

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXIV

HELSINKI 2000 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

PAAVO CASTRÉN	<i>Vici and insulae: The Homes and Addresses of the Romans</i>	7
TIBOR GRÜLL	<i>“Conquerors, Patriarchs and the Law of the Lord”. Interpretation of a late antique Jewish epitaph</i>	23
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Livia and Nemesis</i>	39
TUA KORHONEN	<i>Rhetorical Strategies in Johan Paulinus’ (Lillienstedt) Finlandia (1678). A Versified Oration in Greek from the Baroque Period</i>	63
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Zur Vorgeschichte organisierten Kaiserkultes im gallo-germanischen Raum</i>	89
JERZY LINDERSKI	<i>Banqueting</i>	101
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>A Faiyum Portrait Reconsidered</i>	109
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Notes on Some Greek Inscriptions of Imperial Date</i>	115
ERKKI SIRONEN	<i>Notes on the Language of Johan Paulinus’ Finlandia. A Baroque Eulogy in Greek Verses</i>	129
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CLXXIII–CLXXXIII</i>	149
CHRISTA STEINBY	<i>The Roman Boarding-bridge in the First Punic War. A Study of Roman Tactics and Strategy</i>	193
ANTERO TAMMISTO	<i>Nova bibliotheca Pompeiana I-II. Corrigenda ed addenda con una bibliografia pompeiana fennica</i>	211
JAANA VAAHTERA	<i>Observations on genus nominum in the Roman Grammarians</i>	233
ROLF WESTMAN	<i>Ergänzungen zu LSJ und dessen Rev. Suppl.</i>	253
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	259
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	315
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	319

LIVIA AND NEMESIS

MIKA KAJAVA

An inscription from Rhamnous on the east coast of Attica shows that the fifth-century temple of Nemesis was rededicated by the *demos* to Livia, most probably in A.D. 45/46, a few years after her deification on 17 January 42 (and more than fifteen years after her death).¹ If a temple was planned to be dedicated to the goddess Livia somewhere in Athens, why should it have been that of Nemesis in the remote deme of Rhamnous and, conversely, if the ancient and ruined temple of Nemesis was to be repaired and then rededicated to someone, why was Livia chosen to be the recipient? These questions seem to have remained largely unanswered, and so the issue deserves to be discussed in more detail.² The following intends to illustrate

¹ IG II² 3242: Ὁ δῆμος / θεᾶι Λειβία. Στρατηγοῦντος / ἐ[πὶ] τοὺς ὀπλε[ί]τας τοῦ καὶ ἱερέως θεᾶς / Ῥώ[μη]ς κ[α]ὶ Σεβασ[τ]οῦ Καίσαρος [Δημ]οστράτου / [τοῦ Διονυ]σίου Παλληνέως, ἄρχοντος δὲ / [Ἀντιπάτρο]υ τοῦ Ἀν(τι)πάτρου Φλυέ[ως ν]εωτέρου. For the Claudian date which depends on the restoration of the archon's name (given in a different way by Kirchner, IG: see n. 2), cf. W.B. Dinsmoor, *Hesperia* 30 (1961) 186 ff. (following J.H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 11 [1942] 83 n. 23a; Id., *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law*, Baltimore 1950, 85 n. 18); M. M. Miles, *Hesperia* 58 (1989) 236 ff. (other views are discussed by Dinsmoor and Miles). As for the beginning of lines 3 and 4, I follow the readings provided by V. Petrakos, in: *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Ἡῶ Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Ἑλληνικῆς καὶ Λατινικῆς Ἐπιγραφικῆς I*, Ἀθήνα 1984, 329.

² O. Broneer, *AJA* 36 (1932) 397 ff., restoring the archon's name as *Aiolion* (thus also Kirchner, IG), suggested that the inscription was likely to have been engraved under Galba who thereby would have (indirectly) shown his appreciation for Livia (the good relations between the two are well known). Dinsmoor (above n. 1), 193 f., though he dated the text to A.D. 45/46, also considered the possibility of Nerva's reign because of the emperor's close relations with the powerful family of Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes of Marathon (PIR² C 801), father of the millionaire Herodes Atticus. Through the interest of Atticus, himself high priest of the Sebastoi, the temple of Nemesis, which was close to the family's home, would have been repaired and rededicated to Livia as a former member of the Imperial House. The family's enduring attention to the cult of Rhamnous is shown by the dedications made by

the ideological and historical context of the remarkable Rhamnountine undertaking.

First of all, it should be taken for granted that the association of Livia with Nemesis at Rhamnous cannot have been random. If it was simply intended to celebrate Livia's new divinity in Athens, surely it would have been better manifested in central Athens. When Roman emperors and their relatives were associated or identified with gods or goddesses in the Greek East, they were normally brought into a relationship with the traditional deities of the city, and the cult would have taken place at or in centrally located sanctuaries or the major civic buildings, unless entirely new monuments were built for the Imperial cult.³ In any event, emperors assimilated to gods or portrayed along with them would have been a visible part of the life of the city. In large centres like Athens there were many deities that could be suitable for the purposes of the Imperial cult, and so it is no wonder that Livia had already received cultic worship in Athens in the company of, at least, Artemis, Hestia, Hygieia, and Pronoia.⁴ But why should

the millionaire at the temple (IG II² 3969, 13208), and also by the fact that a sanctuary called Triopion on the family's Roman estate on the Via Appia included shrines to Nemesis and Athena (Moretti, IGUR III 1155, 60 f.; J. Tobin, *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens. Patronage and Conflicts under the Antonines* [Ἀρχαία Ἑλλάς 4], Amsterdam 1997, 355 ff.).

³ S. Alcock, *Graecia capta. The Landscapes of Roman Greece*, Cambridge 1993, 198 f. (199: "The Imperial cult held no place in the countryside..., the orientation of the imperial cult demanded that it dominate the most populous and prominent space, the arena for civic political activity."). Of course, the situation was similar in Asia Minor: S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984, 136 ff.

⁴ SEG XX 152 (Tib.): *Ioulia Sebaste Artemis Boulaia*; IG II² 3240 (after A.D. 22/23?): *Sebaste Hygeia* (according to P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, Le Caire 1927, 156, 205, this should be understood as the Greek rendering of *Salus Augusta*); *ibid.* 3238 (Tib.): *Ioulia Thea Sebaste Pronoia* (cf. Athena Pronoia). As for *Hesperia* 6 (1937) 464 No. 12 (cf. R. E. Wycherley, *Agora III* [1957] No. 427), found near to the Bouleuterion, the epithet of *Ioulia Sebaste Boulaia* suggests an association with Artemis Boulaia (rather than with Hestia B. or Athena B.). Cf. also the private dedications IG II² 3239 (= SEG XXXV 146, Tib.): *Ioulia Thea Sebaste*, and 3241 (Aug?): *Libia Sebaste ... Euergetis*. Moreover, in the Claudian (?) dedication IG II² 3185 to Hestia, Apollo, and *Theoi Sebastoi*, etc., the first two deities might be identified respectively as Livia and Augustus (cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère a Trajan*, Le Caire 1931, 175 f.; T. Mavrojannis, *Ostraka* 4 [1995] 91 n. 53). Note, finally, that the cult of "Hestia on the Acropolis, Livia, and Julia" (IG II² 5096) may be plausibly associated with the round Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis: see now, in detail, M. Kajava, in: O. Salomies (ed.), *The Greek East in the Roman Context* (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 7), forthcoming, where it is

she be associated with Nemesis, who had her ancient cult at Rhamnous, once a locality with a powerful fortress and a flourishing cult but in A.D. 45/46 a more or less abandoned and depopulated place with (perhaps) no more priests attending to the goddess?⁵ Though abandonment of the Attic rural landscape did not necessarily imply abandonment of temples and cultic traditions,⁶ nonetheless the location remains puzzling. Moreover, Nemesis was a minor deity who is not known with certainty to have been associated with any other Imperial lady.⁷ It seems to me beyond doubt that there must have been some particular reason for Livia's cult to have been brought to the temple of that specific goddess in the Attic countryside.

One explanation might be that the Athenians (at least under Claudius) were reluctant to produce conspicuous monuments for the Imperial cult on Athenian soil, and so, in the case of Livia, the primary goal would have been to find "a location about as far from the sight of most Athenians as it was possible to get".⁸ If this was the principal motive, however, one wonders whether the Roman regime and ultimately the emperor himself would have been pleased to find out what was going on in Athens. It is true that the decision to grant the posthumous honour was made officially by the Athenians but it is hardly imaginable that it was made without the knowledge of the Roman authorities. Is it conceivable, moreover, that the hoplite general Demostratus, who was himself priest of Roma and Augustus at the small

argued that the Hestia of this and some other inscriptions should be identified with the Roman Vesta. – For the assimilation of Livia to goddesses in art, see T. Mikocki, *Sub specie deae. Les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses. Étude iconologique* (Riv. Arch. Suppl. 14), Roma 1995, 18 ff. Cf. also below nn. 10, 74.

⁵ J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte. Étude de topographie et d'histoire* (BEFAR 179), Paris 1954, passim (the dedication to Livia: p. 156 f. No. 46, from Broneer [above n. 2]). A succinct survey of the history of the fortress down to the Roman period is given by V. Petrakos, *CRAI* 1997, 605 ff. For the geography of Rhamnous, see also J. Travlos, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika* (1988), 388 f.; H. R. Goette, in: *Stadt und Umland. Neue Ergebnisse der archäologischen Bau- und Siedlungsforschung* (Diskussionen zur archäol. Bauforschung 7), Mainz am Rh. 1999, 160 ff.

⁶ As has been correctly pointed out by Alcock (above n. 3), 194.

⁷ M.-L. Vollenweider, *Der Jupiter-Kameo*, Stuttgart 1964, 7 has suggested that the Younger Agrippina is represented as Nemesis on an Imperial cameo. However, attractive though it is, this proposal has been criticized by several scholars, see the survey in M. B. Hornum, *Nemesis, the Roman State, and the Games* (EPRO 117), Leiden 1993, 17 ff.

⁸ A. Spawforth, in: M. C. Hoff – S. I. Rotroff (eds), *The Romanization of Athens* (Oxbow Monograph 94), Oxford 1997, 194.

monopteros on the Acropolis, and surely closely tied to the Roman authorities, would have promoted the idea of placing Augustus' wife in a remote location in rural Attica? Finally, apotheosis after death was not Greek practice but a Roman institution which required recognition by the Senate. This probably means that the honours of various types given especially for reasons of apotheosis in Greece would have been mostly granted on the initiative of the Romans or at least with Roman support (though, of course, nothing could prevent the Greek cities from taking their decisions independently in such matters).⁹ Unless prompted by the Romans, why should the Athenians have dedicated a temple to Livia, who had already received cult honours in her lifetime, being styled as *thea*, goddess, well before A.D. 42?¹⁰ It seems to me that the idea of honouring Livia at Rhamnous was created by the Romans and that the location was carefully chosen for ideological reasons.

It is well known that Tiberius was unwilling to take any steps to have his mother deified after her death in A.D. 29. Similarly, Gaius did not do much beyond executing Livia's testament. Instead, he elevated the Younger Antonia, his grandmother, to *Augusta* just before her death in A.D. 37, with the evident purpose of putting her on a par with Iulia Augusta. It was only Claudius who carried out his own grandmother's deification in January 42, a short time after he became *pater patriae* himself. Significantly, the day chosen for the consecration (17 Jan.) was the anniversary of the wedding day of Livia and Augustus, which perhaps means that the occasion was intentionally delayed, for one may well assume that the decision had been taken soon after Claudius' accession in late January 41. Among other things, the posthumous honours given to *diva Augusta* included games in the circus, commemorative sacrifices and the collocation of her statue in the temple of

⁹ For the institutions of respectively *divus* and *theos*, see Price (above n. 3), 75.

¹⁰ The use of the term *theos* in the Roman Imperial cult: S. R. F. Price, *JHS* 104 (1984) 79 ff. Though not explicitly attested, it is very likely that Livia was honoured in Athens as *thea* in her lifetime (cf. IG II² 3238–39, with M. C. Hoff, *AA* 1994, 108 f.), just as she was on several Augustan and Tiberian inscriptions from the East. For the associations of Livia with goddesses, see above n. 4, and for her cults in Athens and Eleusis, see K. Clinton, in: *The Romanization of Athens* (above n. 8), 167 ff. See also the work of Hahn cited below in n. 13.

Augustus between the Palatine and the Capitolium, and a dedication to *Pietas Augusta* (in A.D. 43).¹¹

Besides the Rhamnountine dedication, no other instances of honouring Livia's deification are known in Athens, and the same largely concerns the Greek East as a whole. If a cult of *thea* Livia/Julia already existed in a Greek city (or even if it did not), her official consecration in Rome would not have been a reason for founding a new cult.¹² In fact, the dedications postdating A.D. 42 are usually best taken as evidence for the mere continuity of earlier cults.¹³ As in the Rhamnountine dedication, if something specific was decreed for the sake of Livia's deification, it would have been most likely proposed by the agents of the Roman rule. Such was the case in Ephesus where a Claudian governor, commenting on the expenditure on the singing of hymns, announced that the choir of Livia, 'who has been given the long due divine honours' by Claudius, should be given the same status as that of Augustus

¹¹ Games: Dio 60,5,2. Sacrifices: Act. Arv. a. 44 (CIL VI 2033 A) 16 ff. (ed. Scheid No. 17). Temple/statue: Dio *ibid.*; Dessau, ILS 4995; D. Fishwick, *Phoenix* 46 (1992) 232 ff. *Pietas*: Dessau, ILS 202 (this monument, whose appearance and identification is in dispute, had already been promised by the Senate in A.D. 22: E. La Rocca, in: *LTUR* IV 87 f.; A. Scheithauer, *Kaiserliche Bautätigkeit in Rom. Das Echo in der antiken Literatur* [HABES 32], Stuttgart 2000, 99). General discussion in B. Levick, *Claudius*, London 1990, 45 f.

¹² G. Grether, *AJPh* 67 (1946) 250 f.; L. Robert, *Hellenica* 2 (1946) 37 ff.; Price (above n. 10), 85: "The creation of a *divus* made little difference in the Greek world. Greek cults were generally not initiated specifically for a *divus*."

¹³ The evidence is conveniently catalogued by U. Hahn, *Die Frauen des römischen Kaiserhauses und ihre Ehrungen im griechischen Osten anhand epigraphischer und numismatischer Zeugnisse von Livia bis Sabina* (Saarbrücker Studien zur Archäologie und alten Geschichte, Bd. 8), Saarbrücken 1994, 322 ff. Of the 97 numbers (which include some coins), eleven inscriptions can be dated after A.D. 42, and of these, in turn, only one would seem to testify to a new cult founded in commemoration of Livia's deification, i.e., the decree TAM II 549 from Tlos in Lycia, though, in reality, in this case the historical motive was the annexation of Lycia in A.D. 43. For the possibility that a Claudian coin from Thessalonica was struck to commemorate the deification, see J. Touratsoglou, *Die Münzstätte von Thessaloniki in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (*Antike Münzen und geschnittene Steine* 12), Berlin – New York 1988, 35 (= *RPC* I 1577). Moreover, Livia might be represented together with the emperor on the reverse of the early Claudian *RPC* I 1030 from Polyrhenum in Crete. The Latin dedication Corinth VIII,3 No. 55, if referring to a building given to *diva Augusta* after A.D. 42, seems to be evidence for obvious Roman influence in this colony, and the same probably concerns both Corinth VIII,1 No. 19 and VIII,3 No. 153, which, among other things, record poems delivered in honour of the Goddess Julia Augusta: contrary to what is usually thought, these two inscriptions seem to be Claudian (I will discuss this evidence in a forthcoming article).

'since the Senate and the god Augustus thought that she, who had been honoured with sacred law before she became immortal, was worthy of deification and deified her'.¹⁴

That the rededication of the temple of Nemesis is indeed associated with Claudian policy is suggested by a fragmentary statue base honouring the emperor, which was found in front of the temple.¹⁵ Rather than being evidence for Claudius' devotion to Nemesis as the popular goddess of Roman competitions and games,¹⁶ this pedestal should, in my view, be seen as further testimony for the emperor's support for the association of Livia with the ancient cult of Nemesis. One should note that Claudius, though he never came to Athens himself, is recorded as the recipient of at least eight honorific statues in the city, one of which assimilated him to Apollo Patroos in the Agora.¹⁷ Between Augustus and Hadrian, no emperor is known to have been given more dedications in Athens than Claudius. His public image was further enhanced by the institution of games for the ruling emperor, the *Sebastoi agones*, in A.D. 41, and it seems to have been during his reign also that the Great Panathenaia festival was associated with the Imperial cult for the first time, being then called *Megala Panathenaia Sebastai*.¹⁸ However, Claudius not only received honours from the Athenians but he also benefited their city in various ways. His contributions to the restoration of the city include the construction of a new stairway leading to the Propylaea on the Acropolis as

¹⁴ I.Ephesos 17,63 ff.; transl. Price (above n. 3), 70.

¹⁵ IG II² 3275 (cf. SEG XXXI 165); Pouilloux (above n. 5), 157 f. No. 47, who suggests that the participle *μετέχοντες* at the beginning might refer to the Athenians sharing the benefits of the Emperor.

¹⁶ Thus Pouilloux (above n. 5), 157 f. No. 47. For a thorough discussion of the widely attested association of Nemesis with *munus*, *venatio*, etc., see Hornum (above n. 7), 43 ff.; for the Greek world, see L. Robert, *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec*, Paris 1940, *passim*.

¹⁷ IG II² 3268–70 (A.D. 41), 3271–72 (A.D. 42), 3273–74, 3276 (not datable precisely). Apollo Patroos: 3274 (for the dedicator, a priest of Claudius, see K. Clinton, in: *The Romanization of Athens* [above n. 8], 169 f.; for a possible priesthood of Claudius at Eleusis, cf. Clinton *ibid.* 170). Further discussion of the evidence in D. J. Geagan, *AJPh* 100 (1979) 279 ff.; *Id.*, in: *Πρακτικὰ* (above n. 1), 70; M. C. Hoff, *AA* 1994, 113.

¹⁸ Full discussion of the epigraphic evidence in Spawforth (above n. 8), 190 with footnotes 49–50.

well as the restoration to the Athenians of a number of statues plundered by Gaius.¹⁹

The Julio-Claudian period in Athens is characterized by the conservation and restoration, even transplantation, of old temples, shrines and other monuments not only in the city but also in the countryside.²⁰ The reasons for such undertakings could vary from case to case, but usually they would have been carried out in conformity to Imperial ideology and with the sponsorship of local agents and magnates backed by the Imperial regime. Architecture and religion were among the most important propagandistic tools in Augustan Rome, and it is surely conceivable that what was happening in the urban context of Rome could also be related to Athens. In the words of Susan Walker, "The reason for creating, as it were, a sacred museum of religious art and architecture at Athens may be sought in the role played by the classical *polis* in Augustan moral propaganda, a role very clearly seen in the art and architectural decoration of Augustan Rome".²¹

It seems plausible that the rebuilding of the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous also belonged, ideologically at least, to an extensive programme of restoration that had been launched earlier, but whether it should also be associated with an epigraphically attested plan to restore damaged sanctuaries in and around Athens, is difficult to say, for the date of this document is in dispute.²² What seems certain, however, is that the temple had been in need of renovation for a long while, perhaps as many as c. 240 years (if it had been deliberately damaged by Philip V of Macedon in 200 B.C.).²³ Another

¹⁹ Propylaia: D. J. Geagan, in: ANRW II:7,1 (1979) 384; T. L. Shear, Jr., *Hesperia* 50 (1981) 367. Return of statues: Paus. 9,27,3; Dio 60,6,8; in fact, many existing statue bases do record the restoration by the emperor.

²⁰ For a survey, see Shear (above n. 19), 358–368; W. B. Dinsmoor, Jr., *Hesperia* 51 (1982) 410 ff.

²¹ In: *The Romanization of Athens* (above n. 8), 72; cf. also M. Osanna, *Ostraka* 4 (1995) 109 f.

²² IG II² 1035. G. R. Culley, *Hesperia* 44 (1975) 207 ff. and *ibid.* 46 (1977) 282 ff. suggested a date between 10/9 and 3/2 B.C., whereas Shear (above n. 19), 366 f. opted for the period between A.D. 41 and 61. A post-Sullan date between 74/3 and 65/4 B.C. was proposed by J. von Freeden, *Οἰκία Κυρρήστου. Studien zum sogenannten Turm der Winde in Athen* (*Archaeologica* 29), Rome 1983, 157 ff., esp. 174. For a list of estimates (varying by some 300 years) proposed before 1975, see Culley, *Hesperia* 44 (1975) 217 n. 18, and for more recent discussions, see the indices of SEG.

²³ Miles (above n. 1), 235 f.

question is when the repairs were actually begun. Though the possibility cannot be excluded that the rebuilding had already started before A.D. 41/42, the date of the completion of the project can be deduced. The location of the rededication to Livia on the central block of the architrave of the east front suggests that it can be dated to the final phase of the repairs, which means that the temple cannot have been completed until A.D. 45/46. The restoration itself must have been a costly and arduous task (involving considerable – and time-consuming – rebuilding of the east end), but the quality of workmanship is described as often being far from good,²⁴ which seems to point to a hastily executed project. Thus, one may assume that the work of rebuilding was started only after Livia's deification in A.D. 42 or, perhaps, in the aftermath of Claudius' accession in A.D. 41, to be then completed by A.D. 45/46. However, this should not be taken to mean that the idea of having the temple rededicated to Livia had arisen at the same time, for it may be that the association of Livia with Nemesis goes back to earlier Imperial ideology (see below).

If, as it seems, the choice of Rhamnous as the place for the cult of Livia can be explained only by her association with Nemesis, why, then, was the cult not transferred and the temple transplanted to somewhere in central Athens so as to manifest Livia's divinity more effectively? There is indeed some evidence for 'itinerant temples' and other transplanted buildings in early Imperial Athens.²⁵ However, even if old architectural elements were brought to Athens from, at least, Acharnae, Sounion, and Thorikos, to be re-used in the Agora, only one *entire* rural temple is known to have been moved to the city, namely the temple of Ares (but even this building included additions from the temple of Poseidon in Sounion; see below).²⁶ It seems, on the whole, that this phenomenon cannot have been very common. Moreover, the stone by stone transfer of the temple of Nemesis to Athens would surely have protracted its rededication to Livia considerably, which, in turn, cannot have been what Claudius originally meant. As we have seen, the temple was

²⁴ Miles (above n. 1), 236, 239.

²⁵ Above n. 20. For the notion of the 'itinerant temples' (as Homer Thompson used to style them: AJA 66 [1962] 200) being associated with Imperial cults, see Alcock (above n. 3), 191 ff. Cf., however, below n. 39.

²⁶ Moreover, as M. Korres and H. R. Goette, *Horos* 10–12 (1992–98) 83 ff., 105 ff., 111 ff. have argued, it may be rather that the material used in the rebuilding of the Ares temple was brought from the rural temple of Athena Pallenis at Pallene.

probably planned to be ready for rededication as soon as possible after A.D. 41/42. What counted most, after all, was the assimilation of Livia to Nemesis. That this goddess resided at Rhamnous seems to have been, from the ideological point of view, a matter of secondary importance.

Since cult implies priesthood, one would expect that Livia's new cult was also served by a priestess. Though no evidence for such an institution survives, it might be useful to discuss a fragmentary seating inscription from the sixteenth row of the Theatre of Dionysus in Athens, where V. Petrakos has proposed the restoration 'the priestess of Nemesis at Rhamnous'.²⁷ Considering, however, that the document, which is of Imperial date, probably either coincides with, or postdates, the repairs of the temple of Livia/Nemesis in A.D. 45/46, the possibility cannot be excluded that the seat in the theatre was reserved for the priestess of the 'Goddess Julia/Livia at Rhamnous'. If this goddess had a temple with cult, she must have had a priestess as well, and it would have been peculiar if this priestess was not entitled to have a proper seat in the theatre. Two seats for priestesses of 'Livia' and 'Hestia on the Acropolis, Livia and Julia' are also known from the theatre,²⁸ as are those for many other priests and priestesses of the Imperial cult. In any case, the qualification 'at Rhamnous', whether used of Nemesis or Livia, probably served to distinguish a Rhamnountine cult from an Athenian one. As we have seen, Livia had cults in the city of Athens, and the same may be true of Nemesis, if a number of Athenian dedications to the goddess are taken to prove this.²⁹

Interestingly, another seating inscription in the front row of the Theatre of Dionysus shows that an otherwise unattested goddess, called Ourania Nemesis, also had a priest (not priestess).³⁰ Perhaps this was the Athenian version of Nemesis (or one of the Athenian versions). The problem is, however, that the inscription may be as late as Severan, and it may show a newly introduced, or modified, or even revived, cult in Athens (the goddess's name is engraved over an earlier text, which suggests that the seat of some other priesthood

²⁷ IG II² 5143 (cun. III dexter, ordo XVI); V. Petrakos, in: Φίλια Ἔπη. Studies G. E. Mylonas II, Athens 1987, 325: [ἱερείας Νεμέσεως] ἐν Ῥαμ[νοῦντι].

²⁸ IG II² 5096, 5161.

²⁹ IG II² 4747, 4865. By contrast, the name *Nemesia* for an Athenian festival of the dead is not valid evidence, for it may result from an ancient textual corruption in Dem. 41,11, where, according to R. Parker, *Athenian Religion. A History*, Oxford 1996, 247 n. 101, one should rather read *Genesisia*. The agonistic *Nemesia* at Rhamnous are another thing.

³⁰ IG II² 5070.

was given over to that of Ourania Nemesis).³¹ What relation Ourania Nemesis had with Rhamnous, is difficult to say. However, considering that from ancient times the cult statue of the Rhamnountine Nemesis had been compared to various types of Aphrodite,³² the epithet of the goddess might point to an association with Aphrodite Ourania, the 'Heavenly Aphrodite', originally (perhaps) an oriental goddess, whose public worship is attested in Athens by c. 500 B.C.³³

* * *

Considering that Nemesis was mostly regarded as the personification of divine retribution and the avenger of *hybris*, it seems to me that the association of Livia with Nemesis should be explained as a variation on – and continuation of – the theme of vengeance, which in Roman minds went back to the disastrous battle of Carrhae in 53 B.C. Not only were Crassus' legions defeated by the Parthians in that fight, but the legionary standards remained in the enemy's hands. This was a terrible shock to the Romans, which was to have long-lasting effects in many fields of Roman society. The recovery of the lost standards became one of the major themes of Rome's eastern policy (and an important topic in Augustan poetry), and it was widely used for propagandistic purposes.

The idea of the Roman god of war avenging the Parthians would have been conceived some time after the catastrophe, perhaps as early as by Julius Caesar who may have vowed to build a temple to Mars if the Parthians were beaten.³⁴ However, it was not until 20 B.C., following Augustus' diplomatic success, that the standards were finally returned, and this was also the justification for Mars to be accorded the epithet *Ultor*, Avenger (which begins to appear on coins from 19 B.C.). Furthermore, in the famous vow allegedly uttered at Philippi in 42 B.C., Octavian had announced that Mars would

³¹ M. Maass, *Die Prohedrie des Dionysostheaters in Athen* (Vestigia 15), München 1972, 57 f., 134, Pl. XIX.

³² Plin. nat. 36,17 (and his sources), with W. Ehrhardt, *Antike Kunst* 40 (1997) 30 ff.; see also Suda s.v. 'Ραμνουσία Νέμεσις.

³³ Parker (above n. 29), 196 f. For her cult and the sanctuary in the northwest corner of the Agora, see M. Osanna, *ASAtene* 66–67 (1988–89) 73 ff. The epithet *Ourania* is rarely attested for other goddesses: E. Wüst, *RE IX A* (1961), 935 ff.

³⁴ Thus S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, Oxford 1971, 130 ff. The planned temple of Mars: Suet. Iul. 44,1. There is, however, no evidence to suggest that Caesar had already thought of the title *Ultor*.

become *Ultor* if he helped the young Caesar avenge the murder of his adoptive father. In 19 B.C., after Augustus' return to Rome, the standards were to be deposited in a round sanctuary of Mars Ultor on the Capitol. However, this plan was rejected soon after, and instead it was decided to build a temple to the god in a new forum. While the never-built Ultor temple on the Capitol was originally intended to house the standards (thus fulfilling the vengeance on the Parthians), the new temple of the Forum Augustum was to be given to Mars Ultor as the avenger of Caesar, as well.³⁵

Reflections of what happened in Rome soon followed in Athens. A round temple to the goddess Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis was dedicated, most probably in 19 B.C., that is, during the Emperor's last visit to Athens. Recent research plausibly suggests that there was a link between the projects in Rome and Athens, respectively, and indeed it would seem as if the Capitoline plan had served as a model for the Athenian one.³⁶ If so, one could assume that Augustus not only brought the standards to Athens but they were in the city during his stay there in 19 B.C. It is even possible that the standards (or their copies) were exhibited in the Acropolis monopteros.³⁷ Be that as it may, the Temple of Roma and Augustus was plausibly planned to recall the Augustan 'victory' over the Parthians, which culminated in the return of the lost standards. It also deserves to be underlined that the temple was located on the Acropolis which, for the most part, can be read as a panhellenic victory monument over the barbarian East. Considering, moreover, that the new temple was located east of the Parthenon, being aligned along its east-west axis, it is surely a justifiable assumption that Rome's victory over Parthia was intentionally compared with that of the

³⁵ See M. Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums* (Archäologie und Geschichte 9), Heidelberg 1999, 64, 69, 84, 254 f., 360. This book provides thorough reading on all that concerns the Temple of Mars Ultor, its dedication and the ideology behind it. For the non-existence of a temple of Mars Ultor on the Capitol, see *ibid.* p. 62 ff., and also the convincing arguments of J. W. Rich, *PBSR* 66 (1998) 79 ff.

³⁶ P. Baldassarri, Σεβαστῶι Σωτήρι. *Edilizia monumentale ad Atene durante il saeculum Augustum* (Archaeologica 128), Roma 1998, 58 ff. (earlier in *Ostraka* 4 [1995] 69 ff.); T. Schäfer, *Spolia et signa: Baupolitik und Reichskultur nach dem Parthererfolg des Augustus* (Nachr. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen; phil.-hist. Kl. 1998,2), 58 f., arguing that the Athenians could hardly have started building the monopteros without knowledge of the Capitoline plan.

³⁷ Schäfer (above n. 36), 63 ff.

Athenians over Persia, thus producing a new allusion to the west's triumph over the east.³⁸ What is more, in view of the decisive role of Mars Ultor in the Parthian question, the Acropolis monopteros can surely be taken as homage to this god as well.

Significantly, Mars Ultor also received a temple of his own in Athens, for the above-mentioned transplantation of the Ares Temple in the Agora can only be explained as "a centrally inspired project intended chiefly to pay homage to the Roman god of war".³⁹ As I argue elsewhere,⁴⁰ the decision to praise Mars Ultor in Athens probably goes back to around 20 B.C., being thus contemporaneous with the building of the Acropolis monopteros. The Temple of Ares/Mars, the rebuilding of which may have been completed some years after the dedication of Agrippa's Odeion in c. 16/15 B.C., was later ideologically connected with the eastern mission of the young Gaius Caesar in 2 B.C., which coincides with the year of the dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor in Rome. It was planned that Gaius should lead a campaign against the Parthians and negotiate with them,⁴¹ and so an Athenian inscription aptly hailed him as the "New Ares", an appellation which ideologically assimilated him to Mars Ultor and which is clearly echoed in Augustan poetry, Ovid in particular.⁴² Later, in A.D. 17–20, the same honour was given to Drusus Caesar.⁴³ All this was done in the name of Imperial propaganda so as to praise Mars Ultor, the Avenger of Rome's enemies, the Parthians in particular.

Since the Parthian threat was by no means ended by Augustus but continued to be felt in Rome, it would not appear strange if the theme of vengeance on the Parthians was revived with the rededication of the Temple

³⁸ J. M. Hurwit, *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*, Cambridge 1999, 280. See also below at n. 49.

³⁹ Spawforth (above n. 8), 188, arguing that the temple was not originally linked with the Imperial cult.

⁴⁰ Above n. 4.

⁴¹ In reality, however, Gaius' mission was in the nature of ceremony and propaganda, for in 2 B.C. the Parthian problem was not imminent, cf. R. Syme, *History in Ovid*, Oxford 1978, 8 ff.; E.S. Gruen, *CAH X²* (1996), 160 f.

⁴² Cf. *Ov. ars* 1,171 ff. (*passim*).

⁴³ Gaius: *IG II²* 3250. Drusus: *IG II²* 3257; G.W. Bowersock, in: F. Millar – E. Segal (eds), *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, Oxford 1984, 173.

of Nemesis to Livia in Claudian Athens. As a matter of fact, there was a threat of war with the Parthian state in the early 40s because the long-disputed question of the dominion over Armenia was becoming aggravated again.⁴⁴ So the 'eternal' Parthian problem was acute and imminent under Claudius, as it had been before, and as it was to be later. In addition to the reflections of the problem in art and architecture (cf. also n. 51), one could mention a whole series of episodes and events where the Parthians, as adversaries of the Romans, were equated with the Persians fighting against the Athenians. This evidence, which has been recently studied by Antony Spawforth,⁴⁵ extends from Augustan times to the third century. Here it may suffice to recall the *naumachia* organized in Rome in 2 B.C. (on the occasion of the dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor), the purpose of which was to re-enact the victory of the Athenian navy over the Persians at Salamis; significantly, we know that similar sea battles were staged in Athens.⁴⁶ Later, in A.D. 39, Emperor Gaius orchestrated a bizarre triumphal procession on a bridge of boats in the Bay of Naples. Besides the display of the Parthian Darius (an Arsacid living in Rome as hostage), it was said that the bridge imitated the one once built by Xerxes across the Hellespont on his invasion of Europe. According to Dio, Gaius "made all manner of fun of them [i.e., Darius and Xerxes], claiming that he had bridged a far greater expanse of sea than they had done".⁴⁷ Another sea battle between the Athenians and the Persians was staged by Nero in Rome in about A.D. 58,⁴⁸ just before his Armenian war. Remarkably, this war against the Parthians is reflected in the famous Parthenon inscription in honour of Nero from A.D. 61/62, which may be interpreted as a monumental expression for Greek (and now also Roman) struggle against the barbarians.⁴⁹ With that dedication, the Athenians probably wished for success for Nero's campaign against the enemy (who

⁴⁴ For the background and the Claudian policy, see Levick (above n. 11), 159.

⁴⁵ A. Spawforth, in: S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, 233 ff.

⁴⁶ IG II² 1006, 29 f.; A. Chaniotis, in: J. Assmann (ed.), *Das Fest und das Heilige* (Studien zum Verstehen fremder Religionen 1), Gütersloh 1991, 124, 130.

⁴⁷ Dio 59,17 (trans. E. Cary, Loeb ed.). Suet. Gaius 19 reported two further reasons for the work; cf. also Jos. AJ 19,5 f.

⁴⁸ Dio 61,9,5; cf. Suet. Nero 12,1.

⁴⁹ IG II² 3277; Spawforth (above n. 45), 234-237; cf. also K. Carroll, *The Parthenon Inscription* (Greek, Roman and Byzantine Monographs 9), Durham, NC 1982, 67 ff.

they identified with the Persians of the past), but the whole affair was also a clear reflection of Imperial propaganda. Finally, to cite a later example, it was hardly accidental that the *tropaeum*, which Trajan had erected at Adamklissi (in modern Rumania) in A.D. 109 to celebrate his victory over the Dacian barbarians, was dedicated to Mars Ultor.⁵⁰

On the whole, there is a great deal of evidence, literary, epigraphical, and archaeological, to show that from the Late Republic, the Parthians were regarded as hereditary adversaries of the Romans. Besides the city of Rome, this hostility was manifested in a conspicuous way in the Greek East, Athens in particular, where the Parthians came to be assimilated with the Persians. The same comparison is implicit in Augustan poetry as well, especially in Horace who used to style the Parthians as *Medi* or *Persi*.⁵¹ It seems to me that the rededication of the Temple of Nemesis to Livia should be taken as a further instance of the Imperial ideology propagating the idea of the vengeance on the Parthians. It is worth noting, moreover, that the hoplite general Demostratus, who is mentioned in the dedication to Livia, was priest of the cult of Roma and Augustus. This cult was practised at the monopteros on the Acropolis, certainly one of the most visible places in Athens to carry on propaganda for the Augustan victory over the Parthians (see above).

* * *

Though Mars Ultor was the principal avenger of the Parthians, there is clear evidence for Nemesis in that same role. Before discussing the Augustan evidence, attention should be paid to a remarkable testimony that comes from the sanctuary at Rhamnous, that is, the famous cult image of the goddess carved by Agoracritus of Paros in c. 430 B.C. According to some ancient sources,⁵² this statue was sculpted from the block of Parian marble which the

⁵⁰ CIL III 12467; N. Hannestad, *Roman Art and Imperial Policy* (Jutland Archaeol. Soc. Publ. 19), Aarhus 1986, 171 f.

⁵¹ Hor. *carm.* 1,2,22.51, etc. For the Parthian theme in art and architecture, see R. M. Schneider, *Bunte Barbaren. Orientalstatuen aus farbigem Marmor in der römischen Repräsentationskunst*, Worms 1986, 29 ff., 63 ff.; Schäfer (above n. 36), *passim*, and for the Parthians assimilated to the Persians, see, besides the work of Spawforth (above n. 45), J.-L. Ferrary, in: A. Giardina (ed.), *Convegno per Santo Mazzarino (Saggi di Storia Antica 13)*, Roma 1998, 128 ff.; Spannagel (above n. 35), 229 f.

⁵² Paus. 1,33,2 f. (he attributed the statue to Phidias, Agoracritus' teacher); *API.* 16,221 f.,

Persians had ordered to be brought from Paros to Athens during an expedition by sea in 490 B.C. The barbarians, it was told, intended to commemorate their future success by erecting a victory stele made of that very block in Athens. Later, in commemoration of the Athenian victory at Marathon, the stone would have been used as material for the image of Nemesis at Rhamnous. The goddess thus became the symbol of vengeance on Persian hybris. This, of course, sounds like an aetiological legend, and so it has usually been explained. However, the recent study of the remains of the statue by Wolfgang Ehrhardt seems to suggest that the story may well be true.⁵³ What is certain, in any case, is that the role of Nemesis as the avenger of the Persians was included in the ideological message of the cult image as early as the fifth century B.C. It is even possible that the cult statue in the extreme northeast of Attica had even been originally set up so that it faced the eastern barbarians, as did the chryselephantine image of Athena Parthenos in the east room of the Parthenon, and, obviously, the statues of Roma and Augustus in the Acropolis monopteros. At any rate, the cult, also including a new temple, was flourishing by the 420s B.C., and it may be that, in the aftermath of Marathon, the powerful, victorious, and avenging figure of Nemesis was used by the Athenians as a propagandistic tool in the Peloponnesian Wars as well.⁵⁴

Though the cult of Nemesis had indisputably declined by the Roman period, it does not follow, of course, that the statue of the goddess was abandoned. Surely it continued to be kept inside the temenos, just as the ancient idea of Nemesis as the avenger of the Persians would have still endured in the Julio-Claudian period. When Livia entered the temple, her own cult statue would have been brought in, which should not mean, however, that Nemesis was removed. What is remarkable in this context is that Livia was associated with Nemesis to the extent that a reduced version of the goddess's statue with Livia's head was also made; this, in turn, resulted in a

263 (222 = The Garland of Philip I, 296 No. XV [Parmenion]; 263 = Further Greek Epigrams 377 No. LXXI). A close Latin version of APl. 263 is found in Auson. epigr. 42 p. 328 (= No. 22 ed. Green); cf. further Aristid. 12 (p. 203 Dind.); Auson. epist. 27,53 ff. p. 278 (No. 24,45 ff. ed. Green).

⁵³ See above (n. 32), 29 ff., esp. 36 f. Ehrhardt's hypothesis is founded on the admirable analysis of the fragments by G. Despinis and V. Petrakos.

⁵⁴ Ehrhardt (above n. 32), 37; cf. also K. D. Shapiro Lapatin, *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 118 f.

series of replicas available in Rome and elsewhere.⁵⁵ Thus, the Avenger of the Persians would have been identified with the Avenger of the Parthians not only in ideological terms but also concretely, in marble.

In this context, it deserves to be mentioned that a statue of Nemesis is recorded as having been erected somewhere on the Capitolium in Rome, but what relation, if any, it had with the image of Rhamnous, is unknown.⁵⁶ However, though it is a pity that Pliny says nothing about either the artist or the appearance of this statue, the context together with the curious detail about the goddess's memory being situated behind her right ear, seems to point to originally Greek psychological and religious beliefs. The pardon granted by the gods for evil tongues used to be saved in the memory file of Nemesis, with the obvious hope that she would refrain from possible retribution, which, in turn, was the principal function of the Rhamnountine goddess. Pliny, of course, must have known that the Capitoline statue of Nemesis, *quae dea Latinum nomen ne in Capitolio quidem invenit*, drew on a Greek original; it is not too far-fetched to assume that it was a replica of the statue by Agoracritus, this being by far the most famous one to have portrayed the goddess in antiquity. Though cults of Nemesis were known in many places in the Greek world, Pliny and the Romans in general would have associated the goddess Nemesis mostly with the Rhamnountine goddess (cf. below at n. 73). However, if this is so, it does not follow necessarily that the Capitoline statue dates only after c. A.D. 45/46 (and, of course, before the publication of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* in A.D. 77), for a copy may well have been set up on the hill on an earlier occasion. As will be stressed below, Nemesis was politically significant in Rome from the late Republic onwards.

Besides the Rhamnountine statue of Nemesis, there seems to be a further, highly significant, piece of evidence to suggest that the role of Nemesis as the avenger of the Persians was intentionally underlined on the occasion of the temple's rededication to Livia. Archaeological and historical evidence makes it likely that an old hymn in honour of the goddess⁵⁷ was republished at Rhamnous at the same time as the Claudian rebuilding of the temple, obviously because inscribing it before the restoration would have been pointless. What is interesting, among other things, is that the text refers

⁵⁵ B. S. Ridgway, *Roman Copies of Greek Sculpture: the Problem of the Originals*, Ann Arbor 1984, 74; R. Winkes, *Livia. Octavia, Iulia. Porträts und Darstellungen* (Archaeol. Transatl. 13), Louvain 1995, 53. Livia-Nemesis is not discussed by Mikocki (above n. 4).

⁵⁶ Plin. nat. 11,251: *Antiquis Graeciae in supplicando mentum attingere mos erat. Est enim in aure ima memoriae locus, quem tangentes antestamur; est post aurem aequae dexteram Nemeseos, quae dea Latinum nomen ne in Capitolio quidem invenit, quo referimus tactum ore proximum a minimo digitum, veniam sermonis a diis ibi recondentes*; cf. 28,22.

⁵⁷ SEG XIX 222 (cf. *ibid.* XXXVI 271, with some new fragments confirming that the poem was engraved in two columns); A. Chaniotis, *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (HABES 4), Stuttgart 1988, 250, D 38. The inscription has been usually dated between c. 100 B.C. and A.D. 100.

to Datis, joint commander of the Persian troops defeated at Marathon in 490 B.C. One may assume that it was Datis who was charged with procuring the block of marble from Paros (see n. 52), for, after the surrender of the Cyclades earlier in that same year, this island was subjugated by him. The insolence of Datis revealed itself especially after the capture of Eretria, when he boastfully announced in Greek his claims to dominion over Athens. Considering, also, that the arrogant figure of this man remained an object for derision in Athens,⁵⁸ it seems as if the hymn had been republished in view of Nemesis' role as the avenger of both Datis and the Persian enemy in general. Such an allusion to the past would have fitted the occasion of the rededication to Livia, herself avenger of the Parthians. The epithet *μεγάλαυχοι* for the Persians of the fifth century B.C. would not have sounded strange in the Julio-Claudian period.⁵⁹

* * *

Interestingly, Roman coinage issues show that Nemesis began to be associated with the *Pax Augusta* under Claudius.⁶⁰ Together with the current Imperial expression *Nemesis Augusta* (which is attested from the mid-second century onwards), this is evidence for the association of the goddess with the Emperor and the Imperial House. In his discussion of the relationship between Nemesis and the Emperor, Michael Hornum concluded that "the awesome power of Nemesis, in the just overthrowing of those who merit destruction, i.e. the enemies of the state, thereby bringing victory and peace to the Empire, was, like the powers of so many other divine figures,

⁵⁸ As is suggested by the *Δάτιδος μέλος* in Ar. Pax 289 f., which is obviously a joke about Datis and his broken Greek; cf. A. E. Raubitschek, in: K. Schauenburg (ed.), *Charites. Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, Bonn 1957, 236 f.

⁵⁹ *Ἀχαμενιδῶν μεγαλάυχων* (line 11 of the hymn); similarly A. Pers. 533.

⁶⁰ The Claudian theme was later duplicated in Trajanic restitution coins, cf. RIC I² 122 ff. Nos. 9, 21 f., 27 f.; Hornum (above n. 7), 15 ff.; E. La Rocca, in: *La storia, la letteratura e l'arte a Roma da Tiberio a Domiziano* (Atti Conv. Mantova 1990), 1992, 109 n. 203; F. Rausa, LIMC VI (1992), 764. Note that the association of Nemesis with Pax may already be shown by the griffins represented on the sacrificial altar of the Ara Pacis: G. Moretti, *Ara Pacis Augustae*, Roma 1948, Pl. 33. Cf. below n. 77.

successfully enlisted in the cause of the Roman state and its leader.”⁶¹ Accordingly, in the case of Nemesis-Livia, one could say that the couple brings peace by defeating the enemy. It is worth remembering that Nemesis was associated early on with law and order as well as with justice: she had been worshipped at Rhamnous together with Themis, and she was herself sometimes described as ὑπέρδικος ‘very just’, and – in later sources – as the daughter of Dike.⁶²

The idea itself is older, having perhaps its roots in Egypt where divine figures identified with, or assimilated to, Nemesis or her power, had appeared for centuries in the company of rulers. Turning to Roman times, however, the earliest case where a ruler used Nemesis for propagandistic purposes is known from the tumultuous Late Republic. According to Appian,⁶³ when Julius Caesar was given the head of Pompey in Alexandria, he had it interred in a place which was to become sacred to Nemesis. In this way, the hybris of Pompey was aptly punished by the goddess (note that the cult of Nemesis was already well known in Ptolemaic Alexandria). A similar message of retribution may have been the goal of the *aurei* and *denarii* of C. Vibius Varus from 42 B.C., portraying Nemesis together with Roma, which might have been intended to foreshadow the victory of the Triumvirs.⁶⁴ The examples of both Caesar and the moneyer Varus clearly suggest that Roman

⁶¹ Hornum (above n. 7), 40. Among the c. fifty examples of *Nemesis Augusta* listed by Hornum, one may note a second-century (?) dedication from Stobi (AE 1939, 113; Hornum 244 No. 161), which records the donation of a statue (?) of *Ultrix Augusta* to an emperor and to the city of the Stobians. According to H. Volkmann, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 31 (1934) 59 ff., this is evidence for vengeance of the type comparable to that taken by Mars Ultor. – For another, geographically defined, collection of epigraphic and other material relating to Nemesis, see F. Fortea López, *Némesis en el occidente romano: Ensayo de interpretación histórica y corpus de materiales* (Monogr. hist. antigua 9), Zaragoza 1994.

⁶² Themis: Pouilloux (above n. 5), 151; P. Karanastassis, *MDAI(A)* 109 (1994) 130 f.; V. Petrakos, in: V. Petrakos (ed.), *Ἐπαινος Ι.Κ. Παπαδημητρίου*, Ἀθήνα 1997, 405 ff., rejecting the view that there were two priestesses at Rhamnous (one for Nemesis and one for Themis). ὑπέρδικος: Pind. *Nem.* 10,44 (for the meaning of which, see C. G. Brown, *Phoenix* 46 [1992] 95 ff., esp. 104 n. 37). Daughter of Dike: *Mesom.* 3,2 (Heitsch); *Amm.* 14,11,25 (*Iustitiae filia*). – In her recent study of the cult image of the Rhamnountine Nemesis, B. Knittlmayer, *JbDAI* 114 (1999) 1 ff. stresses that the field of action of the goddess was not confined to retribution.

⁶³ App. BC 2,90.

⁶⁴ Crawford, *RRC I* No. 494.35 (cf. p. 511).

generals, their agents and, later, emperors, could regard their enemies as *hybristeis* who would run the risk of being punished by Nemesis. Caesar's adopted son, himself avenger of both the Parthians and the deified Caesar, cannot have been unaware of this.

The motif of 'candelabrum between two griffins', which was represented on the cuirass of the cult statue of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum, is most probably to be interpreted as an allusion to Nemesis, for the griffins are likely to be symbols of this goddess.⁶⁵ Admittedly, a figure identifiable with Nemesis is not clearly attested as being accompanied by a griffin until the second century A.D., and so "it is impossible to argue legitimately that any general retributive functions of the griffin are present before its association with Nemesis, and hence form the basis for that association itself."⁶⁶ This is true in a strict sense, since we are at the mercy of the evidence, but it may well be that the nature of the evidence, as we have it, is due to an accident of survival. In any case, since the iconographical type of Nemesis with the griffin is well known from later Imperial times, and because griffins are already associated with the power of the Emperor, and with the Roman state, on the cuirass of Mars Ultor, one cannot fail to conclude that

⁶⁵ E. Simon, *Latomus* 21 (1962) 773 f. = *Ausgewählte Schriften II: Römische Kunst*, Mainz am Rh. 1998, 164 f.; P. Zanker, *Forum Augustum (Monumenta Artis Antiquae 2)*, Tübingen 1968, 18 f.; P. Gros, *Aurea templa. Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste (BEFAR 231)*, Rome 1976, 167; cf. also K. Stemmer, *Untersuchungen zur Typologie, Chronologie und Ikonographie der Panzerstatuen (Archäol. Forsch. 4)*, Berlin 1978, 154. Contra M. Siebler, *Studien zum augusteischen Mars Ultor (Münchener Arbeiten z. Kunstgeschichte und Archäologie 1)*, München 1988, 59 ff., who explains the candelabrum as a symbol of Vesta's fire being defended by two heraldic griffins (p. 66 ff.). It is true that the fire of Vesta was most important for the Roman state, and the goddess was variously related to Mars (Ultor), yet the introduction of Vesta in this affair seems to be a wishful solution, as is the association of Vesta with the candelabrum. In Siebler's opinion, the notion of vengeance could not have been manifested with the motif of 'griffins and the candelabrum'; for that purpose, the statue of Mars Ultor would have been enough. Even less convincing, in this context, is the proposal which takes the two griffins as defenders of the ruler who has been consecrated by the fire (thus Stemmer, *op.cit.* 153). Admittedly, the griffins may have produced various associations in Roman minds, but clearly the ideological programme of the Forum Augustum was to a large extent founded on the idea of Mars Ultor being the avenger of both the Parthians and of the murder of Divus Julius. The iconography of the griffin, as the symbol of Nemesis, on his cuirass would surely have suited both.

⁶⁶ Hornum (above n. 7), 29. See also C. Delplace, *Le griffon de l'archaïsme à l'époque impériale (Ét. phil. arch. hist. anc.; Inst. hist. Belge de Rome 20)*, Bruxelles 1980, 399 ff.

those griffins were symbols of Nemesis. This evidently implies that not only Mars Ultor but also the goddess Nemesis was the avenger of the Parthians. Similarly, and more generally, when Ares/Mars and Nemesis occasionally appear together in the extant sources, the possibility should be considered that, instead of referring to the world of Roman games, they may reflect the Roman idea of vengeance.⁶⁷

Besides the cuirass of Mars Ultor, that of the statue of Augustus of Prima Porta (in the Vatican) also appears relevant, for it shows Apollo riding a griffin in the direction of the central scene, which is Mars receiving a lost standard from a Parthian. It may be significant, if true, that this statue was made ready for the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C., i.e., the year in which the building of the Temple of Mars Ultor was launched.⁶⁸ Moreover, the avenging role of the Augustan Nemesis is perhaps found in a number of Campana-reliefs in the Vatican and elsewhere, on which griffins seem to be attacking the enemies of Rome.⁶⁹ Finally, in a recent article, Erika Simon has suggested that not only a detail of the southern frieze of the Ara Pacis but also the masterly Gemma Augustea (Vienna) can be taken as evidence for the role of Nemesis in Augustan ideology.⁷⁰ While the Ara Pacis argument is fairly tenuous,⁷¹ that based on the Gemma may be of more consequence.

⁶⁷ One example of this might be found in Patras, where the cult of Ares and Nemesis is recorded (Paus. 7,20,9; 7,21,10 f.; J. Herbillon, *Les cultes de Patras avec une prosopographie patréenne*, Baltimore – London 1929, 145 ff.; A. D. Rizakis, *Achaie I: Sources textuelles et histoire regionale* [Μελετήματα 20], Athens 1995, 183). This may be significant, considering that Patras was a Roman colony, and also because the cult of Ares is scarcely attested elsewhere in Achaia. Perhaps Ares represented the Roman Mars. Admittedly, however, Ares could also be associated with Aphrodite, whose cult is attested in the town. Either way, the resulting cultic couple could be regarded as based on Roman ideology.

⁶⁸ The date of the statue: Schäfer (above n. 36), 91, with references. Mars Ultor: Spannagel (above n. 35), 79 ff. For the association of Apollo with the griffin, see Delplace 376 ff. Though the griffin of Apollo can be interpreted as a hyperborean figure, with the god alluding to Augustus himself, the possibility should not be excluded that on the Prima Porta statue it could also be associated with the notion of vengeance (cf. Schneider [above n. 51], 76).

⁶⁹ Simon (above n. 65), 775 ff. = *Ausgewählte Schriften* II 166 ff.

⁷⁰ E. Simon, in: G. Alföldy – T. Hölscher – R. Kettmann – H. Petersmann (eds), *Römische Lebenskunst. Interdisziplinäres Kolloquium zum 85. Geburtstag von Viktor Pöschl*, Heidelberg 1995, 127 ff., with photographs.

⁷¹ A figure on the south frieze, whose profile is sculpted in low relief between two laureated

Simon attractively identifies a detail behind the *capricornus* sign as a known symbol of Nemesis, who, in turn, charges the Emperor to punish the hybris (*superbia*) of the enemy, and, in fact, the fulfilment of the vengeance is visible in the lower part of the Vienna cameo. It might be relevant, in this context, to mention that Capricorn, Augustus' zodiacal sign, is represented together with the legend SIGNIS PARTHICIS RECEPTIS (or SIGNIS RECEPTIS) on a number of coins struck after the recovery of the standards from the Parthians.⁷²

The above evidence seems to suggest that Nemesis really did have a role in the early Imperial propaganda as the avenger of Rome's adversaries, a role which was not manifested like that of Mars Ultor, but which becomes visible in various ideological allusions. Nemesis was a Greek deity, whose name was not given in a Latin form and whose retributive functions were closely bound with Rhamnous (even if the goddess had important cults in Smyrna and Alexandria also). The normal way in Augustan times and later of conceptualizing the role and residence of Nemesis would have been similar to what we know from Ovid: *ultrix Rhamnusia* (trist. 5,8,3).⁷³

Would it be justifiable to style Livia as another *ultrix Rhamnusia* before A.D. 42? As far as I can see, Livia is not known to have been associated with Nemesis anywhere in the extant literary sources nor in inscriptions (except for the Rhamnountine text),⁷⁴ yet if someone some day discovers an Augustan dedication to Livia assimilated to Nemesis, I would not be surprised, much less if it happened in Athens. In fact, it is conceivable that Livia, as the wife of Augustus, had already been associated with Nemesis in the Augustan propaganda. Similarly, the idea of rededicating to her the temple of the goddess at Rhamnous may have been conceived many decades

escorts of Augustus, seems to sneer at the Emperor so as to defend both him and the Ara Pacis from Nemesis (i.e. "Spott zum Schutz vor Nemesis", as the title of Simon's article reads).

⁷² BMC Emp. I 110 Nos. 679 f. For the historical significance of Capricorn, see Spannagel (above n. 35), 241 f.; E. Gee, Ovid, Aratus and Augustus. Astronomy in Ovid's *Fasti*, Cambridge 2000, 138 ff.

⁷³ Cf. Catull. 66,71: *Rhamnusia virgo*; Auson. epist. 27,54: *ultrix dea*; 27,66: *peregrina diva*; Amm. 14,11,25: *ultrix facinorum impiorum bonorumque praemiatrix*.

⁷⁴ For Livia's public role and divine associations, see recently E. Bartman, Portraits of Livia. Imaging the Imperial Woman in Augustan Rome, Cambridge 1999, 92 ff. Cf. further Hahn (above n. 13), 322 ff.; Mikocki (above n. 4), 18 ff.; also P. J. Johnson, CW 90 (1997) 408 ff. (Livia's characterization in Ovid).

before it was eventually carried out as a result of Livia's deification. Any comparable honours planned or proposed by the Athenians independently, without the Emperor's assent, would have been opposed by Claudius' predecessors, especially Tiberius.

If the public role of Augustus as the guarantor of peace and stability can, in many ways, be associated with that of Mars Ultor as the Avenger of Rome's enemies⁷⁵ – he was also accompanied by Ares in Athens⁷⁶ –, it would appear understandable if Augustus' wife was compared to Nemesis.⁷⁷ Livia's public image as the wife of the Emperor was further enhanced by her deification, which occurred on the anniversary of their wedding day.

Epilogue

The evidence adduced above strongly suggests a Claudian date for IG II² 3242, not least because the archonship of Antipatros *neoteris* is datable to A.D. 45/46. If this is so, why, then, was the dedicatee styled as "Goddess Livia", a most unusual appellation after Augustus' death? Surely one would rather expect to find a dedication to *Thea Ioulia Sebaste*, possibly abbreviated to *Thea Sebaste*, but in any case without the name *Livia*. The onomastic argument has made some scholars propose an Augustan date for the inscription, which, of course, would mean that the rebuilding of the temple was carried out considerably earlier than is generally believed.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ For the ideological connection between Augustus and Mars Ultor, see G. Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti. A Historical Study*, Oxford 1994, 95 ff., and for the god's promotion under the first emperor, D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West I* (EPRO 108), Leiden 1987, 87.

⁷⁶ IG II² 2953, related to the transplanted Temple of Ares (i.e., Mars), shows the god of war in conjunction with Augustus: Spawforth (above n. 8), 187 f.; Baldassarri (above n. 36), 167 n. 64.

⁷⁷ Since, as we have seen, by avenging the enemy, this goddess was also able to bring peace, it might even be of some relevance that the dedication of the Ara Pacis in 9 B.C. fell on Livia's birthday (30 Jan.). However, if an association with a goddess is needed in the case of Ara Pacis, one might rather think of Livia's well-known assimilation to Vesta, who guaranteed the impregnability of the Roman state. For the griffins on the Ara Pacis, see above n. 60.

⁷⁸ C. B. Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*, Cambridge 1997, 222 n. 112. He also points out that in the reference to the priest of

Admittedly, it would be most interesting if the association of Livia with Nemesis at Rhamnous could be dated as close as possible to the dedication of the temples of Mars Ultor in Rome and Ares in Athens, for it is possible that this association goes back to Augustan ideology. However, the evidence is as it is, and so we can only suggest why Livia was given the name *Livia* as late as the mid-40s A.D. If not simply an anomalous exception confirming a rule, one might assume that in this particular context the use of "Goddess Livia" drew on Augustan dedications to "Goddess Livia Nemesis", whose existence is conceivable. Perhaps there were such dedications not only in central Athens, but also around the Rhamnountine temple even before its Claudian renovation.

University of Helsinki

Roma and Augustus, the emperor is not called *theos*, which would suggest a date before A.D. 14. In reality, however, the style *Sebastos Kaisar* (instead of *Sebastos Soter*) may be taken to show that the inscription is post-Augustan, cf. Spawforth (above n. 8), 199 n. 59; it is noteworthy that in the dedication of the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis, the Augustan *Soteri* has been cancelled and *Kaisari* inscribed in its place (IG II² 3173).