Kernos

Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion
grecque antique

26 | 2013
Varia

‘The People to the goddess Livia’

Attic Nemesis and the Roman imperial cult

Emma Stafford

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2214>

DOI: 10.4000/kernos.2214

ISSN: 2034-7871

Publisher

Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique

Printed version

Date of publication: 10 October 2013

Number of pages: 205-238

ISSN: 0776-3824

Electronic reference

Emma Stafford, “The People to the goddess Livia”, *Kernos* [Online], 26 | 2013, Online since 23 December 2015, connection on 02 March 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2214> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/kernos.2214>

‘The People to the goddess Livia’: Attic Nemesis and the Roman imperial cult*

Abstract: In the first century AD a dedication to the deified Livia was placed on the fifth-century BC temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous. This paper examines the inscription against the background of the sanctuary’s earlier and later history, the development of the imperial cult in the east, and Nemesis’ reception at Rome. It develops earlier suggestions that Rhamnous was deliberately chosen for honours to Livia because of the sanctuary’s association with the idea of vengeance against eastern enemies, and reassesses the evidence for linking the dedication with Claudius. It argues that the inscription implies an exceptionally close identification between empress and deity, and has a significant contribution to make to discussion of the imperial cult’s interaction with traditional Greek religion.

Résumé : Au I^{er} siècle de notre ère, une dédicace à Livie divinisée est placée dans le sanctuaire de Némésis à Rhamnonte (V^e siècle av. n.è.). Cet article étudie l’inscription sur l’arrière-plan de l’histoire du sanctuaire, du développement du culte impérial à l’est et de la réception de Némésis à Rome. Il développe des hypothèses antérieures concernant l’association du sanctuaire avec l’idée de vengeance contre des ennemis orientaux et révalue les témoignages qui associent la dédicace à Claude. L’inscription implique une identification remarquablement étroite entre une impératrice et une divinité, et elle constitue une contribution importante à la discussion sur l’interaction entre le culte impérial et la religion grecque traditionnelle.

Introduction

In the first century AD the epistyle of the classical temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous, in the remote north-east corner of Attica, was inscribed with a dedication to the deified empress Livia. Most scholarship on Rhamnous has read the inscription as rededicating the temple to Livia, but without investigating what such a rededication might involve or commenting on the apparent eviction of the temple’s traditional dedicatee. Scholarship on the imperial cult, too, has until recently largely overlooked this example. However, the dedication

* I dedicate this paper to the memory of Tony Brothers, whose expertise in both classical architecture and Roman religion I should have liked to consult. I owe thanks to the anonymous referee who supplied some useful references, and to several colleagues who offered helpful feedback on draft versions: Malcolm Heath, Roger Brock, Steve Green, Penny Goodman, and especially Nick Fisher. All remaining infelicities are entirely my own work.

has two particularly striking features which make it worthy of closer attention. First, its location: the normal pattern in the Roman province of Achaia, as in Asia Minor, is for imperial cult to be located prominently in the most public part of the city-centre.¹ Second, the position of the inscription, and its implication that the whole temple is being rededicated: more common means of adding imperial cult to an existing sanctuary are to introduce statues or altars or supplementary buildings, and care is normally taken to subordinate the imperial personnel to the traditional deity.² My aim here is to elucidate the dedication by taking a holistic approach, examining it against the background of three different types of context: the local cult context of the Rhamnous sanctuary; the imperial cult context, in terms of its early development at Athens and of its treatment of sacred space; the conceptual context of Nemesis' reception at Rome. I shall argue that Rhamnous has an important contribution to make to the wider discussion of the imperial cult in the Greek east, especially in relation to the modalities of emperor-worship's incursion into anciently sacred space, and that it offers a more than usually complex example of two-way interaction between Rome and traditional Greek religion.

1. The dedication

First, let us take a closer look at the inscription (*IG II² 3242, Fig. 1*):

Ὁ δῆμος
θεᾷ Λειβίᾳ, στρατηγούντος
ἐ[πι] τοὺς ὀπλε[ί]τας τοῦ καὶ ἱερέως θεᾶς
Ῥώ[μης] κ[αί] Σεβασ[τ]οῦ Καίσαρος Δημοστράτου
[τοῦ Διονυ]σίου Παλληγένως, ἄρχον[τ]ος δὲ
[Ἀντιπάτρου] τοῦ Ἀν(τι)πάτρου Φλυέω[ς] ν[εωτέρου].

The people to the goddess Livia. When Demonstratos son of Dionysios of Pal-lene was hoplite general and priest of the goddess Roma and Caesar Augustus; and Antipatros the Younger son of Antipatros of Phlya was archon.

The badly weathered and damaged inscription was originally published by Orlandos in 1924, who did not observe the dedication to Livia and dated it to the fourth or third century BC on the basis of letter-forms.³ Broneer re-examined the stone and identified further fragments, noting the Livia dedica-

¹ On the urban centralisation of imperial cult in Achaia, see ALCOCK (1993), p. 180-199. PRICE (1984), p. 78-100 presents a more nuanced account of the distribution of imperial cult in Asia Minor, but nonetheless sees it as primarily an urban phenomenon. LOZANO (2002), p. 51-53 and 79 argues that extra-urban sanctuaries continued to play an important role in the religious outlook of Greek cities in the imperial period, but Rhamnous is one of very few examples he can adduce. On the imperial cult in Achaia see also LOZANO (2010) and KANTIRÉA (2007).

² PRICE (1984), see especially p. 146-156.

³ ORLANDOS (1924), p. 319 fig. 10.

tion and restoring the archon-name as Aiolion, son of an Antipatros known to have been archon in AD 45/6, suggesting a date for the inscription under Galba (AD 68/9).⁴ The 'Aiolion' reading was retained by Kirchner and Pouilloux,⁵ but Dinsmoor, following a suggestion of Oliver, convincingly argued that the archon in question here is in fact the known Antipatros, aptly distinguished from a father of the same name as 'Antipatros the Younger', thus providing the now generally-agreed date for the inscription of AD 45/6.⁶ The version of the text reproduced here is taken from Petrakos 1999 (no. 156), with the addition of Dinsmoor's restoration [Ἀντιπάτρου] in line 6.

Fig. 1. Inscription on the east epistyle of Nemesis' temple, AD 45/6 (*IG II² 3242*).
Drawing: Petrakos (1999) II, p. 124.

The dedication is simply formulated: 'the people to the goddess Livia', the dative case indicating that the verb to be understood is *anetheken*, 'dedicated to...'. It is unusual to see the name Livia in an inscription which post-dates the empress' assumption of the title 'Julia Augusta' on Augustus' death in AD 14: even Hahn's extensive catalogue of epigraphic and numismatic evidence for Livia's cult in the Greek east offers no firmly dated parallel, although it is problematic that the name itself is frequently invoked as a dating criterion.⁷ The qualification *thea* is not inappropriate, since Livia's official deification had taken place just three years earlier in AD 42,⁸ but it had in fact been used in the east already during her lifetime. For example, on Thasos between 16 BC and AD 2 honours are recorded for 'Livia Drusilla, wife of Caesar Augustus, goddess benefactor (θεὸν εὐεργέτιν)' alongside honours for Augustus' daughter Julia and

⁴ BRONEER (1932), p. 397-400. *LGPV II s.v.* "Antipatros" no. 48 lists several inscriptions in which this Antipatros is named; the date AD 45/6 is provided by a passing reference to 'Antipatros being archon at Athens' in Phlegon of Tralles, *Peri Thaumasion* (*FGrH* 257 F 36, 6).

⁵ KIRCHNER (1935) in *IG II² 3242*; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 46.

⁶ OLIVER (1950), p. 85 n. 18; DINSMOOR (1961), p. 186-194; conjecture reported *SEG* 19, 202, 6. See also HAHN (1994), p. 57 and 101-102 (nn. 435-436) no. 8; *LGPV II s.v.* "Antipatros" no. 47 = the father.

⁷ HAHN 1994, p. 34-105 (discussion) and p. 322-334 (catalogue). On Livia's place in imperial cult, see also GREITHER (1946), BARTMAN (1990), p. 127-138, BARRETT (2002), p. 207-213.

⁸ Suetonius, *Claudius*, 11, 2; Cassius Dio, XL, 5, 2; OSGOOD (2011), p. 56-60.

her daughter Vipsania Julia,⁹ while at Corinth around AD 21-3 the programme of Caerean games included performance of a poem 'for the goddess Julia Augusta (εἰς θεᾶν Ἰουλίαν Σεβαστήν)'.¹⁰ The 'people' responsible for the Rhamnous dedication must be the Athenian *demos*.¹¹ In a number of earlier inscriptions concerning the sanctuary (e.g. below), the people of Rhamnous itself appear as the decision-making body, but they are usually designated as *hoi Rhamnousioi*.¹² It is in any case unclear whether the deme would have had a large enough population to support a local administrative body in the first century AD.¹³ The remaining lines consist of the dating formulae regularly used in Attic inscriptions of the period. The hoplite general is named first because he is the most important magistrate at Athens, but his particular association with the imperial cult is emphasised here by explicit mention of his role as priest of Roma and Augustus.¹⁴ The name was only preserved as -οστράτου on the stone examined by Broneer, but his restoration Δημοστράτου has been vindicated by the discovery of a further fragment.¹⁵ This 'Demostratos son of Dionysios of Pallene' could be the grandson of the identically-named *hymnagogos* in an inscription from Eleusis of 20/19 BC; also listed is a *keryx* named 'Dionysios son of Demostratos of Pallene', the *hymnagogos*' father, a good example of the common pattern of names alternating from generation to generation.¹⁶

The AD 45/6 date has been challenged by Lozano, his principal objection being the lack of parallel for posthumous use of the name 'Livia', rather than 'Julia Augusta'.¹⁷ His proposal of a date within Livia's lifetime is reasonable in itself, as is his suggestion that the Demostratos of the Rhamnous decree could

⁹ Thasos: IG XII 8, 381 B 6-7; HAHN (1994), no. 4; DUNANT, POUILLOUX (1958), p. 62-64.

¹⁰ Corinth: MERITT (1931), p. 28-29 no. 19; HAHN (1994), no. 11; cf. WEST (1931), p. 64. Almost a dozen further examples of the *thea* inscriptions catalogued and discussed by HAHN (1994), p. 38-39 are more or less firmly dated within Livia's lifetime: nos. 2, 12 (Gytheion: see below), 17 (Kyzikos: see below), 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 41, 47, 49. On divine honours offered to Livia in her lifetime in the east, see HOFF (1994), p. 108-109, and KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 74-75.

¹¹ GEAGAN (1967), p. 81-83 notes the prevalence of the *demos* alone as the dedicating body in Roman Athens, listing the Rhamnous example in his catalogue (Appendix I.F, 154-159).

¹² WHITEHEAD (1986), p. 405-406 notes the variety of formulae used in Rhamnousian decrees in the hellenistic period; see also OSBORNE (1990), p. 277-285 with Appendices p. 287-293.

¹³ WHITEHEAD (1986), p. 362-363 notes the possibility of deme administration of some kind persisting under Roman rule, though he can only adduce a single example (IG II² 2953, thank-offering to Ares and Augustus by 'the *koinon* of the Acharnians': see below). ALCOCK (1993) broadly confirms the picture of rural depopulation, the trend for nucleated habitation and simplification of local administrative structures.

¹⁴ CARROLL (1982), p. 44-45. Our inscription is in fact the latest evidence for the priesthood of Roma and Augustus: SPAWFORTH (1997), p. 199 n. 59. HOFF (1994), p. 113 and n. 102 adduces our inscription as evidence for the return of the imperial cult to the hoplite general's control after a period under Tiberius when a high-priest of the emperor is attested.

¹⁵ BRONEER (1932), p. 398-410.

¹⁶ SEG 30, 93, 11-12 (father, *keryx*) and 23 (son, *hymnagogos*).

¹⁷ LOZANO (2002), p. 28; LOZANO (2004); LOZANO (2010), p. 215.

be *identical* with the Demonstratos who was an Eleusinian official in 20/19 BC, placing our inscription in the first half of Augustus' principate. However, Lozano's claim that his reading 'does not necessitate creating three generations of unknown Athenians' is disingenuous:¹⁸ the simplification of Demonstratos' identification is counterbalanced by the complication of the identification of the archon, who on Lozano's reading needs to be restored as an ancestor of the known Antipatros. Though neither solution is entirely satisfactory, AD 45/6 seems to be marginally less problematic, and, as we shall see, there are other reasons to prefer a Claudian to an Augustan date.

Fig. 2. Reconstruction of the east façade of the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous, with Fig. 1 superimposed in position across the two central columns.

Drawing of temple: Petrakos (1999) I, fig. 155.

What exactly is the inscription dedicating and what does such a dedication involve? In the absence of any expressed direct object, dedicatory inscriptions are usually assumed to refer either to the item which bears the inscription or to something closely associated, as e.g. a statue-base inscription might refer to the statue above.¹⁹ The stone in question here is a section of epistyle and was found just east of the east end of the temple: Broneer followed Orlandos in locating it inside the *pronaos*, above the inner entrance of the temple, but Dinsmoor, followed by Miles, demonstrated conclusively that it belongs to the exterior

¹⁸ LOZANO (2004), p. 180.

¹⁹ Cf. the examples listed in KAJAVA's (2011) typology of dedications to emperors.

epistyle, noting its lighter mouldings which contrast to the heavier mouldings typical of the interior.²⁰ We should, then, picture it in the most prominent possible position immediately above the east entrance to the temple (*Fig. 2*). This has generally been understood as indicating that the temple itself is the object of the dedication, but what such a dedication actually involves is less than clear: did Livia *replace* Nemesis as the temple's main deity, did the two goddesses simply *share* the temple from then on, or did Nemesis become syncretised with Livia? Pouilloux talks of 'une évolution dans le culte traditionnel', with Livia 'associée à Némésis';²¹ others make reference very much in passing to 'the rededication of the temple' to Livia.²² Even Petrakos, the sanctuary's most long-standing commentator, only remarks briefly that the inscription tells us that 'the temple was dedicated to the dead and deified wife of Augustus Livia', a 'free honour' made for unknown reasons, or 'for political and diplomatic reasons'.²³

The first scholar to question the inscription's meaning was Broneer, who comments that it 'would seem to indicate that Livia somehow shared the cult of the goddess [... but] it is not very clear exactly what is implied'.²⁴ Spawforth gives brief consideration to the dedication's geographical position, in 'a location about as far from the sight of most Athenians as it was possible to get', which he explains as symptomatic of the 'muted quality' of the early stages of emperor worship at Athens.²⁵ Price cites the dedication (in a footnote) as one of a very small handful of examples of 'takeovers' by the imperial cult of abandoned temples.²⁶ Alcock (in an endnote) notes the temple's refurbishment and 'rededication' to Livia *in situ* as an exception to the trend for urban centralisation of cult under Roman rule.²⁷ Shear briefly links the repairs and 'rededication' to a wider programme of sanctuary refurbishments in Attica, in a

²⁰ BRONEER (1932), p. 398; DINSMOOR (1961), p. 182-6; MILES (1989), see especially p. 163-164 fig. 11.

²¹ POUILLOUX (1954), p. 157.

²² DINSMOOR (1961), p. 194; GEAGAN (1979), p. 386; ELIAKIS (1980), p. 221; TRAVLOS (1988), p. 389; MILES (1989), p. 236; BARTMAN (1990), p. 128; HORNUM (1993), p. 19; HOFF (1994), p. 111 and n. 86; CAMIA (2011), p. 203 fig. 19. The inscription is the only first-century evidence supporting HORNUM's (1993) thesis of an association between Nemesis and the imperial family; the second-century and later evidence Hornum collects is more compelling; cf. LEVENE (1997), p. 300.

²³ PETRAKOS (1987), p. 324 and (1999) I, p. 288-289 (cf. p. 42); cf. PETRAKOS (1978), p. 55 and (1991), p. 29.

²⁴ BRONEER (1932), p. 399.

²⁵ SPAWFORTH (1997), p. 194.

²⁶ PRICE (1984), p. 164 n. 73; he notes that there is no evidence from Asia Minor for such takeovers; other examples from mainland Greece are derelict temples mentioned by Pausanias as dedicated to Roman emperors or housing their statues, in Elis' agora (VI, 24, 10) and at Delphi (X, 8, 6), and the Metroon at Olympia (below).

²⁷ ALCOCK (1993), p. 193 n. 30 (p. 256).

downbeat assessment of the 'gloomy' state of first-century AD Athenian culture.²⁸ It is only relatively recently that the inscription has attracted more sustained attention, in the context of an increase of interest in the imperial cult in Greece. Kajava takes issue with Spawforth, rightly pointing out that the priest of Augustus and Roma named in our inscription celebrated the imperial cult back in the urban centre of Athens in the highly conspicuous location of the Akropolis.²⁹ Instead, Kajava argues that the choice of location was deliberate, motivated by a Roman interest in Nemesis as avenger, linked with Augustan propaganda which presented the emperor as *ultor*.³⁰ Kantiréa takes up this line, reading the Rhamnous inscription as an example of Athenian reuse of buildings from the illustrious classical past to flatter the imperial family, and to make a conceptual link with the Persian Wars.³¹ The discussion here builds especially on these last two scholars' ideas, while exploring further the as-yet unanswered question of what the dedication actually implies in terms of cult at Rhamnous.

2. Local cult context: Nemesis' sanctuary at Rhamnous

2.1. Pre-Roman Rhamnous

The first type of context to consider is the local one. There is no doubt about Nemesis' position as primary goddess at Rhamnous before the Roman period: the results of excavation over nearly two centuries are extensively presented in Petrakos 1999, available more briefly in Petrakos 1987 and 1991.³² The sanctuary seems to have been active from around 600 BC, the site having yielded remains of two successive temples of the sixth century as well as smaller-scale finds indicative of ritual activity.³³ The same period sees the first attestation of a foundation myth of sorts, the story of Nemesis' rape by Zeus and subsequent bearing of Helen, which appears in the *Kypria* (fr. 9 PEG), the events being explicitly located at Rhamnous in Ps-Eratosthenes, *Katasterismoi* (25 D, *s.v. Kyknou*).³⁴ The sanctuary gained in importance after the Persian defeat at nearby Marathon in 490, a Greek victory which later authors link with Nemesis' role as personification of divine Retribution (see below). By the mid fifth century the sanctuary was wealthy enough to be making substantial loans to individuals, and a

²⁸ SHEAR (1981), p. 367-368 (see below).

²⁹ KAJAVA (2000), p. 41-42.

³⁰ KAJAVA (2000).

³¹ KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 115-116.

³² See also TRAVLOS (1988), p. 388-403 fig. 487-507; MILES (1989) is a detailed study of the temple; POUILLOUX's (1954) study of Rhamnous' topography remains important. For brief discussion of the sanctuary's pre-Roman development, see STAFFORD (2000), p. 56-60 and 82-96.

³³ PETRAKOS (1999) I, p. 192-197 fig. 107-112.

³⁴ On the possible Rhamnousian origins of the myth, see STAFFORD (2000), p. 78-82.

programme of building work resulted in impressive retaining walls to support the terrace, a fountain house and drainage system, and a stoa.³⁵ Around 430 BC a new marble temple was built, soon to house a magnificent cult statue by Pheidias' pupil Agorakritos, innovations likely to have required some investment by the city as well as the deme itself.³⁶ In the later fourth century a festival of Nemesis at the sanctuary developed alongside the expansion of the fortress of Rhamnous, where ephebes were garrisoned in their second year of military service. From the fourth and third centuries BC we have inscriptions testifying to dramatic and athletic contests, as well as to the existence of the offices of priestess for both Nemesis and Themis, the cult of the latter goddess probably occupying the small polygonal building next to the main temple of Nemesis.³⁷

The third-century BC sanctuary also yields epigraphic evidence of particular relevance to our enquiry, attesting the worship of Macedonian rulers at Rhamnous. A decree published in 1992 records a decision of around 255 BC to sacrifice to Antigonos Gonatas at the Great Nemesia, the sanctuary's major festival:³⁸

[Ε]πλίνικος Μνησίππου Ῥαμνούσιος
εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονο-
ς καὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ δήμου, διατελεῖ εὐερ-
(γ)ετῶν τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων κ[α]-
ὶ διὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸν ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν
τιμαῖς ἰσοθέοις, τύχει ἀγαθεῖ, δεδόχθαι
[Ῥ]αμνουσίοις θύειν αὐτῷ τεῖ ἐνάτει ἐπὶ
δέκα τοῦ ἑκατονβαϊῶνος, τῶν μεγάλ-
ων Νεμεσίων τῷ γυμνικῷ ἀγῶνι
καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν, πόρον δὲ ὑπάρχ[ε]-
ιν] τοῖς δημόταις εἰς τὴν θυσίαν τ[ὸ γε-
νό]μενον αὐτοῖς ἀγοραστικόν· τ[ῆς θυ-]
σίας ἐπιμελίσθαι τὸν δῆμ[αρχον κ-
αὶ τὸ]ν ταμίαν τὸν αἰεὶ καθι[στάμε-
νον· ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε [τὸ ψήφισμα

³⁵ Sanctuary accounts of c. 450/40 BC: *IG* I³ 248; PETRAKOS (1999) no. 182. Building work: PETRAKOS (1999), I p. 204-219 fig. 122-133.

³⁶ PETRAKOS (1999), I p. 221-274 fig. 134-186. MILES (1989), p. 234-235 estimates the cost of the temple at around 30 talents, three times the reserves indicated by *IG* I³ 248; PETRAKOS (1987), p. 309-310 suggests a more conservative 23 talents. On the statue, see below.

³⁷ Games: e.g. ephebic torch-race dedication on round base (*IG* II² 3105; PETRAKOS (1999), no. 98; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 2) and votive reliefs (London BM 1953.5-30.1 + Rhamnous 530, and Rhamnous 531; PETRAKOS (1999), I p. 287 fig. 199). Priestess-hoods: e.g. throne dedications (*IG* II² 4638a-b; PETRAKOS (1999), nos. 121-122; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 40); Megakles' dedication of a statue to Themis (*IG* II² 3109; PETRAKOS (1999), no. 120 (cf. no. 115); POUILLOUX (1954) no. 39); see also WILHELM (1940). Polygonal temple: PETRAKOS (1999), I p. 198-204, fig. 113-121.

³⁸ PETRAKOS (1999), no. 7 and (1992), p. 31-34 no. 15; *SEG* 41, 75; see also HABICHT (1996) and MIKALSON (1998), p. 155-160 (cf. p. 75-104 on Athenian honours for Antigonos I and Demetrios Poliorketes).

ἐν στήλει λιθ[ίνει καὶ στ[ῆσαι οὗ]
 ἂν δοκῇ τῶι β[α]σιλε[ῖ] Ἀντιγόνωι]...

Elpinikos son of Mnesippos, of Rhamnous, proposed: since Antigonos, King and Saviour of the people, continues doing good services to the people of Athens, and because of these the people have paid him godlike honours, for good fortune, the Rhamnousians have decided to sacrifice to him on the 19th Hekatombaion, at the athletic contests of the Great Nemesia, and to wear crowns, and to raise resources for their fellow-demesmen for the sacrifice, that accruing from the market tax; the demarch and the treasurer in office at the time should have responsibility for the sacrifice; and this decree should be inscribed on a stone stele and set up wherever king Antigonos decides.

The inscription has many points of interest, not least in attesting ruler-worship for Antigonos Gonatas, usually thought to have been averse to the practice, and in establishing the date of the Great Nemesia as 19th Hekatombaion. More directly relevant to the issues surrounding the Livia inscription, however, is the fact that the decision-making body here is explicitly *hoi Rhamnousioi* (l. 7), although the *demos* who have already honoured Antigonos 'like a god' (l. 5-6) must be the Athenian people, explicitly mentioned in the previous line. The sacrifice is to be funded by the deme's market tax revenue and be the responsibility of the demarch and sanctuary treasurer, further emphasising the decision's embeddedness in the local community. The cult of the deified ruler is being incorporated into the existing cult of Nemesis, the sacrifice to the king being firmly set within the context of the goddess' sanctuary and festival. Twenty years later, in an honorific decree of 236/5, we again hear of sacrifices to the king who by now is Demetrios II. This time, however, the sacrifices are at the private expense of the Rhamnous garrison's commander, one Dikaiarchos of Thria, rather than the community, which suggests less enthusiastic support for honouring the Macedonian king after the war of Demetrios (l. 27-30):³⁹

... ἔδωκεν δὲ καὶ ἱερεῖα εἰς τὴν θυσίαν τῶν Νεμεσίων καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, ἐγλείπου-
 [σ]ῶν τῶν θυσίων διὰ τὸν πόλεμον, ὅπως ἔχει καλῶς τὰ πρὸς
 [τ]ὰς θεὰς Ῥαμνουσίοις...

He also donated victims for the sacrifice of the Nemesia and the king from his own resources, after the sacrifices had been neglected because of the war, that the affairs of the goddesses might go well for the Rhamnousians...

The body which took the decision to honour Dikaiarchos for his good works was once again 'the Rhamnousians' (l. 1: ... ἔδοξεν Ῥαμνουσίοις...), and the plural 'goddesses' mentioned here (l. 30) must be Nemesis and Themis.

Just a few years later, in 229 BC, Rhamnous reverted to Athenian control, and almost immediately ruler cult disappears from the record. A handful of

³⁹ PETRAKOS (1999), no. 17; SEG 25, 155; OSBORNE (1990), no. 31.

inscriptions attests to continued activity at the sanctuary during the late third and second centuries, with even the addition of a pair of new deities, Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira around 229 BC.⁴⁰ The latest evidence for Themis and the two Saviour deities comes from the end of the second/beginning of the first century BC, including a votive relief of 101/100 BC dedicated to Themis and Nemesis, alongside Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira.⁴¹ Altogether, the record suggests that the people of Rhamnous were fully aware of the political expediency of ruler cult in the hellenistic period, but loyal to their traditional patron deity and quick to adapt to changing circumstances.

2.2. Roman Rhamnous

There is less material from which to reconstruct the sanctuary's history under Roman rule, but what there is is crucial. Most immediately germane is a dedication to Claudius (AD 41-54) found just in front of the temple:⁴²

Καίσαρι Α[ὐτοκράτορι.....]
 [.....]ιοι μετέχον[τες.....]
 [.....]ι Αὐγο[υστ]-
 [.....] Καίσαρι θεοῦ υἱ[ῶ.....]
 [.....]
 [.....]
 [..... Τιβέ]ριω Κλαυδίω [Καίσαρι..] ΚΑΙΙ[.]
 [.....Σεβαστ]ῶ Γερμανικ[ῶ.....]

To Caesar Imperator.....
 partners in
 to Augustus...
 to Caesar son of the divine ...

 ... to Tiberius Claudius Caesar
 ... Augustus Germanicus...

It used to be thought that the stone in question was part of a base for a portrait-statue of the emperor, but the discovery of further fragments in the 1979 and 1982 seasons amplified the inscription and clarified the shape of the monument, assuring its identity as an altar.⁴³ This is of particular interest given

⁴⁰ PETRAKOS (1999), no. 31, 9-12; *SEG* 15, 112; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 17; OSBORNE (1990), no. 39; see MIKALSON (1998), p. 157-158.

⁴¹ PETRAKOS (1999), no. 150; *IG* II² 2869; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 23. See also PETRAKOS (1999), nos. 151-153.

⁴² PETRAKOS (1999), no. 157; PETRAKOS (1981^a), p. 23 no. 1 fig. 10 pl. 11; PETRAKOS (1984), p. 158-159 no. 1 fig. 9 pl. 100a; *SEG* 31, 165; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 47; *IG* II² 3275.

⁴³ Statue-base: e.g. DINSMOOR (1961), p. 194; MILES (1989), p. 239. Altar: PETRAKOS (1999) I, p. 297 and II, p. 124-5.

Claudius' supposed sensitivity on the subject of divine honours: in a letter of AD 41 to the Alexandrians he grants permission to erect various statues of himself and his family, but expresses disapproval of the appointment of a high priest or the building of temples, such honours being suitable only for the gods.⁴⁴ As Price notes, such refusals seem to be part of the complex system of diplomatic exchange involved in the establishment of imperial cult, and indeed inscriptions of AD 42 from Thasos provide hard evidence of a Greek city appointing a priest of Claudius' cult despite the emperor's explicit refusal of divine honours.⁴⁵ However, a statue base is what we might have expected to find at Rhamnous given the good half dozen statues of Claudius which were dedicated at Athens, five of them securely dated to AD 41 or 42.⁴⁶

As with the Livia inscription the dedication to Claudius recycles an older monument, in this case an altar of the fourth century BC.⁴⁷ The inscription is badly damaged, leaving only Claudius' name and the tantalising fragmentary first four lines to give any indication of the occasion for the dedication. Pouilloux's suggestion remains attractive, that the *metechontes* comes from a phrase like *μετέχοντες τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν*, 'partners in benefactions', and that this refers to Claudius having ordered building work at the sanctuary.⁴⁸ Both his altar and Livia's dedication could then be associated with substantial repairs to the east end of the temple, which had been badly damaged during the hellenistic period, most likely during Philip V's raids of 200/199 BC: Livy's accounts of the destruction wrought in both Athens (31, 24-25) and the Attic countryside (31, 26), though highly coloured, is supported by the material record.⁴⁹ Claudius certainly had a general reputation for restoring statues plundered by Caligula, and as many as seven bases from the Athenian Akropolis attest their own statue's restoration by Claudius, the

⁴⁴ HUNT, EDGAR (1934), p. 79-80. See also OSGOOD (2011), p. 65-66 (Alexandria) and p. 73-74 (Thasos).

⁴⁵ PRICE (1984), p. 72-74. Thasos: SEG 39, 910 (Claudius' letter); DUNANT, POUILLOUX (1958), p. 66-70 pl. 8.1 nos. 179 (letter) and 180 (priest). Cf. the correspondence concerning honours for Claudius on Kos, AD 47-8 (BOSNAKIS, HALLOF (2008), p. 206-217 no. 25) and Tiberius' letter to Gytheion requesting merely human honours (SEG 11, 922), recorded on the same stone as prescriptions for the imperial festival (below n. 75).

⁴⁶ Statue bases: IG II² 3268-3274. GEAGAN (1984), p. 70 with n. 2 and p. 73, asserts that Claudius' name does not appear on any Athenian altars, but he lists IG II² 3275 (the Rhamnous inscription) and IG II² 3276 (from the Akropolis) amongst his examples of statue bases; HOFF (1994), p. 113 and n. 104, notes IG II² 3275-3276 as the only two Athenian altars dedicated to Claudius.

⁴⁷ Cf. ALCOCK (1993), p. 196-198 on such recycling.

⁴⁸ POUILLOUX (1954), p. 157; his argument (p. 157-8) that Claudius' favouring of the sanctuary might be explained by Nemesis' development as goddess of agonistic competitions is undermined by the fact that the evidence for the agonistic Nemesis post-dates the first century AD: see HORNUM 1993, 43-88.

⁴⁹ MILES (1989), p. 235. See MIKALSON (1998), p. 189-194 on the extent of Philip's devastation of Attica.

gracious 'benefactor of the city'.⁵⁰ Even more pertinent is Claudius' possible patronage of the remodelled approach to the Propylaia, the old ramp being replaced at some point in his reign by a magnificent marble staircase.⁵¹ The repairs at Rhamnous involved the replacement of the whole of the east epistyle; Dinsmoor suggests that the work was further necessitated by Claudius having had the temple's original metopes removed for their sculpture, although there is in fact no evidence that such sculpture ever existed.⁵² Petrakos alternatively ascribes the repairs to the following century, which would presuppose that the block bearing the inscription was put in place ahead of the more extensive work on the east epistyle.⁵³ The archaeological record is inconclusive on the question, but it would be altogether simpler to suppose, with Miles, that the inscribed block formed a part of the restoration work.⁵⁴ A Claudian date for the repairs also makes sense in the light of an extensive programme of restoration of Attic sanctuaries attested by a pair of decrees, the date of which is contested but plausibly assigned to the period AD 41-61 by Shear: around 50 shrines are listed in the extant text, on Salamis, in the Piraeus, in Athens and in the Attic countryside.⁵⁵

Before leaving the sanctuary, an important question we can settle is whether the dedication to Livia implies that worship of Nemesis was abandoned. The few testimonia we have after the mid-first century all point to Nemesis remaining in place as its main, even its only, dedicatee. In the first half of the second century, the inscribed base of a statue of Aphina Secunda describes the dedication as being made 'on account of her virtue and piety towards the goddess (εἰς τὴν θεόν)' (l. 7-8), suggesting that the deity's identity is not in question.⁵⁶ More conclusive identification is offered by the base of a statue, found in front of Nemesis' temple, dedicated by Herodes Atticus in memory of his foster-son Polydeukion around AD 174/5, one of more than twenty portraits erected after Polydeukion's untimely death.⁵⁷

⁵⁰ Reputation: Cassius Dio LX, 6, 8; cf. Pausanias IX, 27, 3 on Praxiteles' Eros at Thespiiai. Akropolis statue-bases: *IG* II² 5173-5179.

⁵¹ Work on the ascent is mentioned in two lists of Akropolis gate-keepers (*IG* II² 2292, 49-51 and 2297, 11-12); SHEAR (1981), 367 suggests associating the project with Tiberius Claudius Novius' role as *epimeletes* of an unspecified *ergon* in AD 42 (*IG* II² 3271, 4-5).

⁵² DINSMOOR (1961), p. 199-202 pl. 32d; cf. MILES (1989), p. 179-180.

⁵³ PETRAKOS (1999) I, p. 43. ELIAKIS (1980) proposes an even later date, under Julian, but his argument has not found favour.

⁵⁴ MILES (1989), p. 237.

⁵⁵ *IG* II² 1035; CULLEY (1975) and (1977). SHEAR's dating (1981), p. 365-367 is linked to reassessment of the chronology of Salamis' return to Athenian control after its purchase by Julius Nikanor of Hierapolis, who was hoplite general in AD 61/2 (*IG* II² 1723).

⁵⁶ PETRAKOS (1999), no. 162; *IG* II² 4059; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 48.

⁵⁷ PETRAKOS (1999), no. 159, and I p. 291-292 fig. 206; *IG* II² 3969; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 50.

ψηφ[ισα]μένης τῆς ἐξ Ἀ-
 [ρξίου Πάγ]ου βουλῆς καὶ
 [τῆς βουλῆς τῶ]ν πενταχ-
 καὶ τοῦ δήμου [interlinear insertion in smaller letters]
 [ο]σίων Ἡρώδης Βιβούλλι-
 [ο]ν Πολυδευκίωνα ἱππέ[α]
 [Ῥ]ωμαίων, ὁ θεόψας καὶ φι-
 [λ]ήσας ὡς υἱὸν τῇ Νεμέ-
 [σει], ᾧ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔθυσεν, [εὐμ]-
 [ε]νή καὶ ἀίμνηστον τὸν [τρό]-
 φιμον.

By the vote of the Council of the Areopagos and of the Council of Five Hundred and of the people, Herodes (set up this statue of?) Vibullius Polydeukion, *eques Romanus* – who brought him up and loved him as a son – to Nemesis, to whom he used to sacrifice with him, a gracious and ever-remembered foster-son.

It is not absolutely clear whether the sacrifices referred to are private ones, made by Herodes and his favourite alone, or community ones in which they participated, but the inscription does suggest that Nemesis was the most obvious recipient for sacrifices in the mid-second century. Lack of reference to Livia here is particularly pointed given Herodes' role as high priest of the imperial cult, and his dedication at Rhamnous of busts of Marcus Aurelius and his co-emperor Lucius Verus, following the example of his father Atticus, who had dedicated a statue of Hadrian at the sanctuary.⁵⁸

In addition, we have the testimony of Pausanias (1.33), who visited Rhamnous in the 150s AD, for Nemesis' continued domination of the sanctuary. Pausanias' description is entirely focused on the fifth-century cult statue, which was presumably still in place in the temple and in good condition:⁵⁹

A little way up from the sea is a sanctuary of Nemesis, the most implacable of the gods towards hybriatic people (ἡ θεῶν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις ὕβρισταῖς ἐστὶν ἀπαράττητος). It seems that the wrath of this goddess fell upon the barbarians' Marathon landing; thinking contemptuously (καταφρονήσαντες) that nothing could stop them from taking Athens, they brought a block of Parian marble for the making of a trophy for their achievements. Pheidias made this block into a statue of Nemesis...

The attribution to Pheidias, rather than his pupil Agorakritos, is an error; the story about the block of marble seems too neat to be true, but was well

⁵⁸ PETRAKOS (1999) I, p. 291 fig. 203-5 and II no. 158 (dedication to Hadrian). See TOBIN (1997) on Herodes' role as priest (29-32) and dedications at Rhamnous (p. 138 and 278-280); on Herodes' association with Nemesis, see STAFFORD (forthcoming b).

⁵⁹ Pausanias I, 33, 2-3; on the date of Pausanias' visit, see HABICHT (1985), p. 8-11. The statue is reconstructed in DESPINIS (1971); see also MILES (1989), p. 221-35; *LJMC s.v.* "Nemesis" p. 734; EHRHARDT (1997); KNITTMAYER (1999); SMITH (2011), p. 43-44 no. S2 fig. 4.1.

established by Pausanias' time, having appeared in various epigrams of the first century BC and later.⁶⁰ In addition to describing the statue itself, Pausanias lists the figures depicted on the statue's base as including 'Helen being led by Leda towards Nemesis', Tyndareos, the Dioskouroi, Agamemnon, Menelaos, and Pyrrhos son of Achilles, as well as some obscure local Attic heroes.⁶¹ Various suggestions have been made as to how these characters should be identified with the extant remains, and the mythological occasion being depicted, but the focal point of the scene is a reconciliation of the local story of Helen's birth and her more widely known Trojan War context. The inclusion of Pyrrhos especially emphasises the theme of Greek retribution against the eastern enemies with which Pausanias' account of the sanctuary begins. Interest in this theme was certainly current around the time of Pausanias' visit to Rhamnous, since it is alluded to in the speech which Aelius Aristides delivered at the Panathenaia of AD 155: the Persians who landed at Marathon were 'rightly drawn by the nature of the place to pay the penalty for what they had plotted against the Greeks' (*Panathenaikos*, 13). Less easy to demonstrate is the theme's currency at the time of our dedication. Kajava adduces a fragmentary inscription from Rhamnous which mentions the Persian general Datis and 'boastful Achaemenids' (*Ἀχαίμενιδᾶν μεγαλόχων*).⁶² The text certainly does appear to be a hymn celebrating Nemesis' role as avenger of Persian *hybris*, but the inscription is no more precisely dated than 'first or second century AD' in the most detailed recent discussion.⁶³ What is clear, however, is that Agorakritos' statue and its Trojan-War themed base remained *in situ* throughout the first and second centuries, so that a reading such as Pausanias' was at least available during Livia's tenancy of the temple.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ E.g. Parmenion, *AP* XVI, 263; *AP* XVI, 221-222. EHRHARDT (1997), p. 36-37 argues in favour of the story's historicity.

⁶¹ Pausanias I, 33, 8. Specifically on the base, see PALAGIA (2000); SHAPIRO LAPATIN (1992); PETRAKOS (1981b) and (1986); cf. STAFFORD (2000), p. 86-87.

⁶² KAJAVA (2000), p. 54-55: lines 9 and 11 of *SEG* 19, 222 + *SEG* 36, 271; Athens EM 4212; POUILLOUX (1954), no. 52.

⁶³ PETRAKOS (1999) II, p. 130-132 no. 165. RAUBITSCHKE's (1957) hypothesis that the original text of this hymn should be associated with the 'song of Datis' mentioned in Aristophanes' *Peace* (l. 289-295) has proved popular, but goes beyond the evidence. On Nemesis as 'Retribution', see STAFFORD (2000), p. 87-88 and (2005).

⁶⁴ Evidence for Nemesis' continued worship in Attica can also be found in Athens. Two seats in the Theatre of Dionysos are reserved for the goddess' priestly personnel: *IG* II² 5070 (τερέως Οὐρανίας Νεμέσεως) and *IG* II² 5143 ([...] ἐν Ῥαμνοῦντι); see PETRAKOS (1999) I, p. 43, KAJAVA (2000), p. 4 and CONNELLY (2007), p. 205-213. Small altars dedicated to Nemesis have been found in the theatre (*IG* II² 4747), the Kerameikos (*IG* II² 4865) and the Agora (Agora I 4790 + *IG* II² 4817a; RAUBITSCHKE (1943), p. 87-88 no. 26).

3. The imperial cult context

3.1. The imperial cult in Attica

Our dedication also needs to be considered against the background of the early development of the imperial cult at Athens.⁶⁵ The cult is attested soon after Octavian's assumption of the title 'Augustus' (27 BC) with the erection in 19 BC of the round temple of Augustus and Roma on the Athenian Akropolis, just to the east of the Parthenon,⁶⁶ and as many as thirteen small altars of Augustus in the lower city.⁶⁷ At Eleusis, even before 27 BC a massive monument honoured 'Livia Drusilla wife of Caesar Imperator' alongside her husband 'son of the divine Julius',⁶⁸ and under Tiberius, full-blown imperial cult is attested by inscriptions which refer to the post of 'priest for life' for the emperor himself and for Julia Augusta.⁶⁹ Tiberius was honoured in Athens itself with statues on the Akropolis both before and after his accession to power, on one of which he is explicitly designated *theos*.⁷⁰ The epithet is also applied in the rededication to Tiberius of a conspicuous hellenistic monument in the Agora, and an honorific statue records the role of Polycharmos of Marathon as 'high-priest of Tiberius Caesar Augustus'.⁷¹ Under Claudius, in addition to the honorific statues noted above (3.2), thoroughgoing integration of imperial cult into Athens' existing religious system is apparent when Tiberius Claudius Novius is first *agonothetes* of 'the Great Panathenaia Sebasta', a formula suggesting that games in the emperor's honour were added to Athena's major festival.⁷² The same inscription attests Novius' role as high-priest of Antonia Augusta, Claudius' deified mother, and Novius was also first *agonothetes* of the independent Sebastian games in AD 41 and high-priest of 'the house of the Sebastoi' in AD 61/2;⁷³ a collective cult of the Theoi Sebastoi had probably been instituted in the mid 50s, possibly housed in the 'Arcuated

⁶⁵ On which see KANTIRÉA (2011), p. 528-531 and (2007); SPAWFORTH (1997); HOFF (1994), p. 110-114; SHEAR (1981), p. 363-365; GEAGAN (1979), p. 382-383 and 386-387; GRAINDOR (1927), p. 149-158.

⁶⁶ *IG* II² 3137; HURWIT (1999), p. 279-280 fig. 227 pl. 10; ALCOCK (1993), p. 184 fig. 62; TRAVLOS (1971), p. 494 fig. 623-625.

⁶⁷ See BENJAMIN, RAUBITSCHKE (1959).

⁶⁸ *SEG* 24, 212; VANDERPOOL (1968), p. 7-9 no. 3 fig. 1; KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 42.

⁶⁹ *IG* II² 3261 (Tiberius) and *SEG* 47, 220 (Livia); CLINTON (1997), p. 163-165 and 167-168.

⁷⁰ Tiberius statue-bases: *IG* II² 3243-3247 (pre-AD 14); *IG* II² 3228, 3261-3263, 3265 (AD 14-37); *IG* II² 3264 (*theos*).

⁷¹ Rededication: *IG* II² 4209; VANDERPOOL (1959). High priest: *IG* II² 3530; SPAWFORTH (1997), p. 186.

⁷² Honorific statue base: *IG* II² 3535 (late 40s or 50s AD); CAMIA (2011), p. 106-111; on Novius' career, see KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 175-178; LOZANO (2007); GEAGAN (1979).

⁷³ Sebastian games: *IG* II² 3270. High priest of the Theoi Sebastoi: *IG* II² 1990, 5.

Building' in the Roman Agora.⁷⁴ Spawforth notes the relatively late institution of the Sebastian games as evidence of Athens' slowness to embrace imperial cult as compared to other mainland Greek cities. Corinth, for example, had Caesarean games already under Augustus and Tiberius, while Gytheion had a week-long festival for Augustus, Livia and Tiberius from c. AD 15.⁷⁵ Nonetheless, by the time of the Rhamnous inscription, it seems clear that the divinity of both the living emperor and his dead forebears was well established in Attica.

Livia's worship at Athens demonstrates a phenomenon which is a particular feature of Julio-Claudian cult: identification of the emperor or family member with a traditional deity.⁷⁶ Across the empire there is evidence for Livia's identification with a variety of goddesses, the most widespread being with Juno/Hera and Ceres/Demeter; other divine alter egos include Hekate, Cybele, Venus/Aphrodite, and the personifications Fortuna/Tyche, Mnemosyne, Iustitia, Pietas and Pudicitia.⁷⁷ An early literary example is provided by Ovid, in the revised version of *Fasti* I written soon after Augustus' death: Livia's deification is prophesied (l. 536) and her designation as 'the woman who alone was found worthy of the marriage-bed of great Jupiter' (l. 650) identifies her with Juno.⁷⁸ Mikocki catalogues iconographic identifications with as many as thirteen goddesses, while Hahn catalogues ten such combinations in epigraphic and numismatic evidence from the eastern provinces alone.⁷⁹ At Athens, a single seat in the Theatre of Dionysos was reserved for a 'priestess of Hestia on the Akropolis and of Livia and Julia', a formulation suggesting at least a shared precinct; the association with Julia indicates a date before AD 2.⁸⁰ Also probably within Livia's lifetime, after AD 14, a decree from the Agora records honours for 'Julia Augusta Artemis Boulaia, mother of Tiberius Caesar Augustus'.⁸¹ A

⁷⁴ Arcuated Building: *IG* II² 3183; CAMIA (2011), p. 195-216 fig. 14-15; HOFF (1994); TRAVLOS (1971), p. 37.

⁷⁵ SPAWFORTH (1997), p. 190-191. Imperial games at Corinth: SPAWFORTH (1994a); GEAGAN (1968); WEST (1931), p. 64-65. Gytheion: *SEG* 11, 923; LOZANO (2010), p. 198-199; KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 65-69; BARRETT (2002), p. 211-212; ROSTOVITZ (1930).

⁷⁶ GEAGAN (1984), p. 76-77; cf. FRIESEN (2001), p. 123.

⁷⁷ BARRETT (2002), p. 209-210; for discussion of Livia's public image, see also BARTMAN (1990), WOOD (1999), p. 75-141 fig. 21-52, and ALEXANDRIDIS (2004), nos. 9-51.

⁷⁸ See GREEN (2004), p. 236-237 and 298-299; also BARRETT (2002), p. 192-195.

⁷⁹ MIKOCKI (1995), p. 18-30, nos. 1-132; HAHN (1994), p. 322-334; followed by ALEXANDRIDIS (2004), p. 290-293.

⁸⁰ *IG* II² 5096; CONNELLY (2007), p. 207 fig. 7.6; KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 127-129; MIKOCKI (1995), p. 30 (cf. nos. 131-132); GREY (1946), p. 230-231 and n. 43; GRAINDOR (1927), p. 153-5. There is also a seat simply 'of Livia' (*IG* II² 5161), indicating further cult personnel.

⁸¹ Agora I 4012; *SEG* 22, 152; CAMIA (2011), p. 198-200; KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 113-114; MIKOCKI (1995), no. 46; HAHN (1994), no. 56 (cf. no. 90); OLIVER (1965). The dedication's find-spot near the Agora's Southwest Temple has led some to surmise that this building housed a cult of Livia Artemis Boulaia: THOMPSON, WYCHERLEY (1972), p. 165-166; WYCHERLEY (1957), p. 55-57 (nos. 118-120) and 136 (no. 427); THOMPSON (1952), p. 90-91.

date of AD 22/3 is suggested by the editors for a simple dedication 'to Augusta Hygieia' on a marble base found in the Propylaia, on the hypothesis that it celebrates Livia's recovery from a mortal illness at this time.⁸² While Livia is not actually named here, the dedication is paralleled by one to 'Julia Augusta Hygieia' on Thasos, and back at Rome the first recognisable portrait-head of Livia appears on coins of that year with the legend *Salus Augusta*.⁸³ It cannot be coincidental that the Athenian dedication was found near a statue and altar to Athena Hygieia of the 430s BC, which stood in front of the Propylaia's southeast column.⁸⁴ Livia's divinity is made explicit on a base found near the Roman Agora's gate of Athena Archegetis, which records an honour granted to 'Julia *thea* Augusta Pronoia' by the usual public authorities, but paid for by one Dionysios son of Aulos of Marathon, when he was serving as *agoranomos* with Quintus Naevius Rufus of Melite.⁸⁵ This has been assumed by some to post-date Livia's death in 29 and/or her deification in 42, but the *thea* is not conclusive, as we have seen.⁸⁶ The epithet Pronoia, 'Forethought', is usually applied to Athena, and the location would support the supposition that Livia is here being identified with an aspect of Athena.

3.2. The imperial cult and sacred space

In his seminal study of its operation in Asia Minor, Price considers the significance of architecture as 'an articulation of the ideology of the imperial cult'.⁸⁷ The emperor and his family might be introduced to the physical space of a city in various ways: an entirely new temple might be built, or imperial personnel might be introduced to the sanctuary of a traditional deity by the addition of a new building or partitioning-off of space within an existing building, and their presence might be manifested in the form of statues and/or altars. The sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos, for example, housed a cult of Augustus and the Theoi Sebastoi in a building separate from the main goddess' temple,⁸⁸ while the sanctuary of Asklepios at Pergamon housed a statue of Hadrian in a room to one

⁸² *IG* II² 3240; HAHN (1994), no. 81; Tacitus, *Annals* III, 71; CAMIA (2011), p. 206-207; GRAINDOR (1927), p. 156-157.

⁸³ Thasian dedication: *IG* XII 8, 65; HAHN (1994), no. 80. Tiberian *dupondius*: ALEXANDRIDIS (2004), pl. 61.1; WOOD (1999), p. 82 and 109-110 fig. 34; KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 103; MIKOCKI (1995), p. 28 no. 119; BARTMAN (1990), p. 6 fig. 6.

⁸⁴ RAUBITSCHKE (1949), p. 185-188 and 523, no. 166; STAFFORD (2000), p. 151-152; TRAVLOS (1971), p. 124 fig. 170.

⁸⁵ *IG* II² 3238; KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 102; HAHN (1994), no. 5; SHEAR (1981), p. 360; GRAINDOR (1927), p. 155-156.

⁸⁶ Post AD 29: e.g. editors of *IG* II², MIKOCKI (1995), no. 104. Probably pre AD 29: e.g. CROSBY (1937), p. 464 no. 12.

⁸⁷ PRICE (1984), p. 133-164 (quotation: p. 133).

⁸⁸ PRICE (1984), p. 147 no. 28; FRIESEN (2001), p. 43-52 fig. 3.1-8.

side of its colonnaded court.⁸⁹ The idea of partitioning within an established temple can be seen in the temple of Artemis at Sardis, where the *cella* was divided into two equal-sized sections; the date of the partition is uncertain, but Price's hypothesis is plausible, that the arrangement was made so that Artemis' space might remain distinct when imperial cult was introduced in the second century AD, with colossal statues of Antoninus Pius and Faustina.⁹⁰

Price suggests that a division of space is also in question in the case of Athena's temple at Priene: here two inscriptions on the architrave are dedications by the *demos* 'to Athena Polias and the divine Emperor Caesar Augustus, son of god' (ὁ δῆμος Ἀθηνᾶι Πολιάδι καὶ/[Αὐ]τοκράτορι Καίσαρι Θεοῦ υἱῷ Θεῶι Σεβαστῶι).⁹¹ As at Rhamnous, the object of these dedications might appear to be the temple itself, but Price takes their object as the particular architectural element on which they appear, on the basis of a further inscription, written on the upper step of three leading into the *cella*, which records the dedication specifically of 'the step' to Athena Polias and Augustus by one Marcus Antonius Rusticus (Μάρκος Ἀντώνιος] Μάρκο[υ υἱὸς Ῥούστικος τὸν τριβασμον Ἀθηνᾶι]/ [Πολιάδι καὶ αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Θεοῦ υἱῷ Θεῶι Σεβαστῶι].⁹² Only a few letters of this dedication were legible to the editors of *IPriene*, so the reading is based on a note in The Society of Dilettanti's *Antiquities of Ionia* IV (1881) which gives an English paraphrase rather than the actual text, though it does comment on the crucial word τριβασμός.⁹³ Even if the reading is reliable, however, since this dedication is offered by a private individual rather than the *demos*, it is hardly safe to treat the three dedications together, and unnecessary to limit the reference of the first two to the architrave, which is not a clearly discrete part of the building. It is important to note, though, with Price, that all three of the inscriptions name Augustus *alongside* Athena Polias, maintaining a distinction between the two, and that imperial statues within the temple, including two of Claudius, do not seem to have displaced the old cult statue of Athena.⁹⁴

One further possible example of partition is the temple of Apollo at Klaros, which Price notes, citing Robert, but a full text of the inscription was only published in 2000.⁹⁵ This is a dedication running over three fragments of the temple's epistyle, in letters 14.5 cm high:

⁸⁹ PRICE (1984), p. 148 fig. 6 pl. 4a no. 21; KANTIRÉA (2011), p. 523-528.

⁹⁰ PRICE (1984), p. 151-152 fig. 7 no. 57.

⁹¹ MCCABE et al. (1987), nos. 149-150 (*IPriene* 157-158).

⁹² MCCABE et al. (1987), no. 151 (*IPriene* 159); PRICE (1984), p. 150 no. 43.

⁹³ *Antiquities of Ionia* IV (1881), note by Charles Newton between p. 30 and 31 (the engraving pl. 15 depicts the steps in good condition).

⁹⁴ Statues: CARTER (1983), p. 254-257 and 266-267 nos. 90-91.

⁹⁵ PRICE (1984), p. 150 cat. no. 26, citing ROBERT (1954), p. 20; FERRARY (2000), p. 368-370 fig. 15-16.

Τιβερτίου Καίσαρος,
Σεβαστοῦ υἱοῦ, Θεοῦ
υἱωνοῦ, Σεβασ[τ]οῦ

Of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of Augustus, grandson of the God.

Ferrary comments that the use of the genitive is the inscription's 'major interest', and follows Robert in suggesting that it implies 'Tiberius' divine ownership of the temple; it is certainly not a common formula for a dedication, though Kajava notes occasional usage of the genitive on altars to emperors.⁹⁶ Both Ferrary and Price are attracted by Robert's supposition of the existence of a separate cult place for Tiberius in the north part of the *pronaos*, but there appears to be no certain archaeological evidence to support this. Nonetheless, Klaros is of particular interest as an example relatively close in time to our Livia dedication, and for the positioning of the inscription on the temple's epistyle.

In at least some of these cases, as Price argues, the physical arrangements seem to reflect a conceptual separation and/or subordination of the imperial personnel to the established, traditional deity.⁹⁷ Similar arguments might be applied to several instances of imperial encroachment on traditional deities' sacred space in Athens.⁹⁸ In the Agora, the twin-room structure added in the early imperial period to the rear of the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios has been variously identified as a second site of the cult of Augustus and Roma observed on the Akropolis,⁹⁹ or as the main Athenian location for the cult of Tiberius and Livia.¹⁰⁰ It could even have encompassed both cults, on the model of the temple in Lepcis Magna's forum, which from c. AD 23 had a divided *cella* housing colossal statues of two pairs of deities (Augustus and Roma, Tiberius and Livia), as well as smaller ones of other members of the imperial family.¹⁰¹ In either case, the imperial personnel enjoy the association with Zeus Eleutherios, but are kept semi-detached from the old god's space in a clearly-demarcated area of their own. Augustus may also have been worshipped in the classical temple of Ares transplanted to the Agora from Acharnai around 15 BC: a dedication 'to Ares and Augustus' (l. 5) has been associated with the temple, and both Gaius Caesar, who visited Athens in AD 2, and later (AD 20-23) Drusus Caesar are honoured with statues whose bases proclaim them 'the

⁹⁶ KAJAVA (2011), p. 571-576 (type C1).

⁹⁷ More recent work on the imperial cult in the east tends rather to emphasise *lack* of a strict differentiation between deified emperor and traditional god, but does not deal directly with the examples considered here: see e.g. WITULSKI (2007), p. 32-36; FRIESEN (1993), p. 73-75 and 146-152.

⁹⁸ On use of sacred space in second-century Athens, see CAMIA (2011), p. 193-208.

⁹⁹ CAMIA (2011), p. 48-54 fig. 6-8; PRICE (1984), p. 141-142 fig. 4; THOMPSON, WYCHERLEY (1972), p. 102-103; TRAVLOS (1971), p. 527 fig. 665-672; THOMPSON (1966).

¹⁰⁰ CLINTON (1997), p. 168; see also WALKER (1997).

¹⁰¹ BARRETT (2002), p. 208; WOOD (1999), p. 110-112 fig. 35; BARTMAN (1990), p. 129 fig. 102 (Livia statue); SMADJA (1978), p. 178-181.

new Ares'.¹⁰² Here the very transfer of the building is an honour to the emperor, likely to be associated with Augustus' dedication back in his new forum in Rome of the temple of Mars Ultor, but there is no indication that the Attic Ares was displaced as the temple's main dedicatee. A priest of 'Ares Enyalios' is attested in an Akropolis inscription of AD 116/7, and Pausanias (I, 8, 5) not only refers to 'the sanctuary of Ares' but also mentions a statue (*agalma*) of Ares by Alkamenes.¹⁰³ More direct identification between emperor and traditional god can be seen in the designation of 'Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Imperator Apollo Patroos' on the base of a statue erected by Dionysodoros of Sounion, priest 'for life' of Claudius/Apollo and the imperial family.¹⁰⁴ The base is usually associated with the Agora's late classical temple of Apollo Patroos, but once again there is evidence for the cult of the deity continuing, in the form of later epigraphic references to an Athenian 'priest of Apollo Patroos', with no mention of imperial cult.¹⁰⁵

For the appropriation of a whole temple, there are three possible parallels within the province of Achaia. First, an inscription appears on an architrave block of the small fourth-century BC Metröon at Olympia; the original editors proposed the following reading:¹⁰⁶

Ἡλῆροι Θ[εοῦ] υἱοῦ Καί[σαρος]
 Σεβαστοῦ Σωτ[η]ρος τῶν Ἑλ-
 λήν[ω]ν [τ]ε καὶ [τῆς οἰκου-
 μέ]ν[ης] πᾶ[σ]η[ς] ...

The Eleans [*phrase taking a genitive?*] Caesar Augustus, son of God, Saviour of the Greeks and of the whole world.

The genitive case here parallels the Klaros inscription (above), but the presence of a subject (the Eleans) suggests that a phrase like 'dedicate the temple of' should be understood: the general sense must be that the building now honours Augustus. Visiting Olympia in the 170s AD, Pausanias (V, 20, 9) comments on the fact that the temple no longer contained a cult image (*agalma*)

¹⁰² *IG* II² 2953 (Augustus: cf. above n.13), 3250 (Gaius) and 3257 (Drusus); KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 65; SHEAR (1981), p. 362-33. On the temple, see KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 110-113; THOMSON, WYCHERLEY (1972), p. 162-165; TRAVLOS (1971), p. 104, fig. 138-145; DINSMOOR (1940), especially p. 49-52. ALCOCK (1993), p. 191-196 discusses the 'itinerant temples' of Attica as an extreme example of the urban centralisation of cult under Roman rule.

¹⁰³ Priest: *IG* II² 1072; CAMIA (2011), p. 197-8.

¹⁰⁴ *IG* II² 3274; SHEAR (1981), p. 363; GRAINDOR (1927), p. 114.

¹⁰⁵ Priest: e.g. *IG* II² 5061 (Hadrianic); Agora 15.411 (AD 186/7); *IG* II² 3697-3698 (before mid third century AD). On the temple, see TRAVLOS (1971), p. 96 fig. 123-129; WYCHERLEY (1957), p. 50-53.

¹⁰⁶ DITTENBERGER, PURGOLD (1896), p. 478-479 no. 366; see most recently CAMIA (2011), p. 218-218 fig. 26-28, LOZANO (2010), p. 195-196 fig. 17-18, and KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 51 and 147-153.

of the Mother of the Gods, but instead had statues (*andriantes*) of 'Roman rulers'.¹⁰⁷ In fact, reconstructions based on the archaeological evidence place a statue of Augustus in the position normally reserved for a cult statue at one end of the *cella*, with statues of Claudius, Vespasian, Titus, Agrippina and two other imperial women arranged along the two sides. Stone argues that the statues were installed as a group, most likely in the early 70s AD, at the beginning of Vespasian's reign, and that the original statue of the Mother of the Gods might have been removed during Nero's plunderings of AD 68.¹⁰⁸ The inscription, however, may be earlier, which raises the possibility of a direct correspondence with the Rhamnous case, i.e. that the temple was in some sense rededicated to Augustus while still housing its original cult statue. In the absence of a firm date for either the inscription or the removal of the original statue, this remains speculative, but it is significant that Pausanias (V, 20, 9) explicitly says of the temple that 'they still call it "Metroon" to me, preserving its ancient name'. This suggests the persistence of the temple's traditional identity in the face of the original dedicatee's literal replacement – even crowding out – by images of the imperial family.

Second, in the centre of Athens itself, it is initially tempting to see a parallel to our case in the ostentatious inscription blazed across the east epistyle of the Parthenon, in bronze letters 14 cm high, in honour of Nero in AD 61/2:¹⁰⁹

ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴ καὶ ἡ βουλὴ τῶν Χ καὶ
ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων Ἀυτοκράτορα μέγιστον Νέρωνα
Καίσαρα Κλαύδιον Σεβαστόν Γερμανικὸν θεοῦ
υἱόν, στρατηγούντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλίτας τὸ ὄγδοον
τοῦ καὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ καὶ νομοθέτου Τι Κλαυ-
δίου Νουίου τοῦ Φιλίνου, ἐπὶ ἱερείας Παυλλείνης τῆς Καπίτωνος θυγατρὸς.

The Council of the Areopagos and the Council of the Six Hundred and the people of Athens [*verb understood*] the Emperor Supreme Nero Caesar Claudius Augustus Germanicus, son of god, when Tiberius Claudius Novius son of Philinos was hoplite general for the eighth time and *epimeletes* and *nomothetes*, in the priestesshood of Paullina daughter of Kapiton.

Despite its position, however, the inscription appears in fact not to be making a dedication of the temple, because Nero's name and titles are in the accusative. Carroll concludes an in-depth discussion of the inscription with the

¹⁰⁷ The distinction between *agalma* and *andriantes* may reflect a perceived difference between sacred and secular statues, although the terminology is not consistently applied: PRICE (1984), p. 176-179.

¹⁰⁸ STONE (1985); see also ALCOCK (1993), p. 190 fig. 69, and PRICE (1984), p. 160-161 and 164 fig. 9; THOMPSON (1966), p. 186 n. 44.

¹⁰⁹ IG II² 3277; see CARROLL (1982). BRONEER (1932), p. 39 offers this as a parallel to the Livia inscription, but notes that it is 'hardly more than an honorary decree'; PRICE (1984), p. 149 notes it as an instance of 'secular honours' accorded 'in a segment of sacred space'.

suggestion that the verb we should understand is ἐστεφάνωσε ‘crowned’, making this an abbreviated form of the type of honorary decree which confers a crown on the emperor. It could equally be ‘set up’, referring to a statue of Nero erected by the Athenians, making this equivalent to the abbreviated formula commonly inscribed on statue bases, although there is no evidence for such a statue in this area.¹¹⁰ The date of this honour, during the course of an aggressive Roman campaign against Parthia has led various scholars to follow Carroll in arguing that the location of the inscription deliberately drew the analogy between Nero’s war and the old Greek triumph over Persia, as celebrated in the Parthenon’s sculptural themes, an analogy to which we will return.¹¹¹

Third, more thoroughgoing appropriation of one of Athena’s temples can be seen more than a century later. A fragmentary decree of AD 195-8 grants honours to Septimius Severus’ empress Julia Domna which – if Oliver’s restoration is correct – include sacrifices to ‘the saviour of Athens Julia Sebastia Athena Polias’ (l. 15-16: καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ εἰσιτήρια τῇ [σωτείρᾳ τῶν / Ἀθηνῶν Ἰουλίᾳ Σεβαστῇ] Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάδιδι), and the sanctification of a particular day in Thargelion on which ‘the Athenians dedicated the ancient temple to her as Polias’ (l. 21-22: ἐν ἣ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν ἀρχαῖον ναὸν αὐτῇ [ὡς Πολιάδιδι] ἀνήκαν αἱ Ἀθηναῖοι).¹¹² The ‘ancient temple’ of Athena Polias must be the Erechtheion, and it is likely that a cult statue of the new goddess is the object of an injunction that the archon should do something ‘so that she might be enthroned with’ (the goddess?) (l. 18-20: τὸν δὲ ἄρχοντα τη [_ _ _ _ _] λωι ἵνα σύνθρονος [_ _]). At the same time, the Parthenon is explicitly mentioned as the location within which a golden statue of the empress is to be set up (l. 27-28: ἀναστῆσαι [δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ] ἄγαλμα χρυσοῦν ἐν τῷ | Παρθενῶν[τῇ]), in addition to the Erechtheion statue. The term *synthronos* is usefully paralleled in an earlier inscription from Pergamon, where Caligula’s sister Julia Livilla seems briefly to have a shared cult with the city’s Athena, before her exile in AD 39: a public honour is recorded for a priestess ‘of Athena Nikephoros and Polias and Julia enthroned with her, a new Nikephoros, daughter of Germanicus Caesar’ (l. 4-5: τῆς Νικηφόρου καὶ Πολιάδος [Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ] | Ἰουλίας συνθρόνου, νέας Νικηφόρου, Γερμα] | νικοῦ Καίσαρος θυγατρὸς).¹¹³ A little later, under Claudius, Livia herself is granted a statue in the temple of Athena Polias at Kyzikos, as ‘Augusta

¹¹⁰ On the ‘honorific accusative’, see KAJAVA (2011), p. 536-571 (type A).

¹¹¹ See e.g. KANTIRÉA (2007), p. 123-125; HURWIT (1999), p. 280-281 fig. 228; and SPAWFORTH (1994b), p. 234-237.

¹¹² IG II² 1076; STROUD (1971), p. 200-204; PRICE (1984), p. 217. The text is very fragmentary: I adopt the version offered by OLIVER (1940); the translation in BEARD, NORTH, PRICE (1998) (no. 10.5c, vol. 1, p. 355; vol. 2, p. 257-258) omits l. 18-20 altogether. NOCK (1930), p. 34-35 notes as ‘perhaps unique’ the explicit prescription of the shared sacrifice here, and sees this as a rare example of true temple-sharing. See most recently CAMIA (2011), p. 87-88 and HURWIT (1999), p. 279.

¹¹³ FRÄNKEL (1890-1895), no. 497; NOCK (1930), p. 24.

Nikephoros', and worshipped alongside Athena at the city's Panathenaia.¹¹⁴ In all three of these cases the title suggests a complete merging of identities of empress and goddess, but the retention of some degree of differentiation is indicated by the existence of separate statues and/or the articulation of the relationship as *synthronos*.

Altogether, then, the comparative material shows that our dedication to Livia is not an entirely isolated occurrence, but no one case is exactly comparable to the situation at Rhamnous. In some locations, traditional deity and imperial personnel are clearly separated spatially. In others, close identification seems unlikely because of the gender difference involved, as with Augustus and Athena Polias at Priene, Augustus and the Mother of the Gods at Olympia, or Nero and the Parthenon's Athena. Close identification is easier to imagine in the case of Tiberius and Apollo at Klaros; likewise in the Athenian Agora, Augustus might have become syncretised with Ares or Claudius with Apollo, but here the evidence for the relationship comes in the form of honorific titles on statue bases, and may be limited to the statues rather than extending to encompass the actual temples. The closest parallel is the rededication of the Erechtheion to Julia Domna, but here the object of the dedication is made explicit and the empress' relationship with Athena Polias is explicitly articulated.

4. The conceptual context: Rhamnousian Nemesis and Rome

The final strand of contextual information for our dedication concerns the reception of Nemesis at Rome, and particular interest in her Attic sanctuary in the first centuries BC and AD. Athens was a popular destination for upper-class Romans at this period, attending the philosophical schools and taking the 'Grand Tour', which for some might have included seeing the sights of the Attic countryside.¹¹⁵ We know of at least one eminent Roman visitor to Rhamnous from Pliny's anecdote about Nemesis' cult statue (*Natural History* XXXVI, 4, 17):

Pheidias' two pupils competed against each other in making a Venus, and Alkamenes won, not because of his work but by the votes of the citizens who favoured one of their own against a foreigner. So, at this decree, Agorakritos is said to have sold his statue so that it might not remain in Athens, and called it Nemesis. It was set up at Rhamnous, a village in Attica, and Marcus Varro preferred it to all other statues.

¹¹⁴ *IMT* 1431, decree of the *boule* and the *demos*.

¹¹⁵ SHEAR (1981), p. 357-358.

However unlikely the story of the competition may be, the final comment that ‘Marcus Varro preferred it to all other statues’ is reasonable evidence that Varro himself saw Agorakritos’ Nemesis, perhaps in the course of collecting

Fig. 3. Early imperial-period copy of Agorakritos’ cult statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous (original 430–20 BC), from Italy (Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, Copenhagen 2086). Photo: courtesy of the museum.

material for his *Antiquities*, published in 47 BC. The statue also indirectly attests Roman interest in the sanctuary, since at least eleven imperial-period copies survive. We know that the original was never moved from Rhamnous, because its fragments were found more or less *in situ*, so one or more copyists must have visited it. The earliest extant copy (Fig. 3) dates from the first half of the first century AD and is from Italy; most of the later copies are from Greece, including three from Athens.¹¹⁶ Ridgway links the initial copying process with the possible restoration of the sanctuary under Claudius and our dedication, even suggesting that a copy may have been combined with a portrait head of Livia, though sadly no such hybrid survives.¹¹⁷ These copies are the only direct iconographical link to Rhamnous, since the great

¹¹⁶ Athens copies: Athens NM 3949; Agora S 1055 (head only); Akropolis (fragments) 2952/8261/7312/1037 + London 34.2.14 (301). Other copies were found at Corinth, Patras, Messene, Crete and Albania. See LIMC s.v. “Nemesis” no. 2 (a–o) and SMITH (2011), no. S2 (a–m).

¹¹⁷ RIDGWAY (1984), p. 74; see pl. 92 for Copenhagen 2086. KAJAVA (2000), p. 53–54, over-interprets Ridgway when he asserts that a whole series of small-scale versions with Livia’s head was made. The only extant copy with a portrait head is Istanbul Archaeological Museum 28 (late Antonine, LIMC s.v. “Nemesis” no. 2f; SMITH (2011), no. S2e); EDWARDS (1990), p. 537 cites Messene Archaeological Museum 240 (LIMC s.v. “Nemesis” no. 2n*; SMITH 2011 no. S2g) as representing the priestess of Messene’s Artemis Orthia sanctuary, but the identification is debatable.

majority of Roman images of Nemesis follow the type of the two Nemeseis of Smyrna, with their distinctive attributes of the bridle and the cubit-rule.¹¹⁸

The association with Rhamnous is, however, strong in Nemesis' earliest appearances in Latin literature. Catullus coins the appellation *Rhamnusia virgo*, probably in imitation of Callimachus, who may well have used *πάροθενε*... 'Ραμνουσία in the fragmentary Lock of Berenice (fr. 110, 71) and certainly refers to 'Rhamnousian Helen' ('Ελένη 'Ραμνουσίδῃ) in the Hymn to Artemis (l. 232).¹¹⁹ Relying on his readers' knowledge of the *Kypria* story of Nemesis' bearing of Helen (above), as Skinner argues, Catullus uses the phrase to make concise reference to the Trojan War story's overarching theme of divine retribution and in particular the dire consequences of illicit love, motifs relevant both to the immediate mythological context of the passages in question and to the poet's personal situation.¹²⁰ In 68, for example, the invocation of Nemesis is an authorial aside in the story of Laodamia, whose impetuous pre-marital consummation of her love for Protesilaus is portrayed as the offence against the gods which leads to the hero's death at the very start of the Trojan War (l. 77-78):

May I want nothing so much, Rhamnousian maid (*Rhamnusia virgo*),
that I attempt it rashly against the will of the gods!

The prayer highlights parallels between the Laodamia story and Paris' adulterous liaison with Helen, which would lead to so many Greek and Trojan deaths, and at the same time foreshadows Catullus' later admission (l. 143-146) of the adulterous nature of his own relationship with Lesbia, which is implicitly linked with the death of his brother as lamented in a further aside (l. 91-100).

The only place where Catullus refers to Nemesis directly is in a playful, amatory context (50, 18-21):

Now beware of being proud, and heed my prayers; be careful to spit on the ground (*cave despuas*), my love, lest Nemesis exact punishment from you. She is a powerful goddess; take care not to offend her.

The idea of Nemesis punishing haughty lovers is again derived from hellenistic poetry, and it is this side of the goddess which probably accounts for the name of Tibullus' mistress in the second book of his elegies.¹²¹ Two of

¹¹⁸ On the Smyrna Nemeseis and their progeny, see *LIMC s.v.* "Nemesis" nos. 3-72; STAFFORD (2000), p. 97-103 and (2005), p. 202-208; HORNUM (1993), p. 321-330 pls 1-28. It is the Smyrna type which is in question in the one case where an iconographic assimilation between an empress and Nemesis has been (unconvincingly) proposed, the sardonix cameo (Stuttgart Württembergische Landmuseum no. Arch. 62/3): see HORNUM (1993), p. 19 pl. 3 and MIKOCCI (1995), p. 73 no. 426.

¹¹⁹ MERKELBACH (1967), p. 218 suggests the reading (fr. 110, 75): [*πάροθενε μὴ*] *κοτέση[ις 'Ραμνουσίας]*.

¹²⁰ SKINNER (1984); she discusses the example from 68, as well as 64, 395 and 66, 71.

¹²¹ See STAFFORD (2006); also MALTBY (2004).

Nemesis' appearances in Ovid likewise have her being called upon by unrequited lovers, the offending object of love in question being the ultimate non-requirer Narcissus (*Metamorphoses* III, 403-406; cf. XIV, 693-694):

Then one of those scorned, raising his hands to heaven, said, 'So may he himself love, and not obtain what he loves!' The Rhamnousian goddess (*Rhamnusia*) heard his righteous prayers.

A third Ovidian reference characterises Nemesis more generally as *ultrix*, 'avenger', of human arrogance (*Tristia* V, 8, 7-12):

Do you not fear the power of Fortune, standing on her precarious wheel, and of the goddess who hates arrogant words? The avenging Rhamnousian (*ultrix Rhamnusia*) exacts deserved punishments: why do you trample upon my fate with set foot? I have seen drowned in the sea one who laughed at shipwreck, and I said, 'Never were the waves more just!'

For Ovid the goddess is always 'the Rhamnousian', never Nemesis, a usage which again highlights the Attic sanctuary. Elsewhere in his poems from exile, Ovid reminisces about his youthful travels with Macer, and explicitly mentions studying at Athens, so it is not impossible that he had visited Rhamnous himself.¹²² Catullus, too, travelled extensively in the east in connection with his year on the staff of the governor of Bithynia in 57/6 BC, visiting the grave of his brother at Troy, taking in 'the famous cities of Asia', and perhaps rehearsing the choir who would perform his hymn to Diana on Delos, although there is no explicit evidence for a visit to Attica.¹²³

Whether Catullus' and Ovid's usage of Nemesis was inspired by a visit to Rhamnous or by the literary tradition, Nemesis did find a more physical place in the centre of Rome some time before the publication of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* in AD 77. Pliny twice mentions a statue of Nemesis as being established on the Capitol:

Similarly behind the right ear is the seat of Nemesis, a goddess who has not found a Latin name even on the Capitol (*Latinum nomen ne in Capitolio quidem invenit*), and to this we apply the third finger after touching our mouth, laying up there forgiveness from the gods for our speech (*NH* XI, 251, 3-4).

Why do we counteract the evil eye with a special ritual, some invoking the Greek Nemesis, on account of which there is a statue of her at Rome on the Capitol, although she has no Latin name (*quamvis Latinum nomen non sit*)? (*NH* XXVIII, 22, 5-6).

¹²² Ovid, *Ex Ponto* II, 10, 21-30 and *Tristia* I, 2, 75-80; cf. *Fasti* VI, 417-424. Later occurrences of *Rhamnusia* or variants: e.g. Statius, *Silvae* II, 6, 73 and III, 5, 5; *Ciris*, 228; Ausonius, *Epigrams*, 27, 52.

¹²³ Catullus, 10, 28 and 31 (Bithynia); 34 (Delos); 46 (Asia); 101 (Troy); cf. WISEMAN (1985), p. 91-101.

This statue is not firm evidence of an official cult, but it is at least suggestive of one, since the Capitoline Hill was site of the worship of such venerable Republican virtues as Concordia, Fides, Mens, Iuventas and Ops, whose cults had been introduced in the third century BC.¹²⁴ The gesture described in the first passage is not otherwise attested in connection with Nemesis, but mention in the second passage of a 'special ritual' used against the evil eye might refer to the practice of spitting – either into a fold of clothing or onto the ground – which is attested, for example, in Theocritus *Idyll* 6, 39, where one has to 'spit three times into the *kolpos*' to ward off envy; this is explicitly linked with Nemesis in the Catullus 50 passage (above), and in an epigramme by Strato of Sardis (*AP* XII, 229).¹²⁵ In both passages Pliny remarks on Nemesis' Greekness, pointing to a lack of a close match with any existing Roman deity or even a Latin word which would encompass the same range of meanings as *nemesis*.¹²⁶

Conclusion

Considered against the background of our three types of context, the dedication to Livia at Rhamnous comes into clearer focus. Let us first return to Kajava's proposition of a conceptual motivation for the choice of Rhamnous, before venturing further conclusions on the workings of the decision-making process, envisaging how the rededication may actually have worked, and offering a final suggestion on the Roman cult of Nemesis.

As Kajava argues, Nemesis' role as avenger offers one level of explanation for the decision to dedicate her temple to Livia.¹²⁷ While there is no other direct evidence for an association between Livia and Nemesis, the *ultrix Rhamnousia* is an ideal partner for the empress in her particular capacity as Augustus' consort. Augustus cultivated his own reputation as dispenser of vengeance, first against Caesar's murderers and later against the Parthians, the role being celebrated especially in the foundation of the temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus.¹²⁸ As we have noted, the establishment of Ares' temple in the Athenian Agora is very likely to have been associated with this, and images of the Mars Ultor temple and/or the standards recovered from the Parthians

¹²⁴ BRU (2008), p. 302 and HORNUM (1993), p. 15 unquestioningly adduce the Pliny passages as evidence of Nemesis' place in Roman state religion; AXTELL (1907), p. 37 and 44–45 asserts that Pliny's statue was 'merely decorative'. On Roman cults of deified abstractions, see FEARS (1981), especially p. 833–868 on the Republican period.

¹²⁵ For the spitting gesture in general see also Tibullus, I, 2, 56; see STAFFORD (forthcoming a).

¹²⁶ On this and the similar difficulty of translation which underlies modern English usage of 'nemesis', see STAFFORD (forthcoming b).

¹²⁷ KAJAVA (2000), p. 41–42 and 49–52.

¹²⁸ See ZANKER (1988) on Augustus' programme of temple building (p. 104–114) and imagery relating to his Parthian victories (p. 183–192). On the Mars Ultor temple see also FAVRO (1996), p. 126–128 and fig. 43, 51, 56 and 65.

which it contained were widely disseminated across the empire via a variety of coin types.¹²⁹ The Akropolis temple of Roma and Augustus, too, was associated with the theme, its juxtaposition to the Parthenon, with its sculptural themes of the triumph of Greeks over barbarians, promoting the parallel between Augustus' victory over the Parthians and the Persian Wars – a parallel later played upon, as we have seen, in honour of Nero.¹³⁰ For Augustus' wife, then, identification with Attica's traditional *ultrix* makes perfect sense. Of particular relevance to Augustus' Parthian victories would be the Rhamnousian Nemesis' characterisation as avenger against the Persians, an idea implicit in the Trojan War theme of the fifth-century cult statue's base and explicitly articulated in literature of the first century BC and later.

Whether the original impetus for the dedication came from Athens or Rome is impossible to determine for certain. However, the hypothesis, based on the Claudius dedication, that the emperor himself ordered restoration work on the sanctuary, is lent plausibility by the literary evidence for Roman knowledge of the Rhamnousian goddess, as well as by evidence for Claudius' broader interest in Attica's ancient monuments. Such an external interest could certainly have provided a catalyst for the decision to honour Livia, which would then make sense as a reciprocal courtesy, enacted at the same time as the establishment of Claudius' altar. Alternatively, if the sanctuary was in fact still operational in the first century AD, administered and frequented by even a reduced local population, the people of Rhamnous themselves – so active in decision-making in earlier centuries – could have initiated the whole process, offering the sanctuary's facilities to the imperial cult in return for investment in its upkeep. Their approach would have had to be to the Athenian administration in the first place, who could in turn have approached Claudius, in accordance with Price's model of imperial cult-establishment as a system of exchange, and in the same way that approaches must have been made to Claudius by representatives from Thasos.¹³¹ The Athenian *demos* may have funded the repairs themselves, as part of the wider programme of restoration of sanctuaries attested by *IG* II² 1035, but would presumably have expected some benefit in terms of imperial favour.

Wherever the idea originated, making Livia a goddess at Rhamnous fits perfectly with the propaganda of Claudius' early reign. Promotion of Livia to divine status was a crucial move in establishing the legitimacy of his accession, since it was only via his grandmother that Claudius had a blood link to imperial power. The tactic can be seen as part of a wider programme in which images of Livia and other relatively popular members of his family were carefully

¹²⁹ E.g. those illustrated in FAVRO (1996), fig. 42 and ZANKER (1988), fig. 89b and 145.

¹³⁰ SPAWFORTH (1994b) reviews the evidence for the Persian-Parthian equation; see also HURWIT (1999), p. 261–282 on the hellenistic and Roman Akropolis.

¹³¹ PRICE (1984), p. 65–75.

deployed to bolster Claudius' position.¹³² Livia's deification was also a firm marker of the new emperor's difference from his predecessor, restoring dignity to the imperial cult after the brief divine career of Caligula's sister/wife Drusilla, whose apotheosis is derided by Seneca (*Apocolocyntosis* I, 2-3) and Suetonius (*Caligula*, 24, 2).¹³³ In contrast, Livia's status as ultra-respectable 'first lady of Rome', cultivated during her lifetime to complement Augustus' image, makes her the ideal symbol of Claudius' restoration of proper Roman values.¹³⁴ The identification with Nemesis at Rhamnous is a logical extension of Livia's association with other goddesses and personifications, adding righteous vengeance to her portfolio of virtues. The relatively humble altar accorded to Claudius himself at Rhamnous could be an indication of deference to imperial modesty – or at least its appearance – while the more extravagant gift of a whole temple could safely be made to the virtuously dead Livia.

What exactly does the dedication imply about cult practice at Rhamnous? The comparative evidence we have considered offers a variety of models. Worship of Livia and Claudius could simply have been added to the cult of Nemesis, just as the Macedonian rulers had been offered sacrifices at the Great Nemesis in the third century BC, and as imperial games in Claudius' honour seem to have been added to the Panathenaia in first-century Athens. However, the absence of any separately marked out sacred space for Livia within the temple, her gender and the already established practice of identifying her with traditional goddesses and virtues would have facilitated her identification with Nemesis. Entirely missing here is the careful articulation of the relationship between imperial female and goddess as *synthronos*, as seen in the case of Julia Livilla and Athena Nikephoros at Pergamon or of Julia Domna and Athena Polias at Athens. Such an articulation may simply have left no trace in the recoverable record, but there is also the question of the cult statue: at Olympia Augustus' statue replaces that of the Mother of the Gods; in the Erechtheion Julia Domna expressly has a statue alongside that of Athena; and imperial statues likewise seem to coexist with the ancient deity's cult statue at Priene and in the temple of Ares in the Athenian Agora. The absence of a statue of Livia at Rhamnous may simply have been the result of economy, but it would have allowed for a complete merger of her identity with Nemesis. This full syncretisation, however, was not permanent, as over time Livia seems to have been forgotten, allowing Nemesis to re-emerge as the sanctuary's sole dedicatee. This

¹³² OSGOOD (2011), p. 126-146 (especially p. 140); LEVICK (2001), p. 45-46; BARTMAN (1990), p. 27-33.

¹³³ Cf. Cassius Dio's contrasting characterisations of Tiberius (LVII, 9, 1 and LVIII, 8, 4) and Claudius (LX, 5, 4), both modest in their banning divine honours, with the unstable Caligula (LIX, 4, 4).

¹³⁴ The *Romana princeps* appellation is coined in the *Consolatio ad Liviam* (especially l. 349-356): see PURCELL (1982).

is not out of line with Livia's cult across the empire, for which evidence runs out by the end of the second century.¹³⁵

Finally, it is tempting to surmise that Pliny's Capitoline Nemesis was a copy of Agorakritos' cult statue, like our *Fig. 3*.¹³⁶ The influential Varro might have had such a copy made if he really did 'prefer it to all other statues', and would have been in a position to promote the establishment of a Roman cult of Nemesis in the late 50s or 40s BC, a date by when Catullus' references to the *Rhamnusia virgo* would have raised Roman awareness of the goddess. Alternatively the cult could have been established in the 40s AD, in connection with the installation of the imperial cult at Rhamnous, the statue being commissioned by the Athenian *demos* and sent as a gift to Rome, or by the imperial administration in commemoration of Claudius' benefactions at Rhamnous. In either case, Pliny's comments seem to suggest that Nemesis filled a gap in the generally crowded market of minor Roman deities for every occasion.

Altogether, an evaluation of the dedication to Livia at Rhamnous suggests significant two-way traffic in religious ideas and practice between Attica and Rome. The inscription should take its place as a prime example of the complex dynamics of the imperial cult's operation, demonstrating a more complete syncretisation of empress and goddess than otherwise attested.

Emma J. STAFFORD

Department of Classics
University of Leeds
LEEDS LS2 9JT
E-mail: E.J.Stafford@leeds.ac.uk

Bibliography

- S.E. ALCOCK, *Graecia Capta: the landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge, 1993.
A. ALEXANDRIDIS, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses: eine Untersuchung ihrer bildlichen Darstellung von Livia bis Iulia Domna*, Mainz, 2004.
H.L. AXTELL, *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions*, Chicago, 1907 [repr. New York, 1987].
A. BARRETT, *Livia: first lady of Imperial Rome*, New Haven, Conn, 2002.
E. BARTMAN, *Portraits of Livia: imagining the imperial woman in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, 1990.
M. BEARD, J. NORTH, S. PRICE, *Religions of Rome*, Cambridge, 1998.
A. BENJAMIN, A.E. RAUBITSCHKE, "Arae Augusti," *Hesperia* 28 (1959), p. 65-85.
D. BOSNAKIS, K. HALLOF, "Alte und neue Inschriften aus Kos II," *Chiron* 38 (2008), p. 205-242.
O. BRONEER, "Some Greek inscriptions of Roman date from Attica," *AJA* 36 (1932), p. 393-400.
H. BRU, "Némésis et le culte imperial dans les provinces syriennes," *Syria* 85 (2008), p. 293-314.

¹³⁵ BARRETT (2002), p. 224; HAHN (1994), p. 38. It is notable that Pausanias makes no mention of Livia's cult.

¹³⁶ KAJAVA (2000), p. 54 makes this suggestion in passing.

- F. CAMIA, *Theoi Sebastoi. Il culto degli imperatori romani in Grecia (Provincia Achaia) nel second secolo DC*, Athens, 2011.
- K.K. CARROLL, *The Parthenon Inscription* (GRBS Monograph 9), Durham NC, 1982.
- J.C. CARTER, *The Sculpture of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene*, London, 1983.
- K. CLINTON, "Eleusis and the Romans", in M.C. HOFF, S.I. ROTROFF (eds.), *The Romanisation of Athens*, Oxford, 1997, p. 161-181.
- J.B. CONNELLY, *Portrait of a Priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece*, Princeton NJ, 2007.
- M. CROSBY, "Greek inscriptions," *Hesperia* 6 (1937), p. 442-468.
- G.R. CULLY, "The restoration of sanctuaries in Attica: IG II² 1035," *Hesperia* 44 (1975), p. 207-223.
- G.R. CULLY, "The restoration of sanctuaries in Attica II," *Hesperia* 46 (1977), p. 282-298.
- W.B. DINSMOOR, "The temple of Ares at Athens," *Hesperia* 9 (1940), p. 1-52.
- , "Rhamnountine fantasies," *Hesperia* 30 (1961), p. 179-204.
- W. DITTENBERGER, K. PURGOLD, *Die Inschriften von Olympia* (Olympia V), Berlin, 1896.
- C. DUNANT, J. POUILLOUX, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos II*, Paris, 1958 (*Études thasiennes*, 5).
- C.M. EDWARDS "Tyche at Corinth," *Hesperia* 59 (1990), p. 529-542.
- W. EHRHARDT, "Versuch einer Deutung des Kultbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus," *Antike Kunst* 40 (1997), p. 29-39.
- K. ELIAKIS, "Η ανακατάσχευση της ανατολικής όψης του ναού της Νεμέσεως στο Ραμνούντα – μία επισημική στα χρόνια του αυτοκράτορα Ιουλιάνου," *Archaiologikon Deltion* 35.1 (1980), p. 206-223.
- D. FAVRO, *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, 1996.
- J.R. FEARS, "The cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* II.17.2 (1981), p. 827-948.
- J.-L. FERRARY, "Les inscriptions du sanctuaire de Claros en l'honneur de Romains," *BCH* 124 (2000), p. 331-376.
- M. FRÄNKEL, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, vol. 2: *Römische Zeit*, Berlin, 1890-1895.
- S.J. FRIESEN, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesos, Asia and the cult of the Flavian imperial family*, Leiden, 1993.
- , *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John*, Oxford, 2001.
- D.J. GEAGAN, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla* (= *Hesperia* Suppl. 12), Princeton NJ, 1967.
- , "Notes of the agonistic institutions of Roman Corinth," *GRBS* 9 (1968), p. 69-80.
- , "Roman Athens: some aspects of life and culture I. 86 BC-AD 267," *ANRW* II.7.1 (1979), p. 371-437..
- , "Imperial visits to Athens: the epigraphical evidence," in A.G. KALOGEROPOULOU (ed.), *Πρακτικά του Η' Διεθνούς Συνέδριου Ελληνικές και Λατινικές Επιγραφικές* (Athens 3-9 Oct. 1982), Athens, 1984, p. 69-78.
- P. GRAINDOR, *Athènes sous Auguste*, Cairo, 1927.
- S.J. GREEN, *Ovid, Fasti I: a commentary*, Leiden, 2004.
- G. GREYER, "Livia and the Roman imperial cult," *AJP* 67 (1946), p. 222-252.
- C. HABICHT, "Divine honours for King Antigonos Gonatas in Athens," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 15 (1996), p. 131-134.
- U. HAHN, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ebrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina*, Saarbrücken, 1994 .
- H. HERTER, s.v. "Nemesis", *RE* XVI.2 (1935), col. 2388-2390.
- M.C. HOFF, "The so-called Agoranomion and the imperial cult in Julio-Claudian Athens," *AA* (1994), p. 93-117 .
- M.B. HORNUM, *Nemesis, the Roman State, and the Games*, Leiden, 1993.

- A.S. HUNT, C.C. EDGAR, *Select Papyri* II, Cambridge MA, 1934.
- J.M. HURWIT, *The Athenian Acropolis: history, mythology, and archaeology from the Neolithic era to the present*, Cambridge, 1999.
- IGR IV = *Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes* Vol. 4, ed. G. LAFAYE, Paris, 1927.
- IGUR = *Inscriptiones graecae urbis Romae*, ed. L. MORETTI, Rome, 1968-1990.
- IMT = *Inscripfen Mysia et Troas*, eds. M. BARTH and J. STAUBER, Munich, 1993.
- IPriene = *Inscripfen von Priene*, ed. C. FREDRICH, H. VON PROTT, H. SCHRADER, Th. WIEGAND, H. WINNEFELD, Berlin, 1906.
- M. KAJAVA, "Livia and Rhamnous," *Arctos* 34 (2000), p. 39-61.
- , "Honorific and other dedications to emperors in the Greek East", in P. IOSSIF, A.S. CHANKOWSKI, C.C. LORBER (eds.), *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: studies on royal cult and imperial worship (Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens, November 1-2, 2007)*, Leuven, 2011, p. 553-592.
- M. KANTIRÉA, *Les dieux et les dieux Augustes: le culte impérial en Grèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens*, Athens, 2007.
- , "Étude comparative de l'introduction du culte impérial à Pergame, à Athènes et à Éphèse", in P. IOSSIF, A.S. CHANKOWSKI, C.C. LORBER (eds.), *More Than Men, Less Than Gods: studies on royal cult and imperial worship (Proceedings of the International Colloquium Organized by the Belgian School at Athens, November 1-2, 2007)*, Leuven, 2011, p. 521-551.
- B. KNITTMAYER, "Kultbild und Heiligtum der Nemesis von Rhamnous am Beginn des peloponnesischen Krieges," *JDAI* 114 (1999), p. 1-18.
- D.S. LEVENE, Review of Hornum 1993, *JRS* 87 (1997), p. 300-301.
- B. LEVICK, *Claudius*, London, 2001.
- LIMC s.v. "Nemesis" = P. KARANASTASSI, F. RAUSA, R. VOLKKOMMER, s.v. "Nemesis", *LIMC* VI (1992), p. 733-773.
- F. LOZANO, *La religión del Poder. El culto imperial en Atenas en época de Augusto y los emperadores Julio-Claudios*, Oxford, 2002.
- F. LOZANO, "Thea Livia in Athens: redating IG II² 3242," *ZPE* 148 (2004), p. 177-180.
- , "La promoción social a través del culto a los emperadores: el caso de Tiberio Claudio Novio en Atenas," *Habis* 38 (2007), p. 185-203.
- , *Un dios entre los hombres: la adoración a los emperadores romanos en Grecia*, Barcelona, 2010.
- R. MALTBY, "The wheel of Fortune, Nemesis and the central poems of Tibullus I and I," in S. KYRIAKIDIS (ed.), *The Middles of Latin Poetry (Collana «de Rane» 38)*, Bari, 2004, p. 103-21.
- D.F. MCCABE, B.D. EHRMAN, R.N. ELLIOTT, *Priene Inscriptions. Texts and List*, Princeton, 1987.
- B.D. MERRITT, *Corinth VIII.1: Greek Inscriptions 1896-1927*, Cambridge MA, 1931.
- R. MERKELBACH, "Kallimachos, Locke der Berenike 69-76," *ZPE* 1 (1967), p. 218.
- J. MIKALSON, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley-, 1998.
- T. MIKOCCI, *Sub specie deae. Les Impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses. Étude iconologique*, Rome, 1995.
- M.M. MILES, "A reconstruction of the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous," *Hesperia* 58 (1989), p. 131-249.
- A.D. NOCK, "Σύνναος θεός," *HSCP* 41 (1930), p. 1-62.
- J.H. OLIVER, *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law*, Baltimore, 1950.
- , "Julia Domna as Athena Polias," in *Athenian studies, presented to William Scott Ferguson*, *HSCP* Suppl. 1 (1940), p. 521-530.
- , "Livia as Artemis Boulaia at Athens," *CP* 60 (1965), p. 179.
- A.C. ORLANDOS, "Note sur le sanctuaire de Némésis à Rhamnonte," *BCH* 48 (1924), p. 305-320.
- R. OSBORNE, "The *demos* and its divisions in classical Athens," in O. MURRAY, S. PRICE (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford, 1990, p. 265-293.

- J. OSGOOD, *Claudius Caesar: image and power in the early Roman empire*, Cambridge, 2011 .
- O. PALAGIA, "Meaning and narrative technique in statue bases of the Pheidian circle," in K. RUTTER, B.A. SPARKES (eds.), *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*, *Edinburgh Leventis Studies* Vol. I, Edinburgh, 2000, p. 53-78.
- V.C. PETRAKOS, "Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνούντος," *Praktika tēs en Athenais Archaïologikēs Etaireias tou etous* 1976 (1978), p. 5-60 .
- , "Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνούντος," *Praktika tēs en Athenais Archaïologikēs Etaireias tou etous* 1979 (1981a), p. 1-25 .
- , "La base de la Némésis d'Agoracrite," *BCH* 105 (1981b), p. 227-253.
- , "Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνούντος," *Praktika tēs en Athenais Archaïologikēs Etaireias tou etous* 1982 (1984), p. 127-162 .
- , "Προβλήματα της βάσης του αγάλματος της Νεμέσως," *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik* 2 (1986), p. 89-107.
- , "Τὸ Νεμέσιον τοῦ Ραμνούντος," in *Φύλια ἔπη εἰς Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνᾶς*, Athens, 1987, p. 295-326.
- , *Rhamnous* (Ministry of Culture Archaeological Receipts Fund), Athens, 1991.
- , "Ἀνασκαφή Ραμνούντος," *Praktika tēs en Athenais Archaïologikēs Etaireias tou etous* 1989, 1992, p. 1-37.
- , *Ὁ Δῆμος του Ραμνούντος: σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ἐρευνών (1813-1998)*, Athens, 1999..
- J. POUILLOUX, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris, 1954.
- S. PRICE, *Rituals and Power: the Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge, 1984.
- N. PURCELL, "Livia and the womanhood of Rome," *PCPhS* n.s. 32 (1986), p. 78-105.
- A.E. RAUBITSCHKE, "Greek inscriptions," *Hesperia* 12 (1943), p. 12-88.
- , *Dedications from the Athenian Acropolis*, Cambridge MA, 1949.
- , "Das Datislied," in K. SCHAUENBURG (ed.), *Charites: Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, Bonn, 1957, p. 234-242.
- B.S. RIDGWAY, *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: the problem of the originals*, Ann Arbor, 1984.
- L. ROBERT, *Les fouilles de Claros*, Limoges, 1954.
- O. ROBBACH, s.v. 'Nemesis', in Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, Leipzig, 1902-9, vol. 3.1, p. 117-166.
- M. ROSTOVITZEF, "L'empereur Tibère et le culte impérial," *Revue historique* 163 (1930), p. 1-26.
- K.D. SHAPIRO LAPATIN, "A family gathering at Rhamnous?," *Hesperia* 61 (1992), p. 107-119.
- T.L. SHEAR, "Athens: from city-state to provincial town," *Hesperia* 50 (1981), p. 356-377.
- M.B. SKINNER, "Rhamnusia Virgo," *Classical Antiquity* 3.1 (1984), p. 134-141.
- E. SMADJA, "L'inscription du culte imperial dans la cité : l'exemple de Lepcis Magna au début de l'empire," *DHA* 4 (1978), p. 171-183.
- A.C. SMITH, *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*, Leiden, 2011.
- SOCIETY OF DILETTANTI (1881), *Antiquities of Ionia* IV, London.
- A.J.S. SPAWFORTH, "Corinth, Argos, and the imperial cult, Pseudo-Julian, *Letters* 98", *Hesperia* 63 (1994a), p. 226-230.
- , "Symbol of unity? The Persian-Wars tradition in the Roman empire," in S. HORNBLLOWER (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford, 1994b, 233-47.
- , "The early reception of the imperial cult in Athens: problems and ambiguities," in M.C. HOFF, S.I. ROTROFF (eds.), *The Romanisation of Athens*, Oxford, 1997, p. 183-201 .
- E.J. STAFFORD, *Worshipping Virtues: personification and the divine in ancient Greece*, London, 2000.
- , "Nemesis, Hybris and violence," in J.-M. BERTRAND, (ed.), *La violence dans les mondes grec et romain*, Paris, 2005, p. 195-212.

- , “Tibullus’ Nemesis: divine Retribution and the poet,” in J. BOOTH, R. MALTBY (eds.), *What’s in a Name?*, Swansea, 2006, p. 33–48.
- , “Cracher sur son kolpos: gestes et vêtement caractérisant Némésis,” in V. HUET, F. GHERCHANOC (eds.), *Corps, gestes et vêtement des divinités dans l’Antiquité grecque, romaine et gallo-romaine*, Brest, forthcoming (a).
- , *Divine Retribution and the Evolution of Nemesis*, forthcoming (b).
- S.C. STONE, “The imperial sculptural group in the Metrôon at Olympia,” *MDAI(A)* 100 (1985), p. 377–391.
- R.S. STROUD, “Inscriptions from the north slope of the Acropolis, I,” *Hesperia* 40 (1971), p. 146–204.
- H.A. THOMPSON, “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1951,” *Hesperia* 21 (1952), p. 83–113.
- , “The annex to the Stoa of Zeus in the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 35 (1966), p. 171–187.
- , R.E. WYCHERLEY, *The Athenian Agora XIV, The Agora of Athens: the history, shape and uses of an Ancient city center*, Princeton, 1972.
- J. TOBIN, *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens: patronage and conflict under the Antonines*, Amsterdam, 1997.
- J. TRAVLOS, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London, 1971.
- , *Bildlexicon zur Topographie des antiken Attika*, Tübingen, 1988.
- E. VANDERPOOL, “Athens honors the emperor Tiberius,” *Hesperia* 28 (1959), p. 86–90.
- , “Three inscriptions from Eleusis,” *Archaiologikon Deltion* 23.1 (1968), p. 1–9.
- S. WALKER, “Athens under Augustus,” in M.C. HOFF, S.I. ROTROFF (eds.), *The Romanisation of Athens*, Oxford, 1997, p. 67–80.
- A.B. WEST, *Corinth VIII.2: Latin Inscriptions 1896–1926*, Cambridge MA, 1931.
- D. WHITEHEAD, *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 BC*, Princeton NJ, 1986.
- A. WILHELM, “Themis und Nemesis in Rhamnus,” *WJA* 32 (1940), p. 200–209.
- T.P. WISEMAN, *Catullus and his World*, Cambridge, 1985.
- T. WITULSKI, *Kaiserkult in Kleinasien. Die Entwicklung der kultisch-religiösen Kaiserverebrung in der römischen Provinz Asia von Augustus bis Antoninus Pius*, Göttingen, 2007.
- S. WOOD, *Imperial Women: a study in public images, 40 BC–AD 68*, Leiden, 1999.
- R.E. WYCHERLEY, *The Athenian Agora III: Literary and Epigraphic Testimonia*, Princeton NJ, 1957.
- P. ZANKER, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor, 1988.