions can shed light on architectural remains.

¹³ Trümper 2011: 51. In the case of Delos, Trümper has suggested identifying some buildings with clubhouses by comparing their layout and architectural articulation to the securely identified clubhouse of the *Poseidoniastai* in the island (Trümper 2006: 129–30).

¹⁴ Trümper's analysis of the use of space in the clubhouse of the *Poseidoniastai* on Delos is exemplary in this regard. She points out that the clubhouse was designed to serve different functions from congregational and commercial to sacred and honorific, something that is reflected in the articulation of space (2006: 117–22; 2011: 53–8).

¹⁵ For the concept of social space and the role of individuals and collectivities in using, producing and transforming natural space into social space, see an overview by Gans 2002.

the nature and content of rules that regulated space, it will be argued that the relationship of an association to place can inform us about the degree of exclusivity or inclusivity of the association in question.

Exclusive Spaces: Attachment to a Place

Three epigraphic dossiers, those of Diomedon on Cos (late fourth to first decades of the third century BC), Poseidonios in Halicarnassus (ca. 280–240 BC) and Epikteta on Thera (210–195 BC), respectively, are particularly illuminating with regard to the setting and built environment of meeting-places of associations, despite the absence of archaeological remains.¹⁶ Diomedon's dossier consists of three different texts inscribed at different times, within the time span of a few decades between the late fourth and early third century BC.¹⁷ Likewise, Poseidonios' dossier includes three different parts: an oracle given to Poseidonios (χρησιμός, Laum 1914: II no 117, ll. 1–11), a pledge of properties from Poseidonios to his familial group (ὑποθήκη, ll. 12–22) and the decree of Poseidonios and the group (δόγμα, ll. 22–52). Epikteta's dossier, inscribed on the pedestal that once supported her statue and the statues of her two sons, contains her testament (*IG* XII.3 330, ll. 1–108) and the decree of the association (ll. 109–288), including its statutes (νόμος, l. 276).

The importance of these three groups for a study of associational space lies in the fact that they share features that are closely intertwined: a closed group (association), a locale fixed in space (meeting-place of the association) and performance of ritual activity (cult). As will be shown, the founders of the respective associations took concrete steps to regulate space, as this was vital not only or not always for the funding of the cult, but for the perpetuation of the association itself.

A consecrated area, *temenos* (τέμενος), dedicated to a god or a group of gods features in all three cases, while a designated funerary space is included in two instances (Thera and Halicarnassus). In Cos, the *temenos* was adjacent to other facilities such as guest houses with a garden and other

¹⁶ All three texts were included by Laum 1914: II no 43 (Thera); no 45 (Cos); no 117 (Halicarnassus) in his monograph on endowments. These three texts have been discussed together by Kamps 1937, briefly by Parker 2010: 118–20 and Gherchanoc 2012: 159–68. Recently, Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013 focussed on some specific aspects, such as the priestly officials; recently, a detailed analysis has been presented by Campanelli 2016. These three endowments have been recently discussed by Aneziri 2020: 16–18.

¹⁷ Ross 1845: 45–54 no 311, the first editor, noted the different stonecutters, while Herzog 1928: 28–32 no 10, established the date of the dossier.

buildings (ξενώνας τοὺς ἐν τῶι κάπῳ; οἰκημάτια, *IG* XII.4 I 348, ll. 44–5), while in Halicarnassus the *temenos* probably encompassed a courtyard (αὐλή, Laum 1914: II no 117, l.17), a garden (κῆπον, l.17) and other unspecified facilities around the funerary monument (καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, l.17), as the inscription informs us. Their exact location escapes us in all three cases. The pedestal inscribed with Epikteta's testament and the decree of the association was transported to Italy already by 1568.¹⁸ Its original location is hence unknown. In the absence of funerary monuments from within the ancient city of Thera, the *temenos* of the Muses with the funerary monuments should have been located outside the city.¹⁹ Likewise, the *temenos* of Heracles Diomedonteios in Cos should have been located in the outskirts of the city, as indicated by the findspot of the inscription.²⁰ More complicated is the picture with regard to the *temenos* consecrated by Poseidonios in Halicarnassus. Sara Campanelli envisages a rural setting for the *temenos*.²¹ However, the inscription broken into pieces was built into a Turkish house not far away from the Mausolleion.²² As the stele was found in Halicarnassus, we can assume with some caution that the *temenos* was laid out in Halicarnassus, and for this reason it was not felt necessary to further indicate its exact location, unlike the field that Poseidonios bequeathed to the association, the location of which was specified with precision.²³

¹⁸ Wittenburg 1990: 16–17.

¹⁹ Conspicuous funerary monuments in the form of a temple-like structure are in fact attested in Thera, but concrete evidence is missing to identify any of them with the *Mouseion*, as for example the *Heroon* by the Evangelismos Church on the northern slope of the Sellada hill, not far away from the road that leads up to the city from the modern village of Kamari (*Thera* II: 240–51) or the *Heroon* at Echendra on the southern coast (*Thera* II: 251–4). See also Le Dinahet 2014: 353–6 and Caruso 2016: 341–5 on the architectural configuration of the *Heroon* by the Evangelismos Church.

²⁰ Cemeteries and funerary monuments have been located to the south and south-west of the city all the way to the *Asklepieion* (Tsouli 2013: 18–28). For example, the funerary monument of Charmylos, located in the area of Pyli, was part of a property consecrated to the Twelve Gods. For a discussion of this monument, see Campanelli 2016: 162–3.

²¹ Campanelli 2016: 177–8. Her argument is based on the meaning of the term *aule*. She takes *aule* to stand for a farmstead and locates Poseidonios' *temenos* in the countryside by analogy to inscriptions from Mylasa, where αὐλή denotes a farm (Campanelli 2016: 176–7; cf. Robert 1945: 86–7). However, in Poseidonios' inscriptions, the term αὐλή is customarily translated as 'courtyard' (Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013: 104). I prefer to translate αὐλή as an enclosed open-air space (Travlos 1986: 44), which can be part of a farm, a sanctuary or any other structure (Hellmann 1992: 59–61) in order to do justice to the architectural features of the word rather than its function, which might prove a contested issue.

²² For the findspot, see Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013: 101.

²³ This field is designated as being located in an area called Astypalaia and it is clearly demarcated with reference to adjacent properties belonging to different individuals.

Similarities and differences between these three epigraphic dossiers in terms of cult practice, financial management and use of space have been recently analysed at length by Campanelli.²⁴ Underlining the family-based character of the groups and their relation to landed properties and assets, she draws a distinction between real estate and sacred property. In doing so, she explains the different mechanisms employed in these three cases with regard to the management of revenue-bearing property and consequently the different financial means available for the financing of the cult. In the cases of Diomedon and Poseidonios, the meeting-place itself brought revenue to the association through leasing, unlike, for example, the meeting-place of the association of male relatives in Thera, which was protected against any sort of financial exploitation.²⁵

The associations came into being at the initiative of individuals, in order to foster the cult of specific deities and/or deceased family members.²⁶ In all three cases, lineage, real or fictive, constitutes the underlying principle on which membership is based.²⁷ The association founded by Epikteta in Thera bears a full-fledged name – τὸ κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνδρείου τῶν συγγενῶν ('the association of the male relatives') – where all members are described as relatives, even though membership was drawn from three different families.²⁸ In the case of Diomedon, membership is based on descent from the male line of the family as well as on the sharing of the cult.²⁹

²⁴ Campanelli 2016. Besides the three epigraphic dossiers, Campanelli expands her analysis to two more family cult foundations, those of Python (*IG* XII.4 I 349) and Charmylos (*IG* XII.4 I 355), both in Cos.

²⁵ In the case of Poseidonios, revenue for the financing of the cult derived from different resources, namely, from the leasing of the *temenos*, from the leasing of the field at a place called Astypalaia and from the rights of ploughing at a place called Taramptos; in the latter case, the association was entitled to half of the rights.

²⁶ Although I use the term 'association' to refer to all the three groups centred on ancestral or family cults for the sake of convenience and consistency, it should be noted that there are some noticeable differences between these three groups in terms of structure and organisation. In the case of Diomedon's dossier, descriptive terms such as *koinon*, which normally qualifies a group as an association, are missing (with similar concerns Kamps 1937: 154); the same can be said of Poseidonios' group, which does not have a formalised name (*thiasos* is only used to refer to the cult group during a specific year of celebrations: l. 45).

²⁷ On the composition of membership, see also Campanelli 2016: 148–53.

²⁸ *IG* XII.3 330; *CAPInv.* 1645. Wittenburg 1990: 63–6; Stavrianopoulou 2006: 292–302; see also Caruso 2016: 328–45. Epikteta founded the association in fulfilment of the request of her late husband, Phoinix, and late son, Andragoras (*IG* XII.3 330, ll. 16–26).

²⁹ *IG* XII.4 I 348, ll. 9–11, τοὶ ἐγ Διομέδοντος καὶ αἰεὶ τοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν γενόμενοι; τοὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνεῦντες, ll. 7, 80–1, 87–8; τοὶ μετέχοντες τῶν ἱερῶν, ll. 52–3; cf. *CAPInv.* 1919. Unlike Paul 2013: 340 who considers the term *hiera* in the phrase τοὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνεῦντες as referring to the cult, Campanelli 2016: 149 and 156 proposes a more inclusive meaning, which includes not only the cult but also the sacred property and all sacred items dedicated in the sanctuary. She therefore claims that sharing extended to the physical space of the sanctuary (Campanelli 2016: 166 and 186).

Unlike Diomedon, Poseidonios is more inclusive when it comes to descendants, as both relatives from the male and female line are welcomed as well as those related by marriage to them.³⁰ Membership found its primary embodiment, when relatives and descendants – real or fictive – came together during the festivities that were held in honour of gods, founders and/or deceased family members.

In all three inscriptions under question (and especially in the case of Epikteta and Diomedon), the place of the group and its constituent components are among the first to be defined.³¹ Celebrations were fixed in time, their duration was defined and the performance of rites and sacrifices was prescribed and regulated. Likewise, the meeting-place, where the association came together to partake in these festivities, was anchored in a specific locale, the use and management of which was strictly regulated. The cult was tied to a specific place and, conversely, the place demarcated the site for the performance of cultic and ritual activity. In all three cases, the meeting-place is not just any place, but in particular a shrine consecrated to a god or group of gods, a concrete locale for celebrations and ritual activity. A sacred precinct features in all three cases: a sanctuary of the Muses (*Mouseion*) in Thera, a *temenos* of Heracles Diomedonteios in Cos, a *temenos* consecrated to several gods in Halicarnassus (Zeus Patroos, Apollo who rules over Telemessos, the Moirai, the Mother of the Gods, the Agathos Daimon of Poseidonios and Gorgis and the Agathe Tyche of Poseidonios' parents).

Furthermore, a precinct with funerary monuments and a funerary monument is a key element of the cult site in Thera and in Halicarnassus, respectively. In Thera, within the *Mouseion* stood the *temenos* of the heroes (τὸ τέμενος τῶν ἡρώων) – a sacred precinct set aside for the funerary monuments (τὰ ἡρώϊα) of Epikteta's husband and her two sons.³² In Halicarnassus, the funerary monument of Poseidonios' parents is called *mnemeion*, a monument of memory; this term appropriately blends together function (tomb/monument) and symbolism (receptacle of memory).³³ It was surrounded by other unspecified structures, perhaps

³⁰ Carbon 2013 (new edition with commentary) ll. 12–13: καὶ οἱ ἐκ τούτων γινόμενοι, ἐκ τε τῶν ἀρσένων καὶ τῶν θηλειῶν, καὶ οἱ λαμβάνοντες ἐξ αὐτῶν; cf. *CAPInv.* 830.

³¹ This would correspond to what geographers call 'place-making' (Price 2013).

³² Wittenburg 1990: 139–47. On the *Mouseion* in Thera, see Caruso 2016: 341–5.

³³ On the term, see Guarducci 1974: 145; see also Chaniotis 2013: 27.

the altars of the other gods (τὰ περὶ τὸ μνημεῖον).³⁴ Though its location is not specified, by analogy to the case of Thera, it can be safely assumed that it was built within the precinct (*temenos*) that Poseidonios consecrated to the gods.³⁵ The funerary monuments in Thera and Halicarnassus did not stand in isolation but in an organic relationship to their surroundings, within an area consecrated to the god(s).

These funerary monuments underscore the role of memory as a mechanism for sustaining the identity of the association, being called a μνημεῖον or located in a *Mouseion*.³⁶ Memory of the deceased ancestors was enacted through ritual practice – a ceremony open only to members – and therefore acted as a unifying mechanism for the unity and social cohesion of the association. If this process of communication – the way one passes down the memory of the deceased – breaks off, then ‘the consequence is forgetting’, something that would jeopardise the identity of the association.³⁷ In Thera, in particular, the *Mouseion* provided the space for the association’s annual gathering, a three-day celebration for the Muses³⁸ and in commemoration of the deceased members of Epikteta’s family.³⁹ Epikteta had taken care to articulate the visual imagery of the sanctuary with statues of the Muses and of the heroised dead, that is to say, the deceased members of Epikteta’s family. The interplay between the statues of the Muses – daughters of Mnemosyne – and statues of the deceased would have placed the latter on a level equal to the former. The visual space was thus loaded with semantics that helped evoke, accentuate and retain the memory of the heroised dead.

On Cos, conversely, as cult activity was not overtly directed at the commemoration of the founder, a funerary monument does not

³⁴ The phrase is interestingly paralleled in *MAMA* IV 171, a funerary inscription from Apollonia in Phrygia (first century BC or AD), alongside stoas. If juxtaposed to the more often attested phrase *ta peri ton theon*, then the *mneion* emerges as a nucleus of commemorative practice.

³⁵ For a similar view, see *CGRN* 104.

³⁶ On the power of collective memory, see Assmann 2011: 20, who has argued that ‘remembrance is a matter of emotional ties, cultural shaping and a conscious reference to the past that overcomes the rupture between life and death’. On the connection of the Muses with the funerary sphere since Homer’s time, see Caruso 2016: 37–40.

³⁷ Assmann 2011: 23.

³⁸ The inscription refers only to the cult of the Muses, while in other instances the Muses are worshipped together with Mnemosyne, their mother, e.g. in Camirus, *Tit. Cam.* 151.

³⁹ In Istros in the Black Sea, a *Mouseion* was built on private initiative, but there the *demos* was probably the recipient of an endowment of 300 gold staters for sacrifices to the Muses and for a gathering (*synodos*) (*IScM* 1 and *SEG* 51:933, mid third cent. BC). See also Caruso 2016: 239–43. On account of another inscription from Istros that mentions a banquet (*synodos*) held in the gymnasium (cf. *BE* 1958 no 336), Caruso connects this *Mouseion* to a gymnasium. However, the inscription itself does not make any allusion to a gymnasium.

explicitly feature in the text. Instead, the unusual cultic epithet of Heracles – Diomedonteios – alludes to an intimate personal connection between the founder (Diomedon) and the deity (Heracles).⁴⁰ Although Diomedon does not seem to have enjoyed a posthumous cult like Epikteta, the infusion of a personal element in the cultic epithet of the god bears constant witness to this privately founded cult of Heracles.⁴¹

A comparison of these three cases reveals a range of attitudes towards space, in terms of management and use as well as accessibility. Relatives of the deceased are normally responsible for the management of the property, yet there are some noticeable differences from one case to another.

In Cos, the property and its assets (a slave and his descendants) were overseen by ‘those partaking in the sacrifices’ (l. 7: τοῖ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνεῦντες), a collective name denoting the members of this family-based group. The property originally consisted of a *temenos*, consecrated to Heracles Diomedonteios, guest houses within a garden (ξενῶνας τοὺς ἐν τῶι κάπῳ) and other buildings referred to as *oikemata* (οἰκήματα). At a later stage, when the third text was inscribed, among the assets of the group lands were included (τεμένη, l. 82) as well as an *oikia* in the *temenos* (ll. 83–4), a *lesche* ‘hall’ (l. 84–5) and a *peripatos* ‘covered walk’ (l. 85). As inferred by the inscription, the property generated income, which funded the performance of cult activity and the upkeep of the facilities.⁴²

A similar situation is also apparent in Halicarnassus. Poseidonios bequeathed properties and resources in the form of a pledge (ὑποθήκη) to his descendants, both from the male as well as the female line of descent (ll. 13–14: τοῖς ἐκ τούτων γινομένοις, ἕκ τε τῶν ἀρσένων καὶ τῶν θηλειῶν, καὶ τοῖς λαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτῶν), in order to finance a familial cult centred on members of his family and ancestral gods.⁴³ Only the eldest of Poseidonios’ descendants, who was also to serve as the priest, took over the administration of the properties. Every year he was obliged to hand over four gold coins of net value for the two-day performance of cult and sacrifice.⁴⁴ In the decree passed by Poseidonios and his descendants, a further provision, not envisaged in the original pledge, was taken. An additional stipulation of the administration of the pledge was included in

⁴⁰ Cf. Carbone and Pirenne-Delforge 2013: 69 with nn. 20, 96.

⁴¹ According to Kamps 1937: 156, a cult of the heroised Diomedon may have been introduced by later generations. Cf. Campanelli 2016: 139.

⁴² For a detailed analysis of the property and its financial assets, see Campanelli 2016: 156–9.

⁴³ See above n. 25.

⁴⁴ According to Carbone 2013: 111, the χρυσοὶ of the inscription correspond to Ptolemaic staters, that is, 80 drachmas in total.

the decree with the aim of ensuring the financing of its annual gathering. More specifically, in cases in which the eldest of the descendants did not hand over the prescribed amount for the cult or was no longer willing to administer the pledge, then the pledged properties were to be held in common by the association (l. 28: εἶναι τὰ ὑποκείμενα κ[οι]νὰ). In this case, the financial administration of the pledge would be transferred to three *epimenioi*, appointed among members of the association (ll. 23–7, 28–30). They were responsible for farming out the land and the right of tillage as well as renting out the *temenos*.⁴⁵ From the stipulations included in the decree, it becomes apparent that the concerns of Poseidonios and the group were primarily of a financial nature. It was vital that the properties bequeathed by Poseidonios would produce revenues that would allow the organisation of the feast. Inextricably linked to a revenue-bearing property is the effective management of this property, which was placed on the shoulders of the association itself. It was in the group's interest to keep money flowing, which would fund the performance of ritual and would sustain its existence.

A different situation is observed in Thera. Although the *Mouseion* constituted the meeting-place of the association, ownership belonged to Epiteleia, the daughter of Epikteta. In other words, the association did not own the sanctuary; it was allowed to use the sanctuary for three days every year, when 210 drachmas would be handed over to the association on an annual basis for the celebration.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, the association was bound to the sanctuary in multiple ways. It was within this particular setting that members could come together for a common purpose – the three-day gathering – and thus reinstate their identity and strengthen their ties as relatives (συγγενεῖς) by sharing in common cultic and convivial activities. Moreover, as laid out in the testament of Epikteta, even if not enjoying ownership of the place, the association was instructed to act as its guardian under specific conditions (*IG* XII.3 330, ll. 52–4): the association had full power to act against anyone who would commit any sort of offence that would jeopardise the sanctuary and its monuments and by extension would put at risk the survival of the association. Thus, by appointing the

⁴⁵ Carbon 2013: 109–10 has shown that the ἐνηρόσιον ('rights of tillage') was probably related to the renting out or farming of sacred land, analogous to a relevant practice in Delos.

⁴⁶ Epikteta endowed the association of the male relatives with 3,000 drachmas; the group came into being thanks to her endowment. The 210 drachmas per year handed over to the association for the three-day celebration accrued from the interest on this capital.

association as an overseer to ensure the observance of these clauses, Epikteta took concrete steps to ensure its longevity.⁴⁷

It seems that testamentary dispositions in Thera, as in Halicarnassus, possibly experienced potential problems with the continuous subsidy of the cult. For this reason, further provisions were taken to counter possible mismanagement in the long term. Even if space was well protected, as we will see further below, it was thanks to the regular flow of financial resources that the gathering of the association could become materialised. Indeed, both Epikteta's testament and the decree of the association went to great lengths to ensure the financial security of the dispositions. Alternate ways to annually hand over the amount of 210 drachmas to the *koinon* were envisaged by Epikteta. The *koinon* was entitled to the usufruct (καρπεία, l. 72) of designated lands up to the value of 210 drachmas (ll. 71–5). Otherwise, Epiteleia's successors had the option to transfer the initial capital of 3,000 drachmas that was bound to properties owned by Epikteta to another property (ll. 75–9). Likewise, the *koinon* appointed officials in charge of financial matters (the ἐπίσσοφος and ἄρτυτήρ) along with personnel commissioned to enhance the available funds (through the credit business: ἐγδανεῖσται).⁴⁸

So far, we have seen that Poseidonios' dossier placed emphasis on issues related to management of the property in order to ensure the subsidy of the cult, while Epikteta was also preoccupied with the annual remittance to the association of a fixed amount for the three-day celebration. However, Epikteta's dossier as well as that of Diomedon, unlike Poseidonios' dossier, went a step further in laying out stipulations that prevent any alienation of the meeting-place or any other inappropriate management or use of the place in question.

Diomedon's testamentary dispositions did not only regulate the protection of the property and the use of space but also laid out provisions for repair works. The inclusion of clauses that refer to repair works clearly demonstrate Diomedon's vision of the longevity of the association and the

⁴⁷ It seems that she succeeded, as a fragmentary inscription that dates to the late second or early first century BC attests to the *koinon* of the relatives: *IG XII Suppl.* 154, l. 11; cf. *CAPInv.* 1645. However, the attribution of this inscription to the *koinon* of the relatives founded by Epikteta has been a contested issue. Kamps 1937: 166–8 and Wittenburg 1990: 65 no 9 rejected Hiller von Gaertringen's attribution on the same grounds on which Hiller von Gaertringen 1914: 133–4 suggested this attribution, that is, on onomastics. Although the inscriptions are not contemporaneous – Epikteta's foundation dates one generation earlier – the overlap in the name of the association and in the members would speak in favour of one and the same association, especially in a small community like Thera.

⁴⁸ Wittenburg 1990: 103–9; Campanelli 2016: 179; *CAPInv.* 1645.

continuous use of space. Repair works had already been anticipated in the first inscription, and their funding was clearly laid out. There, it was stipulated that expenditure for the maintenance of the *oikemata* and the *temenos* was to be covered by the revenues from leasing (*IG XII.4 I 348 III*, ll. 47–51). In particular, income derived from renting out the garden (κῆπος) to the freedman, Libys, and his children, who were set free by Diomedon's consecration. They were obliged to pay the rent in the month prior to the annual feast in honour of Heracles (ll. 11–17). The financing of repair works was evidently still a matter of some worry in the early third century BC when the third text was inscribed on the pillar. In the third text, the efforts to define once again the potential source of funding for the refurbishment of the buildings and the maintenance of the *temenos*, this time in more detail, reveal concerns of what was considered the most appropriate use of space.⁴⁹ In particular, the rules sought to underscore the proper handling of finances for the benefit of the association and the importance of the upkeep of the place as essential prerequisites for the performance of cult activity.

Diomedon's dossier is particularly instructive in that it shows that the implementation of rules could prove a thorny issue and that self-appropriation by members posed a real threat. Space was not only carefully regulated but clarifications and complementary regulations had to be added to ensure the proper management and use of space as initially envisaged by Diomedon. Unlike Epikteta's dossier where these regulations were part of the testamentary dispositions and recorded as such in stone, in Diomedon's dossier direct resonances to the testament are made in regulations inscribed on the stone in later decades.⁵⁰ Diomedon's dossier is particularly instructive as to the ways in which the testament of the founder could be re-invoked to prevent future misuse. The third text in particular includes direct quotations of Diomedon's testament, an indication that it was in the association's interest to observe the stipulations laid out therein. At the same time, the testament as a legal document would offer a legal justification of the steps taken by the association in order to effectively protect its interests and, by extension, to ensure its longevity. It served to maintain its identity, which was intimately related to the

⁴⁹ Revenues accruing from the lease of the *temenos*, the garden and the guest houses were to be allocated, as was necessary, to the repair of these aforementioned structures, as well to the repair of the house (*oikia*) in the *temenos* (*IG XII.4 I 348 III* ll. 69–77).

⁵⁰ The third text uses first person singular forms (ll. 120, 155: ἀνέθηκα) as well as second person plural forms (l. 115 παρασκευάτε, l. 149: λαμβάνετε), as if Diomedon himself were speaking.

uninterrupted performance of cult and ritual once a year in the best possible conditions.

Originally, the regulations were concerned with prohibiting any appropriation (ἐξειδιάζεσθαι) of the *oikemata* and the *temenos*, as well as forbidding their sale and mortgage (ll. 43–7). In the early third century BC, Diomedon's descendants included three further prohibitions (ll. 80–6): to the members of the group (l. 81: τοῖς κοινωνοῦσι τῶν ἱερῶν) it was prohibited (1) to cultivate the lands; (2) to dwell in the guest houses and the *oikia* in the *temenos*; and (3) to use the hall (λέσχη) in the sanctuary and the covered walk (περίπατος) as a storage facility, except during wartime. These further prohibitions help considerably to elucidate the content of the first prohibition in Diomedon's consecration (the first text), in other words, the content of the infinitive ἐξειδιάζεσθαι ('to appropriate for oneself').⁵¹ In this regard, they should not be viewed as totally new prohibitions, but instead as further clarifications to the already existing regulations, with the aim of further ensuring their implementation.

In fact, some sort of alienation of property does seem to have occurred over the course of time: in the third inscription, we hear of individuals who owned houses in the sacred precinct.⁵² Private possession of these *oikiai* would have taken place at a stage posterior to Diomedon's consecration, since they were originally and explicitly consecrated to Heracles Diomedonteios and thus constituted sacred property.⁵³ If this change in ownership is correct, then clarifying the question of what was meant by 'appropriation' would aim at preventing further misuse and mishandling of the property. The text, however, does not yield any direct evidence of possible disputes between the descendants of Diomedon over issues of property, albeit some hints of this alienation are perhaps perceptible. It is simply taken for granted that among the group, there were those who now possessed houses. In clarifying the content of 'appropriation', it seems that the concern now shifts from property management to the use of the properties. The text stipulates that both houses in question have to be

⁵¹ *JG* XII.4 I 348 III Face C ll. 80–86: μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ τοῖς κοινωνοῦσι τῶν ἱερῶν [γε] | ὠργεῖν τὰ τεμένη μηδ' ἐν τοῖς ξεῖνώσι | ἐνοικεῖν μηδ' ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ τε | μένους μηδὲ ἀποθήκη | χρᾶσθαι τῇ | λέσχη | τῇ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ μηδὲ {ν} τῷ περιπάτω | ἢ μὴ πόλεμος ᾗ.

⁵² *JG* XII.4 I 348 III Face C ll. 104–5: οἱ τὰς οἰκίας ἐκτ[η] | μένοι, the men's house (ἀνδρεία οἰκία) and the women's house (γυναϊκεία οἰκία).

⁵³ This view has been put forward by Bosnakis and Hallof; cf. *CGRN* 96. Campanelli, following Dittenberger (*Syll.*³ 1106 n. 34), has envisaged a different scenario according to which 'the two houses had been inherited by some of Diomedon's descendants in their private capacity' (Campanelli 2016: 161).

made available for the celebration of weddings.⁵⁴ Furthermore, the men's house would also be made available during the festival of the group – the Herakleia – providing the venue to host the sacrifice and banquet to Heracles.⁵⁵ In other words, it is in the early third century BC that regulations about the use of specific buildings in the precinct were introduced for the first time. These apparently new regulations compelled the owners of these buildings to make available the listed property for common use at fixed times. Most important, in the time span of a few decades since Diomedon's consecration, his descendants took steps to lay out once again rules pertaining to the management of realty and, in addition, to dictate the way in which a number of buildings were to be used. Already in the second inscription it is regulated that the statues (ἀγάλματα) and votive offerings (ἀναθήματα) were to remain in the exact same place in the οἰκία where they stood (ll. 55–9). The following possible scenarios can readily be envisaged. Displacement and/or removal of statues and offerings was somehow anticipated or had occurred and it thus had to be prohibited. Alternatively, the space was becoming crowded with dedications, and for this reason the descendants of Diomedon wanted to ensure that the setting up of dedications in the future would not happen at the detriment of existing ones.⁵⁶

Similar prohibitions towards the handling and use of space are to be found in Epikteta's testamentary dispositions, especially with regard to potential problems with the use of space. Epikteta laid out a number of regulations that aimed to preserve the integrity of the space and maintain its function. The prohibitions follow standard legal practice when it comes to the protection of property.⁵⁷ Specifically, the following is prohibited: (1) to sell the sanctuary and the *temenos* of the heroes along with the statues erected there; (2) to put it down as a mortgage; (3) to exchange it; (4) to alienate it; (5) to build up the *temenos* and (6) to use the sanctuary of the

⁵⁴ IG XII.4 I 348 III Face C ll. 104–8: καὶ οἱ τὰς οἰκίας ἐκτ[η]μένοι τὴν τε ἀνδρείαν καὶ τὴν γυναικ[εῖ]αν παρέχοντω εἰς τοὺς γάμους τὰς οἰκ[ί]ας παρεξελόμενοι οἰκήματα εἰς ἀπόθε[σιν] τῶν σκευῶν.

⁵⁵ IG XII.4 I 348 III Face C ll. 108–11: ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀνδρείαν ἔχων[π]αρεχέτω τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν θυσι[σ]τῆν καὶ τὸν ξενισμὸν τοῦ Ἡρακλ[ε]ῦς πάσας | τὰς ἡμ[ε]τέρας.

⁵⁶ In Greek sanctuaries, the display of offerings was sometimes a matter of regulation, at least when it came to areas that were prohibited from holding offerings, as happened in the *Asklepieion* in Rhodes (SER 1; cf. Harris 2015: 73). In other instances, overcrowding could also be a matter of concern, as can be seen in the privately owned sanctuary of Sarapis in Laodicea by the Sea (Sosin 2005).

⁵⁷ Similar stipulations, e.g. sale, mortgage, alteration, alienation, are attested in testaments for funerary monuments from Roman Asia Minor: see Harter-Uibopuu 2010: 257–61.

Muses in any other way.⁵⁸ The association was granted full power to act against anyone who would commit any of the above offences. Any trespass against these clauses would undermine the association itself. Failure to convene in the *Mouseion* would negate the original purpose that brought this association into being: a three-day celebration in honour of the Muses and the heroised dead.

The only exception allowed concerning further building in the *temenos* was the construction of a stoa (ll. 49–50). Its addition would have remarkably uplifted the sanctuary of the Muses, in that stoas were usually expected to be found in sanctuaries or public spaces frequented by many and on a regular basis.⁵⁹ Such an investment in the construction of a monumental structure was accordingly viewed as beneficial, facilitating the gathering of the association and its three-day festivities. It reveals the aspirations of the association and underlines its longevity. At its inception, the association already consisted of at least sixty members.⁶⁰

As already noted in the case of Diomedon, the way in which space was to be used was well defined. Possible uses other than the ones prescribed are explicitly mentioned. In the last section of Diomedon's stele, we hear that weddings of impoverished male members of the family could be held right after the end of the feast.⁶¹ A similar notable exception to the prescribed use of space is also noted in Epikteta's dossier, namely, the permission to celebrate in the *Mouseion* the wedding of members from Epiteleia's side of the family.⁶² In Diomedon's dossier, details are also provided with regard to the buildings (ἀνδρεία οἰκία, γυναικεία οἰκία) that were to be used for the needs of the ceremony. In this case, different aspects of life pertaining to the group were consciously entwined; though the setting remained the same – the *Mouseion* in Thera, the *temenos* consecrated by Diomedon on Cos – the function of the space was expanded to encompass other activities, such as weddings. These activities, not necessarily related to ritual activity, sacrifice and dining in honour of the heroised dead, effectively demonstrate the course of life in the

⁵⁸ IG XII.3 330, ll. 41–51: μὴ ἔχτω [δὲ ἐξου]σίαν μηθεὶς μήτε ἀποδοῦσθαι τὸ Μουσεῖον [μῆ]τε τὸ τέμενος τῶν ἡρώων μηδὲ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τῶν ἐν τῷ Μουσεῖῳ μηδὲ τῶν ἐν | τῷ τεμένει τῶν ἡρώων μηθὲν μήτε καταθῆμεν μήτε διαλλάσασθαι μήτε ἐξαλλοτριῶσαι τρόπῳ μηθεὶ μηδὲ παρευρέσει | μηδεμιᾷ μηδὲ ἐνοικοδομήσαι ἐν τῷ τεμένει μηθέν, εἴ κα μὴ τις στοᾶν οἰκοδομήσαι | προαιρέται, μηδὲ χρῆσαι τὸ Μουσεῖον μηθεὶ, | εἴ κα μὴ τις τῶν ἐξ Ἐπιτελείας γάμον ποιῆ.

⁵⁹ Free-standing stoas were a frequent and almost indispensable feature in many Greek sanctuaries. On Greek stoas, see Coulton 1976; on stoas in sanctuaries in particular, see Hellmann 2006: 212–18.

⁶⁰ Stavrianopoulou 2006: 295. ⁶¹ IG XII.4 I 348, ll. 104–11.

⁶² IG XII.3 330, l. 51: εἴ κα μὴ τις τῶν ἐξ Ἐπιτελείας γάμον ποιῆ.

microcosm of an association. It was fundamental for these groups to facilitate and participate in core events that marked the life of members and especially families, such as weddings. In this respect, the multitude of experiences in the same architectural setting further enhanced the attachment of the association to its specific locale and its sense of belonging. It formed a nexus for the group as a whole and especially for the expression of interrelated familial and cultic bonds.

To summarise, the founders – especially Epikteta and Diomedon – went into detail when defining the meeting-place of the association, prohibiting any mismanagement or use other than the one envisaged by them. In the detailed instructions of the three dossiers, space emerges as a dynamic concept whose physical articulation, use and management, was the object of careful regulation. The close regulation of space is intricately linked with the regulation of membership into the group. The founder envisaged that the identity of the association should be anchored to a specific place. This place sets the stage for the ritual activity that brings the association together. At the same time, place creates boundaries, explicitly materialised in terms of membership. Only members were allowed to take part in the annual celebration, and in this respect the ritual space was only open to members or to what Scott, discussing other instances, has called ‘communities of permitted users’.⁶³ Only members could experience associational space as a sacred space or as a privileged space for ‘family’ members on certain occasions. By becoming a ‘community of permitted users’, members developed an intimate attachment to a place that, in turn, informed their identity as members of a familial association.

It can be noted that in all three cases the founders were fully aware of the inextricable link between the finances of the cult and the longevity of the association. The place where the association came together was the place where the ritual was performed. In other words, cult and association are grounded in a specific locale, explicitly spelled out in all three dossiers. Ritual was directed at different gods and/or ancestors, an aspect that further accentuates the uniqueness of an association, differentiating it from other groups.⁶⁴ The re-enactment of ritual activity once a year at a prescribed time imbued the place with special meaning: a sacred space as

⁶³ Scott 2013: 11.

⁶⁴ According to Assmann 2011: 23, there are two main factors that help sustain the cultural memory of a group; peculiarity and durability. The associations discussed in this section fulfil these two criteria.

well as a place of familial unity and ancestral commemoration.⁶⁵ The visual articulation of space with statues of the heroised dead, statues of deities and other votive offering further vested the space with special symbolism in this regard. Moreover, the founding act and/or the testamentary dispositions were monumentally displayed within the association's space in the form of a pedestal for statues (Thera), a pillar (Cos) or a stele (Halicarnassus), another prominent visual reminder of the role of the association in fostering a set of traditions within a specific locale.⁶⁶ Any dislocation would dramatically break this mnemonic link to place and would threaten the very existence of the association.

Identity and Dislocation from Space

Any circumstance that would prevent an association from gathering in its meeting-place could also potentially disrupt its activities and undermine its *raison d'être*. The *thiasitai* of Dionysus in Cyme were faced with such a reality in the early years of Augustus' reign.⁶⁷ A bilingual letter of the proconsul of Asia in Latin and partly in Greek (the stele is broken) sent to the local authorities in Cyme outlines the efforts of the *thiasitai* of Dionysus. They initiated a legal process to regain access to the sanctuary and resume control of its affairs.

The sanctuary had been mortgaged (ll. 13, 25–6) and ownership had passed to an individual (Lysias). The *thiasitai* approached Lysias to pay him back in their attempt to reclaim the sanctuary for themselves, but their claim was refuted. They therefore appealed to the proconsul through an intermediary, a citizen of Cyme (Apollonides, son of Lucius Norakeios). They claimed that they wanted to restore the cult (l. 15, *sacra*) to the god. Their claim found a legal footing in the edict of the consuls Augustus and Agrippa. Issued in 27 BC, the edict stipulated the restitution of public and sacred properties as well as dedications, which were subject to looting during the period of the civil wars (ll. 1–11). The proconsul therefore redirected the case to the local authorities to solve the issue. The *thiasitai* had the full support of the proconsul who, citing the legal precedent of the edict, was favourably disposed towards the restoration of the shrine to the

⁶⁵ As Mylonopoulos 2011: 57–9 has argued, two essential components of sacred space are architectural setting and the performance of ritual.

⁶⁶ Pedestal: H. 45.4 × L. 284.9 × W. 7.7–8.5 cm; pillar: H. 65 × W. 34 × Th. 24 cm; stele: H. 95.57 × L. 33.66–36.6 × Th. 12–12.7 cm.

⁶⁷ *IKyme* 17; *RDGE* no 61; Jaccotet 2003: no 104; Harland 2014: no 104; Dignas 2002: 121–6; see also *CAPInv.* 954.

god.⁶⁸ Although the outcome of the case is not recorded in the inscription, it can be safely guessed that it was resolved to the advantage of the *thiasitai*.⁶⁹

For Pleket, this is a case of a public *thiasos* of Dionysus,⁷⁰ unlike Engelmann who takes the *thiasitai* to be a private association.⁷¹ In my view, the scale tips towards the latter, for the *thiasitai*, even after being prohibited to access the shrine and perform the due rites to the god, retained a strong sense of identity and took corporate action by appealing to the proconsul through a representative. Before the unfortunate loss of the shrine, it seems that they used the shrine as a revenue-bearing property, probably for the subsidy of the cult, a practice attested in groups of *orgeones* in Athens or in the case of Diomedon and Poseidonios discussed above.⁷² In Cyme too, it can be envisaged that the mortgage of the shrine brought to the *thiasitai* a steady income for the performance of cult; yet unfortunate events or mismanagement resulted in the loss of both income and access to the shrine. It was therefore vital for the *thiasitai* as a group to pull all their efforts together in order to reclaim the shrine. This shrine embodied the *locus* of their identity and their shared ritual experiences.

Inclusive Spaces: Opening up a Sanctuary to Non-Associates

In the cases presented above, it has been argued that place works as a formative element in the creation of the association's identity, creating a closed circle for ritual performance and cultic activity, which are both anchored in a specific locale. To maintain this exclusivity and to guarantee the longevity of the association, the administration and the use of space were closely regulated. However, these cases constitute only snapshots of a picture that is much more diverse and varied than they may otherwise suggest. The three cases of familial groups (Diomedon, Poseidonios and Epikteta) represent one end of the spectrum where both membership and attachment to a specific place have been shown to be exclusive. The richness of the evidence for associations, however, paints a picture with many different gradations between inclusivity and exclusivity.

⁶⁸ A telltale sign is that the proconsul explicitly pointed out that, if the sanctuary was restored to the god (*restituat deo fa[il]num*), he wanted the following to be inscribed in the sanctuary: 'Augustus restored it' (ll. 18–20: *Imp(erator) Caesar deivei f. Augustu[s] resti[tu]it*).

⁶⁹ Cf. also Oliver 1963: 121. ⁷⁰ Pleket 1958: 60. See also Oliver 1963: 121.

⁷¹ Engelmann 1976: 54 and 57.

⁷² On the *orgeones* and their leasing activities, see Papazarkadas 2011: ch. 4.3.

No matter how anchored an association was to a place, this attachment does not always suffice to demonstrate the inclusivity or exclusivity of the group or even how inclusive or exclusive this place would have been. In a number of cases, what appears to be inclusive or exclusive is the cult. This raises the question about the motivation or benefit of opening up the cult to non-associates. Moreover, if a certain degree of openness is attested for the cult, would different attitudes to the use and management of space be expected?

A law passed by the *orgeones* of Bendis in the last third of the fourth century BC underlines their involvement in the administration and management of the shrine.⁷³ The text contains regulations stipulating the financing of the repair of the shrine and the property (*oikia*) rented out by the *orgeones*. It also distinguishes between members and non-members and accordingly sets out different regulations for each group with regard to sacrifices to the goddess.⁷⁴ *Orgeones* who performed sacrifices to the goddess were exempted from any fees (l. 3 ἀτελεῖς), unlike a private individual (l. 4 ἰδιώτης) who had to abide by what the law prescribed. More specifically, in sacrifices performed by individuals, the goddess as well as the priest or priestess were entitled to perquisites that are clearly laid out in the text.⁷⁵ Apparently, then, non-*orgeones* were allowed to enter the shrine in their capacity as worshippers and make a sacrifice as long as they observed the relevant regulations.⁷⁶ This inclusivity of cult comes hand in hand with a wish by the *orgeones* for a broad-based membership or as stated in the inscription ‘so that there may be as many *orgeones* of the *hieron* as possible’ (ll. 20–1). As Vincent Gabrielsen has put it: ‘shrine-participation (μετουσία) was the cardinal factor that drew the dividing line between members – “those who share in the *hieron*” (οἱ μέτεστιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ) – and non-members (ἰδιώται)’. By passing this law, the *orgeones* made explicit the benefits of membership. The two sets of rules for sacrifices (one for members and one for non-members) can thus be considered an effective device for making membership attractive to non-members. By extension, a broad-based membership could augment the prestige of the cult. In the inscription, a 2 drachma contribution is mentioned for sacrifices on the occasion of the festival of the goddess.⁷⁷ If the finances of the festival came

⁷³ IG II² 1361. ⁷⁴ IG II² 1361, ll. 2–6. ⁷⁵ IG II² 1361, ll. 4–7.

⁷⁶ Gabrielsen 2016a: 145.

⁷⁷ Members were obliged to contribute 2 drachmas to the *hieropoioi* (ll. 17–19) before the 16th of Thargelion.

from membership contributions, then a broad-based membership would serve to more adequately maintain the cult.

The phrase ‘*orgeones* of the *hieron*’ should not pass unnoticed. The identity of the *orgeones* is tied to their shrine and the activities performed therein.⁷⁸ In this regard, it was even more in their interest to keep the cult alive and to please the goddess in any way possible. It demonstrates that the significance of the place for creating and retaining identity did not diminish even if non-members had access to this place. The *orgeones* were not simply worshippers but managers of the affairs of the goddess.

The case of the *orgeones* of Bendis clearly shows that the openness of a cult, if properly regulated, could serve the interests of the association. Two more cases are particularly instructive in this respect, as they present features of inclusivity regarding the cult. In these two cases the cult is that of healing deities: Amphiaraus at Rhamnous in Attica and Asclepius at Yaylakale in Mysia.

The earliest of the two is that of the *Amphieraistai* in Rhamnous, an Attic deme and an important fort in north-eastern Attica.⁷⁹ The association came into being at the initiative of a soldier. As the prosopography of the membership demonstrates, members were predominantly fellow soldiers of the garrison.⁸⁰ As its name reveals, the association was centred around the cult of Amphiaraus, a healing hero, who also had a major shrine at neighbouring Oropos.⁸¹ A sanctuary of Amphiaraus has been located a few hundred metres south of the fort at Rhamnous. By the time the association came into being, the sanctuary had gone into disuse and the cult had likely been discontinued.⁸² By opening a subscription and thanks to generous contributions, the members of the association restored the sanctuary, while at the same time securing the subsidy of the cult in the form of an endowment.⁸³ In the inscription, it is stated explicitly that the *Amphieraistai* restored the sanctuary so that anyone who wished could participate in the cult.⁸⁴ Although membership in the association seems to have been restricted to soldiers and members, participation in the cult was open to non-associates. The primary preoccupation of the *Amphieraistai* was the revival and perpetuation of the cult. In this respect, a community of worshippers that would guarantee the performance of cult was of equal

⁷⁸ Gabrielsen 2016a: 144–5. ⁷⁹ *I.Rhamnous* 167 = *CAPInv.* 356; Oetjen 2014: 160–2.

⁸⁰ For the prosopography see Petrakos 1999b: 167; Arnaoutoglou 2011b: 41; Skaltsa 2016: 83–6.

⁸¹ For the cult see Petrakos 1999a: 319. ⁸² *I.Rhamnous* 167, ll. 2–6.

⁸³ *I.Rhamnous* 167, ll. 10–21.

⁸⁴ *I.Rhamnous* 167, ll. 8–10: ὅπως ἂν ἐπι|σκευασθέντων τούτων τῶι θεῶι ἔχῃσι χρᾶσθαι κοινεῖ πάν|τες οἱ βουλόμενοι τῶι ἱερῶι.

importance to the subsidy of the cult, which the *Amphieraistai* sought to guarantee. Without opening up the cult to non-associates, the efforts of the *Amphieraistai*, an association predominantly consisting of soldiers, would, following the removal of the garrison to another fort, be doomed to failure. In this case, then, what was of paramount importance was to regulate the financial backing of the cult and not necessarily issues of accessibility or management of space.

A similar attitude with regard to the openness of the cult can be detected in another instance of a healing cult, in the hinterland of the Pergamene kingdom. On a plateau ca. 30 km to the south-east of Pergamum, in Yaylakale, an association of *Asklepiastai* came into being under the initiative of Demetrios, a *phourachos* (commander of a fortress) in the first half of the second century BC.⁸⁵ The association was composed of fifteen members, including the founder, with family ties noticeable among some of the members.⁸⁶ Given the military office of Demetrios, the onomastics of the members, as well as the strategic position of the location along the route to NW Lydia, the *Asklepiastai* were probably members of the garrison stationed there.⁸⁷ Unlike the *Amphieraistai* who restored a sanctuary fallen into disuse, Demetrios founded a new sanctuary (ἱερόν), which, as the name of the association reveals, was dedicated to Asclepius. It appears that the cult of healing deities, like Asclepius or Amphiaraus, appealed to some degree to soldiers.⁸⁸

The case of the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale becomes even more interesting due to another inscription,⁸⁹ which was found in the neighbouring area of Yala and which, as Müller has shown, should be read in conjunction with the inscription attesting to the foundation of the shrine and the formation of the *Asklepiastai*.⁹⁰ This inscription refers to rules for entry into a sanctuary, to be identified with the one founded by Demetrios. The

⁸⁵ Ed. pr. Müller 2010: 427–40; *SEG* 60:1332. See also *CAPInv.* 857. Associations of *Asklepiastai* are sometimes found in state-administered sanctuaries of Asclepius, as can be inferred by the honorific decree for Alkibiades son of Herakleides from Thorikos set up by the *Asklepiastai* in Athens (*IG II²* 1293 = *CAPInv.* 323); the stele containing the decree was found on the south slope of the Acropolis and has been attributed by Aleshire 1989: 68–70 to the nearby Athenian *Asklepieion*. For other attestations of *Asklepiastai*, see Müller 2010: 428 n. 1.

⁸⁶ Müller 2010: 435. ⁸⁷ Müller 2010: 428–40.

⁸⁸ The observation in Müller 2010: 437 that the cult of Asclepius was rather unusual among soldiers on account of the paucity of evidence may need to be revisited. In light of the inscription from Rhamnous discussed here (above), the epigraphic evidence shows that soldiers exhibited a certain interest in the cult of healing deities.

⁸⁹ Müller 2010: 440–7; *SEG* 60:1333.

⁹⁰ The survey conducted in the area where the stele was found revealed scarce architectural remains, but no other inscription came to light.

inscription is partly preserved; lines 1–12 regulate entry into the shrine (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν). All clauses refer to requirements pertaining to purity. In order to attain a satisfactory degree of purity, worshippers had to abstain from sexual intercourse and wash themselves thoroughly, stay away from a corpse and funeral for two days, and so on. The text also provides insights into the architectural setting of the sanctuary. As expected for a healing sanctuary, an incubation hall (ἐνκοιμητήριον) features in the text,⁹¹ which stood in the vicinity of the sanctuary (ll. 13–14, παρὰ τὸ ἱερόν).⁹² The sanctuary in Yaylakale was not only open to all those observing the purity regulations but was also equipped with the facilities needed for the development of the therapeutic aspect of the cult.⁹³

The measures concerning purification resonate with regulations observed in other sanctuaries, most notably in the sanctuaries of Asclepius and Athena in Pergamum.⁹⁴ They therefore comply with practices attested in the capital of the Pergamene kingdom. It is, however, the authority laying out the rules that differs in this case: the founder of a private association. As a commander of the fort, Demetrios must have had close ties to the royal court. At any rate, he was acting as a representative of the royal power. By founding an association devoted to the cult of Asclepius, one of the major deities fostered by the Attalid rulers, he thus promoted a cult endorsed by the kings in the hinterland of the Pergamene territory, and at the same time he significantly enriched the religious life of members of the garrison as well as those living in the vicinity of the fort.⁹⁵

The purity rules do not touch upon membership or management of space. In other words, these rules, though set out by the association and set up in a sanctuary founded by private initiative, do not aim at regulating membership but instead at opening up the cult to anyone who would observe them. Though membership of the association may have been fixed and internally controlled with a certain degree of exclusivity – namely, by being open only to members of the local garrison – a degree of inclusivity is therefore attested in the cult practice. And although the regulations aim at ensuring that worshippers have attained a state of purity before entering the sanctuary, their ultimate objective is nevertheless the health of the

⁹¹ The building type of the *enkoimeterion* is far from standardised, see von Ehrenheim 2015: 79–86 with bibliography.

⁹² Müller 2010: 446. ⁹³ See also Carbon in Chapter 4.

⁹⁴ Müller 2010: 446 notes the similarities with the regulations of the *Asklepieion* of Pergamum, while Carbon in Chapter 4 extends the comparison to the regulations of the sanctuary of Athena in Pergamum and offers an in-depth analysis of the purification measures.

⁹⁵ On the issue of cults endorsed both by the kings and the army, see Chaniotis 2002: 108–9.

worshipper (ll. 3–4: ὑγίᾱς ἔνεκεν). Needless to say, worshippers would come to this sanctuary with a view to seeking healing from disease. The regulations would act as a reminder that cleanliness was required and certain sources of pollution had to be avoided. In light of the healing aspect of the cult (Asclepius) and the purity measures, it should not come as a surprise that in this case the regulations focus on health, a different virtue than the orderly behaviour or good order that might otherwise be expected of associations.⁹⁶ However, the phrase ὑγίᾱς ἔνεκεν as such is quite exceptional, with no direct parallel in the corpus of purity regulations.⁹⁷ Inscriptions containing purity regulations were displayed in order to ensure ritual purity of the shrine in question.⁹⁸ In this respect, observance of regulations ensured that space would maintain its status that set it aside from other places: an unpolluted sacred space. In this case, however, observance of regulations had a dual objective, namely, to ensure the health of individual worshippers seeking help from the healing deity as well as the overall purity of sacred space.

Conclusions

The polis regulated the use of space in a range of places and institutions, from the agora and the gymnasium to the sanctuary, appointing civic or religious officials to attend to issues of propriety, upkeep of good order and avoidance of alienation, encroachment or misuse of space.⁹⁹ Regulations could take a wide array of material manifestations, from boundary stones demarcating the use of land to stelae bearing regulations pertaining to a number of issues such as purity measures, the exclusion of certain groups of people or opening and closing times.¹⁰⁰ As space preoccupied civic authorities, so its management and use raised concerns among associations too.

⁹⁶ See Gabrielsen and Paganini in Chapter 1. ⁹⁷ See also Müller 2010: 443.

⁹⁸ Lupu 2005: 14–21.

⁹⁹ For example, the law of the *astynomoi* in Pergamum, a second-century AD inscription that seems to have been passed during the reign of the Attalids, regulates issues ranging from water management to house planning (*OGIS* 483; for a commentary see Saba 2012).

¹⁰⁰ Different criteria of exclusion were applied depending on the space in question; in the case of the Athenian Agora, segregation could be exerted on the principle of gender (Just 1989: 105–25) and/or political rights (Hansen 1976: 61–70), while in the case of a sanctuary of a mystery cult, such as the sanctuary of the Great Gods in Samothrace, non-initiates were not permitted access (*SEG* 12:395). Gymnasia were regulated by laws; two extant laws come from northern Greece: the gymnasiarchic law of Beroia (see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993) and the ephebarchic law of Amphipolis (Lazaridou 2015 = *SEG* 65:420). The gymnasiarchic law forbids access to slaves, freedmen, the physically unfit (*apalaistroi*), male prostitutes, charlatans, drunkards and madmen.

It has been shown that familial associations with their orderly and closed membership created well-ordered spaces, going to great lengths to regulate the management and use of space. It has been argued that a primary reason for this is that space and the attachment to a place constituted a core feature of their identity. Exclusivity in the associations from Cos, Thera and Halicarnassus is perceptible in several features of the groups, from their membership profile (relatives, real or fictive) and cultic activity to the construction of space. The meeting-place as a physical space underlined a distinction between insiders (members) and outsiders (non-members), and in this respect it created a 'community of users'. Moreover, as a sacred space, it provided the locale for the cultivation of cognitive (memory) and social/emotional bonds between members through sharing in common traditions and cultic activity. Attachment to place fostered a sense of belonging, created physical and conceptual boundaries and embodied a special meaning ascribed to it by means of ritual and performance. In these respects, the meeting-places in Cos, Thera and Halicarnassus became mnemonic places, constructed to evoke memories and foster a specific identity, that of an associate who played tribute to real or fictive ancestors and worshipped certain gods.¹⁰¹

How much place was charged with emotional as well as material meaning for the identity of the association becomes manifest in cases of detachment from this space. Management of space, especially as a revenue-bearing property, entailed some risks, especially in cases in which the property was mortgaged. This happened with the shrine of Dionysus in Cyme: the *thiasitai* were expelled from the shrine by a certain Lysias who assumed ownership of the place. Yet despite the dislocation, it was the place itself as a sacred space that remained a point of reference for the group. It sought to reinstate its rights and reaffirm its identity by taking collective action to restore the sanctuary to the god.

Associations centred on the cult of healing deities, among others, show that sanctuaries managed by associations could be open to non-members. These cases present us with different attitudes to space and its regulation. The *orgeones* of Bendis had two sets of rules, one for members and one for

¹⁰¹ Regulations pertaining to the prescribed use of space in relation to commemorative activities go back to the Archaic period. For instance, in late archaic Paros, a funeral pyre demarcated by boundary stones constituted a focus of commemorative activity for a phratry, which sought to retain the original function of this space by introducing a regulation that forbade the use of the area of the funeral pyre for private burials and funerary monuments (Matthaiou 2000-3; *SEG* 51:1071). Cf. also the boundary stone from Cymae that prohibits burial to the non-initiated to the Dionysiac mysteries: *LSCG Suppl.* 120; *SEG* 4:92.

non-members, when it came to sacrifices. In doing so, they underlined the benefits of membership, the latter open to whoever wanted to share in the cult. The *Amphieraistai* in Rhamnous and the *Asklepiastai* in Yaylakale restored or built shrines, not only for themselves, but also for the benefit of non-members who wished to partake in the cult. When studied together, the epigraphic evidence from these two sites outlines a fuller picture. Whereas the *Amphieraistai* took measures to ensure the subsidy of the cult, the *Asklepiastai* were more particularly concerned with the sanctity of space and its function as a place of healing – regulations are addressed to the community of worshippers, not only to members. Of prime concern was the health of the worshippers and, by extension, of the sanctuary as a community of worshippers, a virtue that could be achieved through the observance of purity measures.

Overall, the analysis offered here illustrates some aspects that pertain to the exclusivity or inclusivity of space. In the diverse body of evidence for ancient associations, we alternately find a looser or closer attachment to a place. For instance, groups of *orgeones* could meet just once a year and rent out their private property for the remainder.¹⁰² The *Iobacchoi* in Athens, on the other hand, met on a regular basis in their *Bakcheion*, namely, monthly and on other specific occasions.¹⁰³ Still other groups were associated with a public sanctuary or a sanctuary open to the public.¹⁰⁴ For instance, three different associations are attested in the sanctuary of Pankrates in Athens in the third century BC.¹⁰⁵ Although their organisational structure and longevity escape us, this sanctuary apparently provided a fertile ground for the co-existence and interaction among these associations.

It has been argued that the control and ownership of the place, or lack thereof, as well as the type of place and its use (tomb, house, clubhouse or larger sanctuary), matter crucially. By looking closely at regulations and the attachments of associations to place, it has been suggested that we can shift emphasis from a focus on propriety and order to consider other important aspects of associations as well-ordered societies, such as their varying degrees of exclusivity and inclusivity or even the promotion of virtues like good health. Though archaeological remains of meeting-places of associations may continue to be elusive, the concept of space in the study of

¹⁰² Papazarkadas 2011: 191–7. ¹⁰³ The *Iobacchoi* are discussed by Arnaoutoglou in Chapter 6.

¹⁰⁴ For the case of the *Bakchoi* in Cnidus, see Carbon in Chapter 4.

¹⁰⁵ The relevant inscriptions remain largely unpublished but references to *SEG* provide the names of the associations in question: *eranistai* (*SEG* 41:82 and 171); *koinon* of *thiasotai* (*SEG* 41:83); *orgeones* (*SEG* 41:84).

associations proves to be anything but static. Instead, intermittently contested and reinstated, it was being shaped by and at the same time was shaping the activities and experiences of the collectivity. Even in cases where an association became unmoored from its physical setting, place/space continued to inform the identity of the group. While the overall picture drawn from the epigraphic record is not uniform regarding the precise mechanisms involved in the regulation and use of space, nevertheless, space abidingly provided the locale for reunion, unity and cohesion among the collectivity.