Nemesis’ principal cult centre was situated at the strategically important coastal town of Rhamnous in Attika where a temple, sanctuary, and cult statue were dedicated to her. Nemesis’ previously discussed chthonic connection is also found here, at Rhamnous, with Petrakos suggesting this was originally an agricultural role involving the just allocation of lands, the fertility and productivity of that land, and the produce which grows from the earth, or in his words: ἡταν ἡ ἀγροτικὴ θεά ποὺ φροντίζει γιὰ τὴν κατανομὴ τῶν βοσκοτόπων, μεριμνά γιὰ τὴν ἰσορροπία καὶ τὴ διατήρηση τῆς ἀγροτικῆς τάξης καὶ οἱ ἰδιότητες τῆς αὐτὲς (‘she was an agriculture goddess who cared for the allocation of pastures, ensuring balance and maintaining the rural order, and the qualities of these’). As such, this aspect is reflected in the etymological origins of her name from the verb νέμω ‘to deal out’, ‘distribute’, and also ‘lead to pasture’. Whatever aspects of life and death, distribution and allocation, were her concern before and after the Archaic period, it was the Greek success over the invading Persian forces at Marathon in 490, in which she was believed to have played a seminal role, that her attribute as a retributive goddess became so firmly established that Pausanias, writing six or seven hundred years later, described her as: ‘the most implacable deity to

---

1 Athanassakis & Wolkow, The Orphic Hymns, 50, Hymn 61.
3 LSJ 1167, col. 1 s.v. νέμω, 1167; Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνόντα', 36; Theocharaki-Tsitoura, 'Η Κεραμική του Ιεροῦ της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνόντα', 42; Petrakos, 'Οι Ανασκαφές τοῦ Ραμνούντος', 273.
hybristic men (ἡ θεόν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις ὑβρισταίς ἐστὶν ἀπαραίτητος), owing to her punishing retribution towards the arrogance and hybris of Persian presumption, to be discussed.

It can be credibly concluded that the place-name Rhamnous was derived from the plant which grew prolifically in the area, namely the buckthorn bush or to use its botanical name, Rhamnus Cathartica or Rhamnus Frangula. This plant was thought to have magical and purifying properties, including purgative qualities. When chewed, it was believed the resultant diarrhoea exorcised the spirits of the dead away from the body through its power to act as an emetic. As a bouquet it might also be hung over the door of a house where a baby was about to be born to ward off evil spirits, and it was believed to give protection against witchcraft, demons, and headaches.

Rhamnous is situated on the coast of Attika, approximately forty kilometres north-east of Athens, with magnificent views across to the island of Euboea (figure 20). In his writings, Pausanias described the location of the town in relation to its distance from Marathon, and its sanctuary to Nemesis:

---

5 Paus. 1.33.4.
7 Pliny NH 24.124.
About sixty stades from Marathon as you go along the road by the sea to Oropos stands Rhamnous. The dwelling houses are on the coast, but a little way inland is a sanctuary of Nemesis, the most implacable deity to hybristic men.9

A brief account is also given by Strabo:10 μετὰ δὲ Μαραθόνα Τρικόρυνθος, εἶτα Ῥαμνοῦς, [ὅπου] τὸ τῆς Νεμέσεως ιερὸν (‘after Marathon one comes to Tricorynthus; then to Rhamnous, the sanctuary of Nemesis’).

Mythologically, Rhamnous was significant, since, according to Eratosthenes and implied by Kallimachos, this was where Zeus raped Nemesis (as part of his plan to bring about the destruction of mankind as told by the Kypria):11

Zeus, having changed into a bird, flew to Rhamnous in Attika, where he had intercourse with Nemesis, who bore an egg, from which Helen emerged and was born, so Kratinos the poet says.13

It is difficult to know whether the naming of Rhamnous in the myth was inspired by the temple or whether Eratosthenes’ had another, more ancient, source. What can be argued is that as the supposed site of Nemesis’ rape this was a mythically sacred place imbued with a potent force meriting a sanctuary to honour the wronged goddess. The sculptor of Nemesis’ fifth-century statue base preserved this myth by including a scene of Leda presenting Helen to her true mother, Nemesis,14 and thus provided a tangible connection between the worship of Nemesis at Rhamnous with the legend of Nemesis as Helen’s mother, and a conviction of Rhamnous as central in the myth. Later literary sources continued to link goddess, daughter, and place in references to

---

9 Paus. 1.33.2.
10 Strab. 9.1.22. See also: Steph. Byz. s.v. Ῥαμνοῦς, 543: Ῥαμνοῦς, δῆμος τῆς Αἰαντίδος φυλῆς. Rhamnous is not mentioned by the lexicographers, Harpokraton or Hesychios.
12 Eratosth. 25 s.v. κύκκου.
13 The poet Kratinos and his play Nemesis (PCG iv FF114-127) is discussed above pp. 152-165.
‘Nemesis Rhamnousia’, and ‘Rhamnousian Helen’: Τευκρόν ἣνίκα νής Ἀχαιών ἠπείρου ἑπάλεν ἄμορ’ Ἐλένη Ῥαμνουσίδη θημωθείσαι (‘the Achaian ships sailed to grieve the Trojan cities, angered for Rhamnousian Helen’).

Archaeologists have established that the Rhamnous area was a thriving agricultural community from ca. sixth century forward. At its peak, ca. fifth and fourth centuries, the town would have been teeming with activity: around and near to the temple stood houses, official buildings, boundary walls and fences, pens for animals, farm buildings, store houses for the produce (mainly olives, figs, almonds, and cereal crops) grown throughout the wider area, people thronged the surrounding streets as they went about their business, Athenian soldiers from the fort in the walled town-centre swaggered through the neighbourhood, children played in the streets, while pilgrims and travellers marvelled at the sights. The temple itself would have been a hive of activity with worshippers coming and going, prayers and sacrifices offered, and a priestess with assistants in attendance. The temple stoa would have been alive with the raised voices of buyers and sellers of sacrificial animals, dedicatory offerings, and souvenirs. The noise, the smells, the sights, the frenetic pace of life would all have contributed to the vibrant and important town of ancient Rhamnous with its goddess Nemesis. Today the temple temenos and the town lie deserted, isolated, and silent, with vast empty tracks of scrubby land stretching for kilometres in every direction.

---

15 Kallim. Hymn to Artemis 3.232 (translation: author); Suda, s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις (rho 33); Zen. Centuria 5.82, CPG vol. 1, 153.82, s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις; cf. M. B. Skinner, ‘Rhamnusia Virgo,’ Classical Antiquity 3, no. 1, 1984, 134-141. Catullus uses the term ‘Ramnusia virgo’ when he means Nemesis: Catull. 64.395, 66.71, 68.77; also: Apuleius, Met. 11.5; Ovid, Met. 3.406: ‘Adsensit precibus Rhamnusia justis’ (‘the Rhamnousian approved the righteous prayer’). 14.694: ‘time Rhamnusidis iram’ (‘you should fear the wrath of the Rhamnousian’); Stafford, ‘Tibullus' Nemesis: Divine Retribution and the Poet,’ 40.


17 Archaeologists have found remains of large and small buildings, houses, boundary markers, and farms. Inscriptions and graffiti left by ancient vandals provide information about the locals as well as the ethnicity and social standing of the numerous visitors to the area: V. Petrakos, Rhamnous, Athens, 1991, 14; V. Petrakos, PAAH 138, 1982 [1984], 139.
THE SANCTUARY

The first known significant archaeological expedition at Rhamnous was undertaken under the auspices of the Dilettanti Society in 1812-1813 led by John Gandy Deering, and a few years later by fellow society member, William Leake. Gandy’s work is valued for his detailed descriptions of the remains including meticulous mathematic detail in the drawings of his interpretation of how the site may have originally looked. On the other hand, it is regrettable that he failed to draw the remains in situ and in the condition in which he found them, especially since several pieces in his report have subsequently been lost or stolen: for example, two corner akroteria each with a griffin attacking a stag. Conversely, Despinis argues that the artwork on these akroteria would have been later Roman modifications since the association of Nemesis and the griffin more correctly belongs to the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

Later nineteenth-century archaeologists who undertook excavations at the site included Spyridon Phintiklis and Dimitrios Philios in 1879-1880, and Valerios Staïs in 1890-1892. Petrakos, the most recent archaeologist to excavate the site, has strongly criticized Staïs for his confused methodology, lack of academic application, his omission to record items correctly, and his failure to

22 A comprehensive list of travellers and archaeologists who visited Rhamnous in this period can be found in: Miles, 'A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous', 139-140, with notes; Travlos, 'Rhamnous,' 390; Pouilloux, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte*, 9-13.
Cult Centre at Rhamnous

publish much of what he discovered. Although important inscriptions and artefacts have subsequently been found within Staïs’ spoil-heap where they lay ignored or unnoticed by him, his lack of archaeological methodology have, according to Petrakos, made it impossible for modern archaeologists to determine their original find spots.

**THE EARLY SIXTH-CENTURY TEMPLE**

Petrakos’ excavations have established that three consecutive temples occupied the site on which the present fifth-century temple stands, with the first dating to the early sixth century. And, although the datable pottery shards have led him to confidently confirm continuous occupation of the site from at least the early Helladic period, he has found no evidence of any permanent building or structure within the *temenos* until this early sixth-century building. Conversely, Early Helladic and Mycenaean building remains have been discovered nearby, with evidence suggesting the Rhamnous area was one of the earliest settled areas of Attika.

With the exception of Corinthian and Lakonian manufactured roof-tiles nothing else remains of the early sixth-century building. The roof tiles are especially appealing aesthetically, since several have an impressed potter’s stamp depicting a striding lion with head looking back and a raised tail. The

---


27 Mycenaean and Geometric pottery fragments have been found throughout the site which still showing traces of colour: Petrakos, *PAAH* 138, 1982 [1984], 135, 143, 153; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 18.


inclusion of the potter’s name, ΕΣΤΟΝ or ΑΛΕΣΤΟΝ, under the lion’s paws, adds a nice personal touch (figure 21).30

Although early sixth-century building remains are scarce the same cannot be said for other material of this date. Amongst the finds were large quantities of pottery-shards that originally belonged to superior quality vessels; richly decorated amphorae, votive offerings, phialai, hydriai, loutrophoroi, tripods, temple accoutrements and other items all manufactured in various places but especially Attika and Corinth, all of which has led Petrakos to conclude the building functioned as a temple.31 What is less certain is the identity of the deity worshiped here, although in the opinion of Petrakos and others the circumstantial evidence indicates it was Nemesis (to be discussed).32 It can also be stated that despite the absence of any concrete evidence to prove the deity’s identity, that since Nemesis is confirmed for the fifth century, a presumption of continuity of dedicatee is a fairly safe one.


32 Petrakos, Rhamnous, 20; Theocharaki-Tsitoura, 'Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 42.
Pottery and Sculptures

Figure 22: On the left, an early sixth-century ceramic face with 'archaic smile' from the Rhamnous temple fill thought to have originally belonged to a sphinx (perhaps similar to the Athenian sphinx on the right that sat on top of a grave pillar; MMA inv. 11.185 (photograph: [left] Theocharaki-Tsitoura, museum [right]).

The quality and rich decoration of the votive offerings and temple vessels point not only to the high regard in which the goddess was held, but also to the high social standing of her worshippers, many of whom were pilgrims from afar, which proves her renown extended well beyond Rhamnous.33 An example of the fine quality of the pottery is evident in the early sixth-century ceramic face with ‘archaic smile’ in figure 22,34 which was found within the fill material of the post-480 retaining wall along with other artefacts discarded by Staïs. The face is believed to have originally belonged to a funerary sphinx similar to the one on the right in figure 22 of the same period.35 The sphinx had chthonic

33 Theocharaki-Tsitoura, 'Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνόντα', 41.
34 I.Rhamnous I 193; Theocharaki-Tsitoura, 'Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνόντα', 41-43; Petras, PAAH 140, 1984 [1988], pl. 115b; Winter, 'News Letter from Greece 1982', 53; Petras, PAAH 139, 1983 [1986], 113; Touchais, 'Chronique des Fouilles et Découvertes Archéologiques en Grèce en 1982', 752-753, fig. 17; Catling, 'Archaeology in Greece 1983-1984', 13. Theocharaki 43 has identified the face as one belonging to a sphinx: αποτελεί κεφάλα σφίγγα με αμυγδαλωτά μάτια, αρχαίο χιμάγκο και λεία και στιλπνή επιδέρμια.
associations connected with death and funerals from at least the Bronze Age, as well as a reputation as a ‘corpse snatcher’ and as an agent of death. She had close links to the Harpies, Sirens, and Keres, was a prophetess of ill-omen, and reputed to carry men towards destruction. Conversely, the sphinx was also a protector of tombs and graves, and was a frequent inclusion on grave-stelai for this purpose, an attribute she shared with Nemesis in her similar role as protector of the dead and of tombs.

Loutrophoroi were used to carry water for ritual purification purposes connected with marriage ceremonies or burial rites. The remains of those found at Rhamnous date from the late seventh to the end of the sixth century, and their artwork reveals they were largely funereal. Theocharaki-Tsitoura notes that although there were many that were closed underneath, several showed evidence of being ‘open’ (Επικρατεῖν τα ανοιχτά σχήματα και ιδανίτερα οι λεκάνες) i.e. their bases were not complete so that libations poured into a loutrophoros would flow out at the bottom enabling the dead to partake thereof, a typical feature of chthonic loutrophoroi. The pottery pieces from Rhamnous in figures 23 and 24 are from high quality loutrophoroi which still show the bright colours with which they were decorated over two thousand six

---


37 Aischyl. Seven 541; Apollod. Bibl. 3.5.8; Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, 204, 207-212. Sourvinou-Inwood, ‘Reading’ Greek Death: to the End of the Classical Period, 272-273; Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, 97-98, 99 no. 8, 401 pl. 11.8; Dietrich, Death, Fate and the Gods, 143-144, n. 6; Vermeule, Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry, 173; Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, 204, 207-212.

38 Sourvinou-Inwood, ‘Reading’ Greek Death: to the End of the Classical Period, 271. From Thessaly a sixth-century inscribed base of a column which once supported a sphinx narrates the sphinx’ protective role over the grave: SEG 15.381; Volos Museum E650.

39 Previously discussed, pp. 142-146, 151.

40 Cf. Dem. 44.18, 30, where loutrophoros is referred to as the vessel in which to carry water for funeral rites especially for an unmarried youth, inferring that the deceased was now wedded to death. Water was important in funeral and wedding rites: Eur., Hek. 611.


42 Theocharaki-Tsitoura, ‘Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα’, 42-43.
hundred years ago. Petrakos and Theocharaki-Tsitoura describe many as being decorated with chthonic snakes along the rim, with processions of wailing women, attractive floral rosettes on the handles, and consecutive rows of lions, sirens, and water birds on the bowl. Some of these features are illustrated on the shards in figures 23 and 24.

These features correspond almost identically to the funereal loutrophoros from the Kerameikos in figure 25, although the latter artist is identified as the KX painter and the former as the Polos Painter. Clearly evident are the similar rosettes, the wailing women, the lions, the sirens, and the water birds.

---


44 B. Kreuzer, The Exaleiptron in Attica and Boeotia: Early Black-Figure Workshops Reconsidered (Proceedings of the Symposium Held at the Université libre de Bruxelles, 27-29 April 2006), in A. Tsingarida (ed.), *Shapes and Uses of Greek Vases (7th–4th Centuries B.C.)*, Brussels, 2009, 25 n. 50; V. Sabetai, ‘Marker Vase or Burnt Offering? The Clay Loutrophoros in Context (Proceedings of the Symposium Held at the Université libre de Bruxelles, 27-29 April 2006),’ in A. Tsingarida (ed.), *Shapes and Uses of Greek Vases (7th–4th Centuries B.C.)*.
Figure 24: Loutrophoroi shards from Rhamnous; Polos Painter (source: Petrakos).

Brussels, 2009, 298; Theocharaki-Tsitoura, 'Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 42.
Figure 25: Funereal loutrophoros with a procession of female mourners; KX Painter; early sixth century; Kerameikos Museum inv. 2865 (source: museum).
Cult Centre at Rhamnous

There can be little doubt that chthonic *loutrophoroi* shards are amongst those found at Rhamnous, as confirmed by Petrakos and Theocharaki-Tsitoura. Consequently, I find the hypothesis presented by Alexandridou confusing. After first describing the Rhamnous *loutrophoroi* as chthonic, he later infers their association with marriage and fertility rituals connected with Nemesis. Similarly, I do not agree with Sabetai’s identification of the Rhamnous *loutrophoroi* shards as connected to pre-nuptial rites associated with Nemesis as ‘the protector of marriage’. Sabetai goes on to state that: ‘Since no funerary *loutrophoroi* were found, the cult of Nemesis should be perceived, not as a ‘chthonic’ one, but as related to the safe passage to married life’. This statement contradicts the conclusions reached by Petrakos and Theocharaki-Tsitoura, following their discovery and examination of the shards from the archaeology at Rhamnous, that Nemesis’ cult was chthonic in nature. Further substantiating evidence, unfortunately now lost, that confirms this aspect of the goddess was the discovery in the nineteenth century AD of *chimairai* shards of unknown date (called griffins by Miles), with their clear chthonic association. Nemesis’ association with marriage and fertility rites, or with pre-nuptial ceremonies are aspects of the goddess which are no-where else attested or suggested in the primary sources nor in the archaeology.

From the evidence of the ceramic sphinx-face, the *chimairai* shards, and the quantity of seventh- and sixth-century funerary *loutrophoroi* I believe the deity

---

worshipped in, and prior to, this early sixth-century temple, had associations with chthonic worship, and that the deity was Nemesis. From the fifth century forward there is less evidence of loutrophoroi shards, leading to a conclusion the goddess’s role, or part thereof, had begun to alter in line with her new-found fame as a goddess of retribution after she was credited with the Greek victory over the Persian hybris.\(^{49}\) Despite this slight role change at Rhamnous, Nemesis continued her relationship with death and the dead. As previously discussed she was the avenger of the wronged dead, since they cannot avenge themselves; she was a protector of the tomb against those who would violate the one interred or the tomb itself; she was invoked on altar inscriptions, such as the one on an altar from the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros: Τύχας [Νέμεσος; and, her chthonic nature was petitioned in fifth-century literary sources such as Aischylus Phrygians, and in Sophokles Elektra where Elektra makes a heartfelt appeal to her: ‘Listen! Nemesis of the newly dead!’\(^{50}\)

**THE LATE SIXTH-CENTURY TEMPLE**

Seemingly the goddess soon outgrew her early sixth-century temple or perhaps she was thought to be deserving of a new one. Whatever the reason, the first temple was replaced in the late sixth century by a small poros Doric temple with two columns in antis. Extensive quantities of the stone from this temple have been found within the aforementioned retaining wall fill to the north and east of the sanctuary area.\(^{51}\)

Amongst the artefacts linked to this temple is a collection of coarsely made herms, together with a pair of stone sandals believed by Petrakos to have been dedicated by a craftsman working on the temple or on the retaining wall that pre-dated the existing one built after 480.\(^{52}\) The stone sandals are an unusual dedication for a builder, so I suggest they may have been an offering from a

---

\(^{49}\) Theocharaki-Tsitoura, \'Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα\', 43.
\(^{50}\) Aischylus’ Phrygians is discussed above, pp. 142-145; Sophokles’ Elektra, pp. 146-148; altar inscription from the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros, pp. 148-149. Generally as avenger of the wronged dead, and protector of the tomb, pp. 142-151.
\(^{51}\) Petrakos, \'Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα\', 38.
\(^{52}\) Petrakos, PAAH 139, 1983 [1986], 122, pl. 107a-b; Petrakos, \'Νέες Ἐρευνές στὸν Ραμνούντα\', 16.
cobbler in the hope of business prosperity or, a dedication from a traveller about to embark on a journey in the hope of safety and protection.

One especially interesting item is the 45cm, now headless and handless, female statuette depicted in figure 26. It was found with a group of other statues of various periods in a small polygonal building close to main temple. From her seated position Petrakos confirms she is a representation of a goddess, perhaps a votive offering, and from the stylistic attributes has dated it to ca. 520. The goddess sits on a throne with her feet resting on a footstool. Her pose and dress is indisputably Archaic, with her stiff formal posture, her himation and Ionian chiton, and the remains of Archaic-styled braided hair falling down her back and each shoulder.

Although the goddess cannot be definitively identified, the evidence of a helmet dedicated to Nemesis of very nearly the same date (discussed below) may suggest this is a sixth-century representation of Nemesis. A theory possibly supported by the fact that after the late sixth-century temple was destroyed, probably by the Persians in 480, this statuette was not, as were numerous others items from this temple, consigned as discarded fill to the post-480 retaining wall, but was moved into the fifth-century polygonal temple for safe keeping. Its good state of preservation reveals it had been well cared for.

53 Discovered in 1890 at Rhamnous. NAMA, cat. no. 2569; N. Kaltsas, Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum, trans. D. Hardy, Los Angeles, 2002, 61 no. 79; Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 59, fig. 5; Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νεμέσις στον Ραμνοῦντος,' 303; Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νεμέσις στον Ραμνοῦντος,' 34, 38; Petrakos, National Museum: Sculpture - Bronzes - Vases, 62 fig. 45, 68 no. 2569; S. Karouzou, National Archaeological Museum: Collection of Sculptures, Athens, 1968, 30. Not in LIMC.
The discovery of three sixth-century marble pieces from the rim of an inscribed περιρ(ρ)αντήριον\(^{54}\) confirm the worship of not only Nemesis at the sanctuary for this period but also Themis (figure 27).\(^{55}\) The badly fragmented inscription, restored by Petrakos and dated by him to the second-half of the sixth century, although Karanastassi suggests early sixth century,\(^ {56}\) reads: Φιλόδ[ορος] ἔστ[ήσατο] Θέ[μι καὶ Νεμέσ]ι. \(^{57}\) Other restorations suggest: Φιλόδ[ορος] ἔστ[ήσατο] Θέ[μι καὶ Νεμέσ]ει with a date of ca. 470-480,\(^ {58}\) and Φιλόδ[ορος] ἔστ[ήσατο] ἄνεθ[ε]κεν Νεμέσ]ει by Pimpl.\(^ {59}\) The degree of fragmentation frustrates a definitive reading but with the majority view following Petrakos, I would be inclined to accept his reading. In which ever way it is restored epigraphers, with the exception of Pimpl, agree Nemesis and Themis were the deities to whom the \textit{perirrhanterion} was dedicated, proof of their combined worship at Rhamnous from at least this date. I have taken Petrakos’ ‘second-half of the sixth century’ date as most likely since it was he who discovered and initially analysed the three marble pieces along with hundreds of other inscribed items from the site, the surrounding area, and the town below, enabling him to competently familiarize himself with any chronological regional idiosyncratic letter formations. Another factor to consider is that advances in writing styles would have been adopted more slowly by towns and villages in the countryside, such as Rhamnous. The \textit{perirrhanterion}, used for ritual purification purposes, would have been placed

\(^{54}\) Large water basin on a tall stand (similar to a bird-bath), used for ritual water purification which were placed in various religious situations, such as the front of temples, the entrances to sanctuaries, and also in votive cult places in gymnasia or near herms. Cf. inscribed fourth-century \textit{perirrhanterion} found in the military fort dedicated to Nemesis: \textit{I.Rhamnous II} 125.

\(^{55}\) Another \textit{perirrhanterion} was found at Rhamnous in 1813 by Gandy and given to the British Museum where it remains. There is no inscription and is thought to be Hellenistic: BM 1823.0811.1; M. D. Fullerton, ‘The Archaistic Perirrhantieria of Attica,’ \textit{Hesperia} 55, 1986, 211-212; Petrakos, ‘Νέας Ἐρυτοῦς στὸν Ραμνοῦντα’, 54-55, fig. 20.


\(^{58}\) The authors of \textit{IG i³}.
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just outside the temple, and it was in this exact spot that two of its fragments were discovered with the third coming from within Staïs’ spoil heap.

This second sixth-century temple was, along with many other Greek temples, believed to have been destroyed by the advancing Persians during 480-479.\(^6\) It would be approximately another forty or fifty years before another was built, and it is the ruins of this third temple which are still visible today.

The Archaic Votive Wheel

Of all the finds from the two sixth-century temples the one which deserves particular attention is a small bronze four-spoke votive wheel (figure 28) measuring approximately one-hundred millimetres in diameter.\(^6\) Found in 1982 within the debris of the fifth-century well and with two thirds of the rim inscribed in late sixth-century Attic script, it reads: Ἑρόδορος ὀνέθεκεν\(^6\) (‘Herodorus dedicated me’).\(^6\) The straight, blunt ends of each spoke have led

---


\(^6\) Petrakos gives the diameter of the wheel as between 0.103m and 0.094m, the spokes between 0.004 and 0.005m, the thickness of the rim as 0.008m and the height of the letters on the rim between 0.005 and 0.006: Petrakos, PAAH 140, 1984 [1988], 195 no. 701.

\(^6\) IG I² 1018(4); SEG 35.25, 38.24; I.Rhamnous II 76; BE 1998 no. 138bis. The peculiarity of the square-shaped omega, theta, delta, and rho seen in figure 28 are not indicative of any epigraphical variant, rather it was easier for the engraver to inscribe small letters on bronze in this manner instead of with their usual roundness. The same explanation is given for the use of punched dots on other wheel inscriptions instead of whole letters: A. G. Bather, The Bronze Fragments of the Acropolis; JHS 13, 1892, 125.

Petrakos to conclude that these originally joined σχηματίζοντας ὄρθογώνια ὀπή [γυνή] (‘forming a rectangular hole [axle]’). This unusual shape would suggest it never held an axle, certainly not the usual round variety, and is therefore deduced not to be the remnant of a votive chariot but a complete offering to the deity in itself, as confirmed by Petrakos when he adds that the wheel is ἀκέραιος (‘complete/whole’). The absence of the deity’s name could suggest the sanctuary had a single deity at this date, i.e. Nemesis, rendering the added cost of engraving a name superfluous, were it not for the fact of the evidence of the perirrhanterion, just discussed, attesting to the combined worship of Nemesis and Themis at this date. Perhaps Herodoros was anxious to keep costs down and anyway he knew to whom the dedication was intended; what was important to him was to demonstrate his religious piety to his neighbours and the deity.

The wheel, together with the whip, measuring rod, balancing scales, and griffin only became firmly associated with Nemesis ca. second century AD.

---

64 Petrakos, PAAH 140, 1984 [1988], 197.
66 Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 38; Theocharaki-Tsitoura, 'Η Κεραμική του Ιερού της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 43; Petrakos, PAAH 139, 1983 [1986], 121-122; Petrakos, PAAH 138, 1982 [1984], 136, 141.
67 This iconography is depicted on coins from Alexandria in Roman Egypt dating to the reign of Domitian, and on an Egyptian style relief of roughly the same period: Hornum, Nemesis.
although the evidence of a first-century silver bowl from Novocherkassk in Russia (figure 29),
would suggest an earlier link. The female figure on this bowl who stands to the left holding a wheel in her right hand has been identified as Nemesis by her distinguishing Hellenistic apotropaic gesture of spitting into her kolpos to deflect bad luck.

Depicted on the bowl is a scene involving Psyche torturing a bound Eros with a burning flame whilst he looks towards Nemesis (statue?). Kaposhina suggests Eros’ torture is a visual interpretation of the pangs of love, while Edwards interprets Nemesis’ presence as a justifying witness to Psyche’s revenge against Eros for his prior treatment of her and sees the wheel in Nemesis’ hand as a ‘punishing wheel’. Faraone proposes that the scene reminds the viewer of how the hybristic and the recalcitrant are punished by Nemesis. He further argues that the discovery of the Rhamnous votive wheel indicates this punishing element in Nemesis is older than first thought and he assigns a sixth-century date linking her to

---

68 LIMC vi Nemesis 205b (P. Karanastassi); Hornum, 'Nemesis Trampling the Enemy: A Previously Unrecognized Example,' 134; S. I. Kaposhina, 'A Sarmatian Royal Burial at Novocherkassk,' Antiquity 37, 1963, 256-258, pl. xxx. The discovery of this bowl discounts the theory that Nemesis’ wheel was inspired by the iconography of Tyche/Fortuna whose earliest representation with a wheel dates to the first century AD: Edwards, 'Tyche at Corinth', 532-533 n. 16; Hornum, Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games, 25-28, 26 n. 10.

69 The earliest surviving literary reference to Nemesis and the wheel is Mesomedes’ second-century AD Hymn to Nemesis which implies a wheel of torture in the fortunes of men at lines 7-8: ὑπὸ τῶν τροχῶν ἀστατῶν ἀστήβη γαρ ὁπολὺ μερόπων στρέφεται τύχα.

70 Kallim. F280-281 (third century); Theok. 6.39, 20.11 (third century); Anth. Gr. 12.229 (third-century AD); Stafford, 'Tibullus' Nemesis: Divine Retribution and the Poet,' 39.

71 Edwards, 'Tyche at Corinth', 532-533, n.18; Kaposhina, 'A Sarmatian Royal Burial at Novocherkassk', 256-258.
'judicial torture and punishment';\textsuperscript{72} a view no-where else attested for so early a period. Since the wheel as a votive offering was not uncommon,\textsuperscript{73} and was never unique to Nemesis as attested by the numerous votive wheels dedicated to various deities with no obvious connection to punishment that have been found at temples and shrines around the Greek world,\textsuperscript{74} I do not accept Faraone’s theory.

Rouse suggests that the many miniature metal objects found in numerous Greek sanctuaries, including wheels, point to offerings made for their intrinsic value alone, similar to tithe (δεκάτευ) offerings,\textsuperscript{75} and are not necessarily directly associated with the deity; a theory hinted at by Guarducci but rejected by Cook.\textsuperscript{76} Rouse’s theory is feasibly validated by the inventory lists compiled by the treasurers of Athena which include votive wheels and vast quantities of other metal objects.\textsuperscript{77} The large variety of smaller metal objects found in

\textsuperscript{72} Faraone, \textit{Ancient Greek Love Magic}, 64 n. 105; Edwards, 'Tyche at Corinth', 533 n. 18.


\textsuperscript{74} Originally the wheel was thought to be a representation of the sun, i.e. on its journey as it ‘rolled’ across the sky: E. T. H. Brann, 'Late Geometric and Protoattic Pottery: Mid 8th to Late 7th Century B.C.', \textit{The Athenian Agora VIII}, 1962, 13; Nelson, 'A Greek Votive Iynx-Wheel in Boston', 446; cf. Cook who also includes the iynx-wheel as symbolic of the sun: Cook, \textit{Zeus}, vol. 1, 253-265. Wheel symbols have been found on prehistoric rock carvings in Egypt, China, Europe, Anatolia, and Mesopotamia. A discussion on the wheel motif in Greek Geometric art is in: J. Bouzek, 'Die Anfänge des griechisch-geometrischen Symbolguts,' \textit{Eirene} 8, 1970, 98-101; Benson assigns a Mycenaean date to the symbol: J. L. Benson, \textit{Horse, Bird and Man: the Origins of Greek Painting}, Amherst, 1970, 67-68. Langdon regards the wheel motif as a Geometric ‘linear artistic repertory’ that endured: M. K. Langdon, ‘A Sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Hymettos,’ \textit{Hesperia Supplements} 16, 1976, 61 no. 247.

\textsuperscript{75} Examples of tithe offerings from the sixth and fifth centuries: Smykythe, \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{2} 473, \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 794 (Σινας ἢ πλάντηρα δέκατεν ἀνέθηκεν); Glyke, \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 548 bis (Γλύκη : δεκάτεν ἀνέθηκεν); Empedia, \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 767 (Ἐμπεδία δέκατεν ἀνέθηκεν ; ῥόον ἅθ[α]ναιαί); Ergokleia, \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 582, \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 615 (Ἐργοκλεία : ἀνέθηκεν - -αμαρτήν).


\textsuperscript{77} \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{2} 1425 line 374 ημιπότος ἢπον \textit{προφύς} (368/7); \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{2} 1425 line 376 χίλιοιντον \textit{προφύς} ἢπον (367/8); cf. \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{2} 1426 line 23; \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{2} 1481 line 10 \textit{προφύς} (fourth century); \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{2} 1424a col. II lines 282-283 χίλιοιν \textit{προφύς} \textit{ἔχεν}ον· \textit{προφύς} χίλιοιν (369/8). Harris does not mention these wheels: Harris, \textit{The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion}, passim. An earlier sixth-century inscription describes the metal objects collectively as χίλιοιν dedicated to Athena: \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 510 (EM 6975); 'The treasurers [dedicated] these metals [on behalf of the city], having collected them; to [the daughter] of mighty-[minded] Zeus; [the treasurers were] Anaxian and Eudikos and S[--- and ---] and Andokides and Lysimach[os and --- and ---]': Harris, \textit{The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion}, 14; A. de Ridder, \textit{Catalogue des bronzes trouvés sur l'Acropole d' Athènes}, Paris, 1896, 428; Jeffery, \textit{The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece}, 77
temple sites, such as those in figure 30 from Ithaca, seemingly supports Rouse’s theory that they represent a δεκάτεν to the temple treasury.

![Figure 30: A hoard of miniature metal objects from Ithaca thought to be religious; ca. eighth century (source: Payne).](image)

A useful exercise would be to examine known miniature votive wheels to help clarify the possibilities in these theories:

- The oldest known miniature bronze votive(?) wheel was found in the remains of a large building complex at Modi on the island of Poros, and dates to approximately the LH IIIC era, i.e. eleventh century (ca. 1090-1060). It is not inscribed, and its symbolic significance is unknown, although its find-spot would indicate it had a civic or religious function.

- An eighth-century uninscribed miniature nine-spoke votive(?) wheel pendant was found with other metal objects such as bronze animals, pins and fibulae within a temple precinct near Aetos (possibly ancient Alalkomenes) on Ithaca (figure 30). Its find-spot denotes a religious connotation but the association is unclear, although given the variety of objects, Rouse’s δεκάτεν may be indicated here.
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- Olympia has yielded several small uninscribed eighth-century wheels \cite{80}, consisting of four- or six-spokes, with indications that several originally belonged to miniature chariots such as the ninth-century example in \textit{figure} 32\cite{81}, or may have been representative of one. The chariot is identified by the museum as a votive offering.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure31}
\caption{Miniature votive chariot wheel from Olympia; \textit{ca.} eighth century; Olympia Museum no. B7672 (source: museum).}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{figure32}
\caption{Miniature chariot from Olympia; \textit{ca.} ninth century; Olympia Museum no. B1671 (source: museum).}
\end{figure}

- A seventh-century uninscribed lead wheel measuring twenty-eight millimetres, now in the British Museum, was found at the Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia in Sparta\cite{82}. The find-spot suggests a religious connection and owing to its small size may have been jewellery such as a pendant, brooch, or perhaps worn as a good luck charm by the dedicant, or was given to the goddess as such.

- \textit{Figure} 33 depicts a sixth-century inscribed four-spoke bronze votive wheel measuring one hundred millimetres in diameter thought to have come from Argos\cite{83}, possibly the sanctuary of the Dioskouroi (Ἄνακες). Epigraphers

\vspace{1cm}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{82} BM 1923,0212.238, BM 1923,0212.188.
\end{flushright}
have generally restored the inscription as: τοῖς Γανάκοις ἔμι Ἐιδ[ικο]ς ἀνέθεκε. But the BM suggests: τῷ Γανάκῳ ἔμι Ἐιδ[αιμο]ς (or Ἐιδ[αιμα]ς) ἀνέθεκε, arguing that Γανάκῳ is another form of the dative Γανακτὶ from ἄνας that may indicate that Zeus and not the Dioskouroi was the intended recipient. If correct, Newton suggests the wheel was given as thanks to Zeus for victory in a race, possibly the Nemean Games. However, since ἄνας as a term of respect can refer to several of the gods including Zeus, the Dioskouroi, Apollo, Poseidon, or even to the collective gods, the intended deity cannot be confidently stated.

Considering the unconventional and rather small axle hole, this wheel was unlikely to have ever been a component of a miniature votive chariot. It may, however, have been dedicated as a token representation of one, but it is more likely that the


84 IG iv.566; Woodhead, The Study of Greek Inscriptions, 49.10; Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, 169 no. 28; Dunst, 'Archaische Inschriften und Dokumente', 139; Guarducci, Epigrafia Greca, 127 n. 1; Vollgraff, 'Ad Titulos Argivos', 29.
85 LSJ 9114, col. 1, s.v. ἄνας; Walters, Catalogue of Bronzes, 28 no. 253; Newton, Hicks & Hirschfeld, Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions, 3 no. 138.
86 BM 1880,1211.1; Newton, Hicks & Hirschfeld, Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions, 3 no. 138; Walters, Catalogue of Bronzes, 28 no. 253.
87 Aischyl. Pers. 762, Suppl. 524; Dem. 35.40.
88 Plut. Theas. 33. 2.
89 Aischyl. Ag. 509, 513, Eu. 85; Soph. Oed. Tyr. 80; Hom. Il. 1.390.
90 Aischyl. Seven. 130; Ar. Clouds 264.
91 Aischyl. Suppl. 222; Pind. Ol. 10.49.
92 Small single wheels may have been dedicated as an abbreviated representation of a chariot, making the offering less cumbersome for the sanctuary and less expensive for the dedicator.
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The central hole was the means by which it was attached to the sanctuary wall or pillar amongst other votive offerings. Perhaps it was offered as thanks for some personal victory in a chariot race or similar, in which case the Dioskouroi (possibly Kastor the horse-tamer) would be an appropriate recipient. Certainly the inscription would broadcast the piety of Εὔδ[ικ]ς or Εὔδ[αμ]ς, and would have advertised him as a good and devout citizen.

- At Kamiros, Rhodes, a sixth-century six-spoke bronze wheel seventy-five millimetres in diameter was dedicated to Apollo by Onesos, a bronze-worker (figure 34). Here the wheel’s identification as a representation of a miniature chariot wheel is indisputable since it is clearly inscribed: Ὅνησος : με ανῆθκη : τόπολονι : ο χαλχότυπος : τροφον⁹⁵ αρματο[ς] : (‘Onesos, the smith, has dedicated me to Apollo, a chariot wheel’). The flanged hub also identifies it as such. Since it is improbable that the only surviving part of a votive chariot/wagon would be this well-preserved wheel with its inscription, I believe it was dedicated as a token representation of a chariot by Onesos who personally crafted it to perhaps thank the god for past business success and future prosperity.

As a theory it is not universally accepted: Rouse argues that if a wheel could represent a chariot then the same would apply for a leg of a tripod representing the complete tripod which would be an ‘artistic blunder’: Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, 166; also Deonna, *Delos*, 341. This practice became something of a nuisance to the temple of officials and worshippers, for example see the disparaging remarks made by Plato about devotees cluttering up the temples with votive offerings of whatever comes to hand: Pl. *Laws* 202e-210a. A problematic situation which was evident in temples and sanctuaries throughout the ancient world as seen in two third-century decrees: one from Rhodes alludes to this problem by stipulating that no-one should request any votive offerings to be set up in the lower part of the sanctuary or anywhere where they would hinder people: *BE* 1948 no. 172; *Suppl. Epig. Rodio* 1; F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Suppliment*, Paris, 1962, no. 107. The second from Miletus states: ‘it is forbidden to fasten to the woodwork of the new stoa in the sanctuary of Apollo either a votive tablet or anything else, to prevent the woodwork from being damaged, nor to the columns. And if someone wishes to place any votive offering in the new stoa, he must place it against the plastered sections of the walls, underneath the stone course supporting the beams’, (trans. van Straten): D. F. McCabe (ed.), *Miletos Inscriptions: Texts and List*, Princeton N J, 1984, no. 6; Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Suppliment*, no. 123; a useful discussion on this topic is found in F. van Straten, ‘Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries,’ in A. Schachter (ed.), *Le Sanctuaire Grec*, vol. xxxvii, Geneva, 1992, 248-254, 270-271.


⁹⁵ τροφον from τροφός, archaic form of τροχος, wheel.
The four-spoke sixth-century bronze wheel from Isthmia in figure 35 is dedicated to Poseidon. It measures ninety millimetres in diameter and is inscribed in archaic Corinthian letters which read: [...\v[\i\v]θεκε Ποσειδανο [...]. Raubitschek believes it to be an individual votive offering and suggests that the genitive of the god’s name is dependant on another now missing word such as ἰαρὸν.\(^96\) In common with the wheel from Argos in figure 33 the axle-hole of this wheel indicates it would have been well-suited to have adorned the temple wall.

The inscribed sixth-century bronze votive wheel illustrated in figure 36 is eighty-five millimetres in diameter and was discovered within the surrounds of the Athenian acropolis.\(^97\) It has a clearly visible dedicatory inscription in dotted lettering which reads: Πίθεκος ἀνέθηκεν.\(^98\) Πίθεκος

---


\(^{97}\) Courtesy, © Acropolis Museum: (previously NAMA no. 6914).

\(^{98}\) IG i3 548; IG i2 435; J. S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens*, vol. 14, Toronto, 1995, 196 no. 773190; M. J. Osborne & S. G. Byrne (eds), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. 2, Oxford, 1994, 367; de Ridder, *Catalogue des bronzes trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes*, 132 no. 405; Bather, 'The Bronze Fragments of the Acropolis', 127 no. 42, pl. VI.42; possibly because it was not found within any of the acropolis buildings as such, this wheel is not mentioned in: Harris, *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*. De Ridder details two other bronze votive wheels found within the acropolis area, though these are smaller and uninscribed: de Ridder, *Catalogue des bronzes trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes*, 132-133, nos. 404 and 406. Both Traill and Osborne give the wheel’s date as ca. 480-470 in contrast to the Acropolis Museum and De Ridder who furnish a sixth-century date.
translates as ‘ape’, ‘monkey’, and was sometimes the nickname for a trickster, but without further information about Πίθακος it is impossible to know if the name is appropriate. In common with the Rhamnous wheel no deity is mentioned but the find-spot plausibly suggests Athena as the recipient. My examination of this wheel has revealed that its width is very thin, less than two millimetres, denoting its impracticability to have facilitated an axle. As such, I have concluded it was a complete votive offering and not the remnant of a chariot, and would have been displayed attached with other votive offerings to the temple wall or pillar.

Figure 36: Votive wheel dedicated to Athena(?) from the Athenian acropolis; ca. sixth century; Acropolis Museum no. 19.3 (source: museum). Figure 37: Inscribed votive wheel from Samos; ca. 580-570, Vathy Museum no. B1443 (source: museum).

- From Rhoikos on Samos an unusual and seemingly more primitively crafted bronze wheel dating to ca. 580-570 (figure 37). It measures two-hundred and fifty-three millimetres in diameter and is inscribed: Αργείος μάνέθηκε. Again, no deity is mentioned but, since its find-spot was by the altar within the sanctuary of Hera, where she was the sole deity, this would reasonably indicate that the additional cost of inscribing the goddess’ name was deemed unnecessary. The spoke ends are visibly rounded and meet to form a very smooth axle-hub and if it was the

99 LSJ Πίθακος; IG I 5 548; SEG 29.938 (Ἀριστοκλείας ἐμί τὰς καλὰς καλά | ἡαίτα δ’ ἐμί, Πίθακος [Πίθακος] αὑτὸς ἐχει). 100 Dunst, ‘Archaische Inschriften und Dokumente’, 139, pl. 55.3. Dunst mentions that the name Αργείος was a not an uncommon name on Samos. He also discusses another bronze votive wheel from Samos which is uninscribed.
remaining part, or the representation, of a wheeled vehicle it is suggested that its unsophisticated manufacture would indicate a cart or wagon.

Figure 38: Bronze votive wheel dedicated to Apollo; ca. sixth century; Boston MFA no. 35.61, cat. no. 681 (source: Jeffery).  
Figure 39: Votive wheel dedicated to Aphrodite, from Dodona; ca. fifth century; NAMA no. 456 (photograph: author).

- The ca. 550-525 four-spoke votive wheel in figure 38, although inscribed in (Opountian) Lokrian script is thought to have originated in Galaxidi.\(^\text{101}\) It measures one-hundred and sixty millimetres in diameter and was dedicated to Apollo by Phalas: Φάλας Πεδιαρχείον ἀνέθηκε τὸπόλοντι (‘Phalas son of Pediarcheion dedicated [this] to Apollo’).\(^\text{102}\) Bousquet interprets the second word, πεδιαρχείον, as ‘archon of the plain’ with Phalas making a dedication to Apollo in his capacity as an official at the chariot races during the Pythian Games at Delphi (he further suggests Phalas was perhaps a judge, a magistrate, or president of the games).\(^\text{103}\) Whatever the interpretation, this wheel with its distinctively flanged axle-hub either belonged to, or is a representation of, a chariot.

---

\(^\text{103}\) Bousquet, ‘Delphes et les Asclepiades’, 592.
The unusual fifth-century bronze votive wheel in *figure 39* from Dodona is dedicated to Aphrodite by Ophelion. It measures one hundred twenty-five millimetres across, and has a punched inscription around the rim: Ὠφελίων Ἀφροδίται ἀνέθηκε. Instead of spokes seamlessly joined to the rim and hub this wheel has individually crafted spokes attached by means of rivets (two are lost). Clearly this wheel was not part of, or was ever meant as a representation of a chariot, although its association with either the donor or Aphrodite is unclear.

The fifth-fourth century bronze votive wheel in *figure 40* is from Boiotian Thebes and measures one hundred millimetres in diameter. The punched inscription reads: Ξένων κή Πυρρίππα Καβίριο κή Παιδί (‘Zenon and Pyrrippa (dedicate this) to the Kabeiros and child’). Little is known of this mystery cult though it was linked to fertility and to young men entering manhood, and seems also to have an association with seafaring and blacksmiths. As such, it is difficult to know the context in which it was dedicated. With its broad flanged axle-hub and pin still clearly in tact there is no doubt that this wheel originally belonged to a votive model chariot.

Numerous miniature votive(?) wheels have been excavated at sanctuaries such as Corinth, Delphi, and Delos but these are uninscribed with many dating to

---


105 Dunst, 'Archaische Inschriften und Dokumente', 139; P. Wolters, *Das Kabirenheiligtum bei Theben*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1940, 41 no. 46; Newton, Hicks & Hirschfeld, *Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions*, no. 958.

106 Paus. 9.25.5-7; Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 167, 281-282.
the Roman era.\textsuperscript{107} It is undeniable that as a votive offering the wheel and other items were a tangible and visual expression of the dedicant’s piety, and given through a need to establish contact with the divine (and most likely to also demonstrate their piety). Perhaps this need arose from some personal crisis, or perhaps a prayer had been answered and the offering was given in gratitude, or possibly the dedication was made simply to appease a chosen deity.

Wheel votive offerings had symbolic and religious significance,\textsuperscript{108} and this belief logically extended to their use as charms and symbols for good luck, good fortune, and prosperity. In this regard, the wheel is evident everywhere: on weapons of war like shields in the hope of victory in the field;\textsuperscript{109} on coinage in the expectation of prosperity;\textsuperscript{110} jewellery as amulets;\textsuperscript{111} and, on religious artefacts to reinforce spirituality.\textsuperscript{112} Miniature wheels were also used as burial accoutrements to adorn the body of the deceased, plausibly as amulets for protection into the afterlife. A fine eighth-century example, now in the National Archaeological Museum in Athens, was discovered in Amphikleia (Dadi), is the body of a young woman decorated with miniature wheels and other accessories.\textsuperscript{113}


\textsuperscript{108} As an ancient motif and its various representations, see: Lezzi-Hafter, 'Wheel without Chariot - A Motif in Attic Vase Painting,' 147-158. The wheel as a votive offering was not unique to Greece. There is evidence throughout Europe, Asia, and the Mediterranean that such offerings were made to various gods in the Bronze Age and later.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{ABV} 322.1; \textit{Para.} 142; \textit{Add.} 2 87; \textit{CVA British Museum} vol. 1, iii H e, pl. (26) 2.2a-2b; BM 1842.0314.1. Lezzi-Hafter, 'Wheel without Chariot - A Motif in Attic Vase Painting,' 149-150, fig.5a. Also, two seventh or sixth-century lead votive warriors holding shields decorated with wheel emblems: BM 1923.0212.99, 1923.0212.95; a sixth-century \textit{kylix} and a \textit{lekythos} portray shields with wheels held by warriors: BM 1897,1028.1, 1836.0224.220.

\textsuperscript{110} This type of early coinage is now known as ‘wappenmünzen’ which translates as ‘blazon money’. Seltman’s theory that the symbols on the coins represented ‘coats-of-arms’ or insignia of Athenian aristocrats is disputed: G. R. Stanton, \textit{Athenian Politics c. 800-500 B.C.: A Sourcebook}, London, 1990, 61 n. 3; R. J. Hopper, ‘A Note on Aristophanes, Lysistrata 665-70,’ \textit{CQ} 10, no. 2, 1960, 242-247; C. T. Seltman, \textit{Athens, Its History and Coinage Before The Persian Invasion}, Cambridge, 1924, 18, 19-84, and passim; cf. Lezzi-Hafter who thinks the wappenmünzen wheel motif on hoplite shields led to the erroneous belief that hoplites were aristocrats: Lezzi-Hafter, 'Wheel without Chariot - A Motif in Attic Vase Painting,' 148.

\textsuperscript{111} Walters, \textit{Catalogue of Bronzes}, numbers: 2186, 2187, 2188, 2198, 2198, 2200, 2201.

\textsuperscript{112} For example, the decorative wheel-motif on the remains of a cauldron leg from Lakonia: NAMA no. 415.

\textsuperscript{113} From a cist burial discovered in 1953 at Amphikleia (Dadi) in the prefecture of Phthiotis. This burial has been reconstructed and is on display in the Karapanos Bronzes hall in the NAMA; cf. Cook and Boardman’s detailed description of this grave: J. M. Cook & J. Boardman, 'Archaeology in Greece, 1953,' \textit{JHS} 74, 1954, 157-158.
Wheel votive offerings were dedicated from at least ca. 1100. The wheels from Olympia, Isthmia, and Delphi were most likely connected with the games held at these centres as gifts to persuade the gods to look favourably upon the chances of the dedicant in one or other of the events. Wheels from other sanctuaries might represent the grateful thanks of the dedicant to the deity for the fulfilment of some request or the hope thereof. Or possibly the dedicatee’s profession was associated with wheels in some way such as Onesos from Kamiros and his hope for the god’s blessing on the prosperity of his trade. Consequently, the discovery of a single miniature votive wheel at Nemesis’ sanctuary at Rhamnous should not elicit any enormous surprise and should not be interpreted as evidential proof of her connection with ‘judicial torture and punishment’ as suggested by Faraone. Nor does it assign a sixth-century date to her later attribute of divine retributive power.

Helmet Dedicated by the Rhamnousians

The earliest documented evidence for the worship of Nemesis at Rhamnous is the previously discussed sixth-century *perirrhanterion* and votive wheel, but the discovery of an inscribed bronze helmet of a similar, or slightly later, date further confirms her worship at this early date (figure 41). The helmet was discovered in the debris of the fifth-century sanctuary cistern, and reads: Ῥαμνόσιοι οἱ ἐν Λέμνῳ[ι]νε[θεσαν Νεμήσει ('The Rhamnousians in Lemnos dedicated (this) to Nemesis'). Petrakos dates the helmet to ca. 499 or 498.

---

and connects it to Miltiades’ Lemnos campaign in the late sixth or early fifth century where an Attic occupational settlement of klerouchoi and colonists was later established.\textsuperscript{119} The helmet directly ties Rhamnous to the actions on Lemnos and indicates a Rhamnousian deme-contingent as part of the original takeover under Miltiades and/or the subsequent klerouchoi.\textsuperscript{120}

The extensive archaeological and epigraphical discoveries, under the auspices of Vasilios Petrakos, from the fortified town of Rhamnous which lies immediately below Nemesis’ temple and sanctuary, have established Rhamnous as a garrison town with an important military fort from at least the


\textsuperscript{120} Andok. 3.12; Xen. \textit{Hell.} 4.8.15; cf. Thuc. 1.115.3; I.Rhamnous II 86; Gastaldi, ‘Lemnos e il V secolo,’ 142-143; Cargill, \textit{Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century BC}, 6.

Figure 41: The remains of the helmet dedicated to Nemesis by the deme-contingent from Rhamnous (drawing: K. Eliaki).
sixth century (figure 42). The epigraphical evidence confirms the fort’s strategic importance continued to increase and by the fourth century the garrison installed there comprised local epheboi, Athenians, other poleis contingents, foreign mercenaries, sailors, and was an Attic military training centre. Ober and Petrakos suggest a two-fold purpose for the Rhamnous fort and military installations: firstly to guard the shipping lanes on the north-east coast between Attika and Euboia, and; secondly, to protect the land-route from Oropos, a shipping port handling grains and foodstuffs from agriculturally-rich Euboia, down through Rhamnous to the Marathon and the Athenian plains. The route is described by Pausanias:

About sixty stades from Marathon as you go along the road by the sea to Oropos stands Rhamnous.

Rhamnous’ proximity and excellent views across to Euboia have encouraged Moreno to conclude the fort was used as a base from which to ensure Athenian control over the island (particularly after the revolt there in 446) as well as to protect and guard the Athenian klerouchoi who settled there ca. 450. He has further identified the Rhamnous fort, albeit on the mainland, as one in a series of forts that stretched along the coast of Euboia to make up a fortification ‘ring’. Such a defensive network would have provided protection

---

121 For example, an inscribed dedication of a Herm to the Hero Archegetes dated to 550-500 and found within the archaeology of the fort: SEG 41.20-21, 43.6; BE 1991 no. 237; I.Rhamnous II 74, 77; V. Petrakos, Epign 37, 1990 [1991], 9, fig. 9. Prior to Petrakos’ sixth-century discoveries it had been thought the fort dated to the late fifth or early fourth century: R. Osborne, Athens and Athenian Democracy, Cambridge, 2010, 62; J. Ober, Fortress Attica: Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404-322 B.C., Leiden, 1985, 135-137; J. Boersma, Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C., Groningen, 1970, 83, 93.

122 Osborne, Athens and Athenian Democracy, 54; Petrakos, Rhamnous, 44-45; also, a fourth-century ephebic dedication: W. E. McLeod, ‘An Ephiebic Dedication from Rhamnous,’ Hesperia 28, no. 2, 1959, 121-126. Non Attic Greeks at the fort are attested for the third century, for example: a third-century garrison inscription interpreted by Kent as honouring mercenaries at the Rhamnous fort: I.Rhamnous II 12; EM 12968; Ober, Fortress Attica, 95; J. H. Kent, ‘A Garrison Inscription from Rhamnous,’ Hesperia 10, no. 4, 1941, 342-350. The garrison related inscriptions found at Rhamnous have been collated by Petrakos: I.Rhamnous II; a discussion on these is found in: Osborne, Athens and Athenian Democracy, 39-63.

123 Ober, Fortress Attica, 112-114, 137; cf. Thuc. 7.19 1-2; Petrakos, Rhamnous, 44; Gomme, Andrews & Dover, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, 395.

124 Paus. 1.33.2. There would have been geographical obstacles preventing a strict adherence to a ‘coastal road’ but the route can essentially be described as ‘coastal’. For comments on its exact route, see: Ober, Fortress Attica, 113-114.

125 Thuc. 1.114.1.

against pirates and enemies, shelter for shipping, border controls, and bases for the large Athenian navy during the Peloponnesian war.\textsuperscript{127} These purposes are construed when Thucydides speaks of: τὴν ὶς γὰρ Ἀττικὴν καὶ Ἐuboian καὶ Σαλαμῖνα ἕκαστὸν ἐφύλασσον\textsuperscript{128} (‘for one hundred [ships] were guarding Attika, Euboia, and Salamis’), since such a large contingent would, of necessity, have had bases conveniently situated nearby.

Alternative supply routes from Oropos to Athens traversed Ephidna and Dekeleia, with the latter the most direct and developed route with associated infrastructure such as a good road equipped to withstand heavy traffic and, no doubt, good inns.\textsuperscript{129} The loss of Dekeleia to the Spartans in 413, during the Peloponnesian War,\textsuperscript{130} effectively blocked this supply route\textsuperscript{131} (and possibly

\begin{table}[h!]
\centering
\caption{Ruins of the Rhamnous garrison fort on the hill-top with surrounding city-centre, overlooking the gulf across to Euboia, with remains of the city fortification wall in the foreground.}
\end{table}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{127} Moreno, \textit{Feeding the Democracy}, 132-135.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Thuc. 3.17.2.
\item \textsuperscript{129} Thuc. 7.28.1. The remains of this ancient road were still evident in the nineteenth century AD: Ober, \textit{Fortress Attica}, 115, n. 12. Dikaiarchos narrates that the route that passed Ephidna had good inns: F1.6-7, in: C. Müller (ed.), \textit{Geographici Graeci Minori}, vol. 1, Paris, 1855, 100-101.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Thuc. 7.19.1-2, 27.3-4; cf. Xen. \textit{Hell.} 1.1.35-36, 2.1.17.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Thuc. 7.28.1, 8.95.1-2.
\end{itemize}
also the route via Ephidna owing to its proximity to Dekeleia), which required the Athenians to look for alternatives. Thucydides informs that the alternative route chosen was by sea around Sounion and into Piraeus, and while he is silent about the option via Rhamnous Athens would have utilized this route to maintain the passage of grain and food into Attika given Rhamnous’ advantageously placed harbours lying in close proximity to Euboia just across the gulf.\(^{132}\) It was these harbours which were used at the beginning of the war to effect the secure evacuation of Athenian livestock to Euboia for safe-keeping on the island’s agriculturally rich plains,\(^ {133}\) and they would certainly have been used again as a back-door trade route for supplies.

With Rhamnous’ strong strategic position, its two harbours, fortified town and military fort with epheboi from diverse regions, I suggest the Rhamnousian fighting forces would have collaborated with their Athenian counterparts in military sorties, with Miltiades’ Lemnos campaign as a case in point.\(^ {134}\) With victory secured the captured Lemnian weaponry would have been dedicated by the different deme contingents in their home town temples in thanks for a successful campaign. The archaeological discoveries at Olympia and the acropolis at Athens of two \(ca.\) 500-493 Athenian-dedicated Corinthian-style helmets, inscribed: \[Αθέναιοι τὸν ἔγ Λέμν[], and Αθέναιοι [τ]ον ἔγ Λέμν[α],\] believed to be dedications from captured Lemnian weaponry, further proves this point.\(^ {135}\) The epigraphical letter forms on these helmets is the same as the

\(^{132}\) The harbours served as anchorages for the \textit{triremes} that patrolled the south Euboian Gulf, and as trading ports for the loading of exports and unloading of the merchant ships carrying goods for Attika from regions throughout the Meditererranean: Petrakos, \textit{Rhamnous}, 51; V. Petrakos, \textit{Εργον} 50, 2003 [2004], 12-15 for the geophysical surveys on the harbours; J. Whitley, 'Archaeology in Greece 2003-2004,' \textit{Archaeological Reports}, no. 50, 9.


\(^{134}\) An early fifth-century casualty list in Attic script discovered on Lemnos is believed to list those Athenians who fell in Miltiades’ Lemnos campaign \(ca.\) 499: \textit{IG} xii Suppl. 337; N. T. Arrington, 'Topographic Semantics: The Location of the Athenian Public Cemetery and its Significance for the Nascent Democracy,' \textit{Hesperia} 79, no. 4, 2010, 504.

\(^{135}\) \textit{IG} i\(^{1}\) 518, \textit{IG} i\(^{2}\) 453, (Athenian acropolis); \textit{IG} i\(^{2}\) i\(^{1}\) 1466, (Olympia); Gastaldi, 'Lemnos e il V secolo,' 142-143; Sekunda, \textit{Marathon 490BC}, 15-16; A. G. Keen, 'Grain for Athens: the Importance of the Hellespontine Route in Athenian Foreign Policy before the Peloponnesian War,' in G. J. Oliver, R. Brock, \textit{et al.} (eds), \textit{The Sea in Antiquity}, British Archaeological Reports International Series, vol. 899, Oxford, 2000, 67; Rausch, 'Miltiades', 7-17, esp. 8; A. J.
one from Rhamnous establishing all three as contemporary,\textsuperscript{136} and confirming an Athenian and a Rhamnousian presence on Lemnos in the same period.

Another helmet, belonging to Miltiades, was dedicated at Olympia and inscribed: Μιλτιάδες ἀνέ[θ]εκεν [τ]ο[ῖ] Δί ('Miltiades dedicated [this] to Zeus').\textsuperscript{137} Again the letter forms indicate a date of \textit{ca}. 500-493, but because of the greater significance of the Greek victory at Marathon it has traditionally been connected with this particular battle where Miltiades was \textit{strategos}. This customary attribution is unsubstantiated by any firm evidence and since Miltiades’ military career was extensive there is no reason not to suppose this helmet related to some other campaign, perhaps Lemnos \textit{ca}. 499.

Further confusing the evidence is the debate as to whether the three helmets confirmed as having a connection with Lemnos should be seen as offerings from captured Lemnian weaponry \textit{ca}. 499, or later dedications by \textit{klerouchoi} who may have been trying to emphasize their mainland Attic origins after Lemnos collaborated with Persia in 480.\textsuperscript{138} A third proposal suggests the helmets are later still and should be associated with subsequent action on Lemnos under the command of Kimon \textit{ca}. 450. These last two suggestions would exclude the addition of Miltiades’ helmet to the three with a confirmed connection to Lemnos, since he had died \textit{ca}. 489. This inconclusive debate is the result of epigraphic analyses of the helmets’ letter-forms which disposes Gastaldi and others to favour a lower date, whereas Petrakos and followers of his methodology maintain the \textit{ca}. 499 date for the helmet from Rhamnous.\textsuperscript{139}

\begin{itemize}
\item Rausch, ‘Miltiades’, 8, 13. Arguing against this conclusion is Arrington, who suggests the Rhamnous helmet may date to a decade later: Arrington, ‘Topigraphic Semantics’, 504 n. 24.
\item \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 1472; \textit{SEG} 14.351, 23.251, 50.93, 54.492bis; Hatz (ed.), \textit{The Archaeological Museum of Olympia}, 142 B2600; W. K. Pritchett, \textit{The Greek State at War}, vol. III, Berkeley, 1979, 271. (Translation: author.)
\item Rausch, ‘Miltiades’, 17.
\end{itemize}
Although invaluable, the accuracy of epigraphic dating can often be problematic and unreliable, and without additional datable evidence from other sources such as an archon name, reliance on letter forms alone can be ambiguous, especially given differences in regional and scribal scripts. On the other hand, since the helmet dedication from Rhamnous would have been offered in a military context after a victory, in my opinion Petrakos’ ca. 499 date and the connection to Miltiades’ campaign has much to recommend it.

Dedications of armour captured from the defeated enemy was an ultimate hoplite goal that was both traditional and ancient. Compare, for example, Hektor’s vow to dedicate the armour of his slain enemy in the temple of Apollo. With the exception of the Spartans who did not dedicate or display enemy armour, dedications of spoils of war served a two-fold purpose: as thanks offerings to those gods who were thought to have aided the victory;


Military equipment dedicated in the Archaic temple of Poseidon at Isthmia together with devices for fixing them to the wall: O. Broneer, ’Excavations at Isthmia, 1954,’ Hesperia 24, no. 2, 138, nos 5-12, pl. 54a; Raubitschek, The Metal Objects (1952-1989), no. 576 (IM 694), pl. 88; belt toggle IM 107, 56. Other dedicated inscribed armory of similar date, include: armory and helmets from the treasures of the Acropolis: IG i 3 351.15; Harris, The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion, 82-87, 115-119, 206-208; a helmet in the Corinthian style from Olympia dedicated by the Messenians for their victory over Mylai: Hatzi (ed.), The Archaeological Museum of Olympia, 137; Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, (Olympian helmet dedicated by the Messenians) 454 no. 6a, (helmet dedicated by the Orchomenians at Olympia) 95 no. 11, pl. 8, (helmet dedicated by Argos as a thanks offering for their victory over the Corinthians) 162, 1 69 no. 18, pl. 27 no. 18.

Hom. Il. 7.81-83; cf. Il. 10.458-464, 570. Cf. the ca. 700 inscribed large bronze statue of a hoplite dedicated by one Mantiklos to Apollo; and the large inscribed statue of Zeus dedicated at Olympia by the Lakdaimonians after the campaign against Messenia which Jeffery dates to ca. 500: SEG 11.1203a, 17.204, 28.429; Paus. 5.24.3; Meiggs & Lewis 47 no. 22; Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, 90-91, 94 no. 1 (to Apollo), 195-196, 201 no. 49 (to Zeus);

Dillon discusses the difficulties of correctly dating the dedication to Zeus: M. P. J. Dillon, The Lakdaimonian Dedication to Olympian Zeus: The Date of Meiggs & Lewis 22 (SEG 11, 1203A); ZPE 107, 1995, 60-68.

When the Spartans were questioned about this Plutarch reports Kleomenes replied that since captured armour had belonged to cowards it was unfit to offer to the gods: Plut. Apoph. 45.18 (Mor. 224B18); Jackson, ’Hoplites and the Gods: The Dedication of Captured Arms and Armour,’ 231-232; Pritchett, The Greek State at War, 292. Leotychidas, when asked the same question, added that since the weapons had belonged to cowards they were also unfit for the young to see: Plut. Apoph. 49.4 (Mor. 224F4); Jackson, ’Hoplites and the Gods: The Dedication of Captured Arms and Armour,’ 232; Pritchett, The Greek State at War, 292-293.
and, as a mark of respect and piety in the hope of further divine military support in the future. The offerings would be hung in the god’s sanctuary as evidential proof of the deity’s efficacy, and as a public display of the dedicator’s bravery, aretē, and piety. The sight of the weaponry seized from fallen enemies would be cause for civic and national pride, and confirmation of the military prowess and superior strength of those of their demesmen who had fought with such success. This civic pride is summed up in the words of Alkaios, writing in the late seventh and early sixth century, which simultaneously gives a mental image of a sanctuary adorned with weaponry.

The great hall gleams with bronze: the whole ceiling is dressed for the war-god with bright helmets, down from which nod white horse-hair plumes, adornments for men’s heads. Bright bronze greaves hide the pegs they hang on, defence against a strong arrow; there are corsets of new linen and hollow shields thrown on the floor. Beside them are swords from Khalkis and many belts and tunics. These we have been unable to forget, ever since we first undertook this task.

THE CLASSICAL TEMPLE

The defining event which more than any other increased the fame and renown of the goddess Nemesis was the Greek victory at Marathon over the superior invasionary Persian force in 490. It was at Marathon, a site just fourteen kilometres south of Rhamnous, that Nemesis was credited with having played a seminal role in the defeat of the enemy through the retributive justice meted out by her against the arrogance of the Persian expansionist aims and their overweening goal to invade and forcibly possess the land of another. The declared Persian motivation behind this act of aggression was as a means to

143 Jackson, ‘Hoplites and the Gods: The Dedication of Captured Arms and Armour,’ 230; Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece, 90-91, 94 no. 1. The literary sources are full of the importance or significance of the dedication of captured arms as trophies to the gods, for example: IG ii2 1469B lines 67-68; Aischyl. Ag 578-579; Eur. Tro. 575-576, Andr. 1122-1123, Iph. Taur. 74-75; Diod. 12.70.5; Paus. 1.15.4, 2.21.4, 6.19.13, 10.19.3.

144 A ca. 370 Apulian krater illustrates the interior of Apollo’s temple at Delphi with dedicated wheels and helmets adorning the wall: Museo Nazionali di Napoli 3249; cf. Furtwängler & Reichhold, Griechische Vasenmalerei, pl. 179.

145 Alk. F140; Athen. xiv 627ab.

146 Paus. 1.33.2; Shapiro, Personifications in Greek Art, 174; Petrakos, 'Τὸ Ναῷ τοῦ Παμφιλοῦ,' 305-306, 317-320. Fisher acknowledges that the perception of Nemesis’ involvement in the Greek victory at Marathon and the defeat of the Persians is one occasion for this otherwise rare ‘cause and effect’ concept for this period: Fisher, Hybris, 503, n. 16.
punish Athens and Eretria for their involvement in the burning, *ca. 498*, of the lower town of Sardis in Persian controlled Lydia including the temple of Cybele;\textsuperscript{147} although as a *raison d’être* it was a convenient foil to the truer objective of the empire-building, implied by Herodotos’ words: τὸ σκηπτόμενοι οἱ Πέρσαι.

Legend has it that in 490, when the Persians sailed against Greece they brought with them a block of marble from the island of Paros with the intention of creating a victory monument after what they believed would be their certain triumph: a presumptuous and conscious act of *hybris*.\textsuperscript{148} The ultimate irony, or so Pausanias relates, was that this slab of marble was ultimately fashioned into the cult-statue of the goddess deemed responsible for their defeat, Nemesis:

> The wrath of this goddess fell also upon those barbarians who landed at Marathon. For in their contemptuous belief that *<nothing>* would impede their taking Athens they brought a piece of Parian marble for the making of a trophy for victory as if it were already brought about. This stone Pheidias sculpted to be a statue of Nemesis.\textsuperscript{149}

The truth of the story is unknown but, given the route and time the Persians took to arrive on the Greek mainland, it is feasible. Certainly they were not relying on any element of surprise since they spent time advertising their presence and objectives by sailing around the islands, besieging, subduing, and enslaving populations.\textsuperscript{150} Their successes would have emboldened their anticipation of victory on the mainland and in their arrogance may have procured a suitable piece of marble for the purpose of setting up a monument once they claimed victory. Since Nemesis’ statue is indeed made from Parian marble, and not local marble, this may support the report, but the evidence is

---

\textsuperscript{147} Hdt. 5.101-102, 6.95.
\textsuperscript{150} Hdt. 6.96-97, 99.
Cult Centre at Rhamnous

circumstantial and the story remains hypothetical.\(^\text{151}\) The truth or historicity of the account is less important than the actual narrative and what it says about Greek beliefs in Nemesis’ punishing power consequent upon *hybris*, in this case the hybristic Persian invasionary force.

![Figure 43: Map showing the proximity of Rhamnous to Marathon.](image)

When the Persian fleet eventually approached the mainland it first sailed up the Euboian Gulf past Rhamnous to commit further acts of violence by laying waste to Eretria and enslaving the population,\(^\text{152}\) before returning the same way past Rhamnous and down to Marathon where they disembarked,\(^\text{153}\) intent on taking Athens. Their journey (blue line in *figure 43*) would have twice, defiantly, taken them past Rhamnous in clear view of the temple of Nemesis, the goddess who punishes the hybristic. My photograph in *figure 20*, taken from Nemesis’ temple site, illustrates the clear and expansive view of the gulf.

---


across to Euboia. Nemesis and the inhabitants of Rhamnous would have observed the Persian ships at close quarters, and also in 480 when another Persian fleet sailed through the gulf towards Salamis. Having been outraged by the Persian effrontery Nemesis’ anger could now only be assuaged by a total and humiliating Persian defeat.

The Greek victory was an enormous achievement, and probably unexpected. No doubt, it would have been thought that such a momentous triumph had been brought about with the assistance of some god or goddess. In grateful thanks deities such as Pan, Athena, Apollo, and Artemis were honoured;\textsuperscript{154} a new temple to Eukleia (Glory) was built from the spoils of the battle;\textsuperscript{155} and in ca. 436-432 Nemesis was given a new marble temple and cult statue at Rhamnous to more appropriately acknowledge and promote her elevated status.\textsuperscript{156} Despite their defeat, within ten years the Persians again sailed against Greece, set on revenge. This time their partial success was the cause of much destruction, looting, and burning of towns,\textsuperscript{157} sanctuaries and temples,\textsuperscript{158} including, it is thought, Nemesis’ late sixth-century temple.\textsuperscript{159} Ultimately, the Greeks again prevailed and the Persians were defeated in 479.

Persia and its empire abounded in wealth, prosperity, and expansive territories, yet, in their \textit{hybris}, they sought to seize the comparatively impoverished lands of the Greeks. This arrogance is summed up in the words of the Spartan general Pausanias after the Greek victory at the battle of Plataia in 479, who, on viewing the abandoned Persian camp with its rich embroidered hangings  

\textsuperscript{154} Hdt. 6.105 (Pan); \textit{IG i}³ 784, Meiggs & Lewis 18 (Athena); Meiggs & Lewis 19 (Athena and Apollo); Xen. \textit{Anab}. 3.2.12, Ael. \textit{VH} 2.25 (Artemis).

\textsuperscript{155} Paus. 1.14.5.

\textsuperscript{156} Stafford notes the ‘aggrandisement of the sanctuary’ is seemingly linked to the repulsion of the Persians’ invasions: Stafford, \textit{Tibullus’ Nemesis: Divine Retribution and the Poet}, 37.

\textsuperscript{157} Hdt. 8.53 (Athens).

\textsuperscript{158} Hdt. 8.140, implied in the words of Xerxes’ messenger when asking for a covenant from the Greeks: ‘rebuilt all their temples that I burnt’: Hdt. 5.102, where the Persians use the accidental burning of the Cybele’s Sardis temple by the Greeks as a pretext to burn as many Greek sanctuaries as they could when they invaded in 480-479: τὸ σκητότειμον οἱ Πέρσαι ὑπέρ τοῦ Πασχαλίαν σάρκωσαν τὰ ἐν ’Ελληνικῷ ἱερῷ. Comment on the evidence for the destruction is found in: Petrakos, \textit{Rhamnous}, 20; Meiggs, ‘The Political Implications of the Parthenon’, 37-38.

\textsuperscript{159} I.Rhamnous I 24-26, 194-198; Miles, ‘Burnt Temples in the Landscape of the Past,’ 124; Mikalson, \textit{Herodotus and Religion in the Persian Wars}, 224; Camp, \textit{The Archaeology of Athens}, 57; Petrakos, ‘Τὸ ιερὸ τῆς Νέμεσις στὸν Ραμνοῦντα’, 38; Theocharaki-Tsitoura, ‘Ἡ ΚηρυμαΚῆ του Ιεροῦ της Νέμεσις στον Ραμνοῦντα’, 42; Miles, ‘A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous’, 137-139. 
decorated in gold and silver thread, the gold plate, the luxurious accoutrements, and the sumptuous feast adorning the tables, is reported by Herodotos to have said, no doubt sardonically:

Ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, τὸνδέ εἶνεκα ἐγὼ ὑμέας συνήγαγον, βουλόμενος ὑμῖν τοῦτο τῷ Μήδουν ἡγεμόνος τὴν ἀφροσύνην δέξαι, ὡς τοιήνδε διαταίρῃ ἔχον ἠλθε ἐς ἡμέας οὕτω ὀξύρην ἔχοντας ἀπαρησόμενος.

Men of Hellas, it is for this reason I gathered you together, as I wished to show you the folly of the leader of the Medes who, having such a lifestyle as this, came to us so they might deprive us of our pitiful existence.  

With the construction of Nemesis’ new fifth-century temple she was honoured for the part she was believed to have played in bringing about a Greek victory. The sixth-century military fort in the town below was improved and strengthened with city walls, and it became a centre for epheboi in their second year of training. These youths participated in agonistic games held during the annual Nemeseia festival, a festival in which they would have honoured the goddess thought to have aided their forebears during the Persian invasions and in the hope of her future help in wars to come or whenever Greece was threatened by hybristic invaders. Nemesis was also honoured with an imposing cult statue with elaborate base depicting the introduction of Helen to her true mother, Nemesis, by Leda, her step-mother, in the company of numerous Trojan War notables, interpreted as an allusion not only to the Greek conquest of the Trojans, but also of Nemesis’ retributive punishment of the Persians at Marathon, i.e. Greek nemesis subduing Persian hybris. This was a theme that endured, and still celebrated in song in a first century AD Hymn to Nemesis. The hymn names Datis, the Persian commander at Marathon, a figure whose arrogance was still remembered. It would also have been Datis who, if the story is true, brought the block of marble from Paros after subduing

---

160 Hdt. 9.82. Translation: author.
161 Discussed below, pp. 278-286.
the island, to erect a victory stele, but which was instead sculptured into a statue of Nemesis.\textsuperscript{164} Datis and the Persians deserved Nemesis’ retribution:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[----- c.14 ------------]} \text{ισε-----------------]}
\text{[----- c.12 ----]} \text{δεωτα[------- c.9 ------]} \zeta
\text{[----- c.9 ------]} \text{νεοχμιαν κα[------- c.8 ------------]α}
\text{[------- c.6 ----]} \text{στειθοισα ποδ[εσσι--------]}
\text{[------- c.5 ----]} \text{دية σα Καλλιπας ανε[-------]}
\text{[---------]} \text{δία μελετη πεδ' αετ[----------]}
\text{[---------]} \text{ίνον έχοισα πόνον κάμινε[τ]}
\text{[Ητ]ορ διμως' (vac.)}
\text{[ού]τι γάρ ευπαλές ἐστιν Δάτις τ' ἁγας[. ]}
\text{[ο]λος παθὼν (vac.)}
\text{καὶ χώρα Ἀχαμηνιδᾶν μεγαλαύχων.}\textsuperscript{165}
\end{array}
\]

… new … she (Nemesis) treading with her feet … (of) Calliope … (Fate’s) providence with ever-… enduring … toil is distressed in her heart nevertheless; for it is no easy matter; … Datis knows it, having suffered, as does the land of the vainglorious Achaemenids.

**The Temple**

![Figure 44: Petrakos’ reconstruction of the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous; (drawing: K. Eliaki).](image)

\textsuperscript{164} This marble block is discussed on p. 224, and the statue on pp. 239-247.

Figure 44 is an artistic representation of Petrakos’ interpretation of Nemesis’ fifth-century sanctuary, with the temple in the centre, altar to the front, a smaller ‘temple’ on the left, and on the right a roofed well-house in front of a *stoa*. The temple was built in exactly the same position as the previous two sixth-century temples in *ca.* 436-432, although Miles and Fullerton suggest 430-420. Immediately in front of the post-480 retaining wall is a road that linked the sanctuary, domestic houses, and farms to the main town-centre on the coast below. Excavations of the fill behind the retaining wall have revealed considerable quantities of archaeological material, which has proved invaluable in providing additional evidence on the chronology, function, and history of the sanctuary and surrounding area.

The delay of approximately forty or fifty years between the destruction of the late sixth-century temple and the construction of the fifth-century temple is curious. A lack of funds after the deprivations suffered during the two Persian wars is a theory suggested by Palagia, but this seems unlikely given the apparent fiscal health of the sanctuary, to be discussed. The more likely reason is one of the terms of an oath known as the Oath of Plataia. This oath was reputedly taken by the Greeks before the battle of Plataia in 479, and included a number of vows to the gods in return for a Greek victory against the Persians. One of these, recorded by Diodoros and Lykourgos, stated:

---


169 Palagia, ‘Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,’ 62.

Nor will I rebuilt any of the sanctuaries that have been burned and razed, but I will leave them as a memorial for our descendants and as a memorial of the impiety of the barbarians.\(^{171}\)

The late date of the only extant copy of the Oath (a fourth-century inscribed stele), and the fact that it was described as an invented falsehood (καταψεύδεται) by Theopompos,\(^{172}\) makes it uncertain whether an oath in the form in which it now exists was actually avowed.\(^{173}\) Regardless of its authenticity, the temples burnt and destroyed by the Persians were mostly left in a desolate state for many years, as noted by Pausanias:

The Greeks who resisted that barbarous invasion decided not to re-erect the sanctuaries that were burnt down, but to leave them for-ever as remembrances of hatred. This is why the shrines at Haliartos, and in Athens Hera’s shrine on the Phaleron road, and Demeter’s at Phaleron, have stayed half-burnt to this day.\(^{174}\)

Hostilities between Greece and Persia were apparently set aside ca. 449 in a treaty known as the Peace of Kallias, the authenticity of which is similarly

---

\(^{171}\) Diod. 11.29.1-4: καὶ τῶν ἑρῶν τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων καὶ καταβληθέντων οὐδὲν ἀνοικοδομήσω, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸνεμνήμα τοῖς ἐπιγνωμόνοις ἑάω καὶ καταλίγω τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἁσβείας; and in almost identical phraseology: Lyk. 1.80-81: καὶ τῶν ἑρῶν τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων καὶ καταβληθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων οὐδὲν ἀνοικοδομήσω παντάπασιν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸνεμνήμα τοῖς ἐπιγνωμόνοις ἑάω καταλίγω τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἁσβείας.

\(^{172}\) _FGH_ 115 F153: ὅτι ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς δρόκος καταψεύδεται, ἢν Αἴτητοι φασοῦν ὡμόταυ τοῦ Ἐλλήνας πρὸ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Πλατααισὶ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, καὶ αἱ πρὸς βασιλέα [Ἀρείον] Ἀθηναίοι [πρὸς Ἔλληνας] συνθέται (‘the Hellenic oath which the Athenians say the Hellenes swore against the barbarians before the battle is falsified, and the treaty of the Athenians with King Darius against the Hellenes’).


\(^{174}\) Paus. 10.35.2: Ἐλλήνοις δὲ τοῖς ἀντιστάται τῷ βαρβάρῳ τὰ κατακαυθέντα ἑάω μὴ ἀναστήσανε σφικτὰ ἐδοξεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐς τὸν πάντα ὑπολέιπεσθαι χρόνον τοῦ ἐδοξίου ὑπομενήματα: καὶ τούτῳ ἔνεκα τοῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀλατρίᾳ ναοῖς καὶ Ἀθηναίοις τῆς Ἡρας ὑπὲ ὡδό τῇ Φαληρικῇ καὶ ὑπὲ Ἐλλήνῃ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ κατ’ ἐμὲ ἦλθαν μένουσιν. Plut. Per. 17, mentions a Panhellenic conference to be convened (ca. 447-448) which would, amongst other topics, discuss the temples burned by the barbarians; Podlecki, _Perikles and His Circle_, 70.
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If an Oath of Plataia can be assumed, it would follow that any vows made under its charter during a time of hostility between the two nations would be null and void once peace was agreed, whereupon a programme of temple rebuilding could commence with impunity. Whatever the reason for the delay, rebuilding began approximately forty years after their destruction, with Nemesis’ Rhamnous temple one which fell within this programme.

It is likely that Athenian capital contributed to the financing of the temple rebuilding, along with local gifts, donations, taxes, and the temple treasury. Although it cannot be confirmed whether temple funds suffered during the hostilities, the Rhamnous temple treasury had been, from at least the late sixth or early fifth century, in a healthy fiscal position as confirmed by an inscribed lead receipt for the transfer of funds from the epistatai to the hieropoioi. The receipt names the sanctuary officials, the amounts received by them (which were not insignificant), and details monies being repaid into the sanctuary treasury. By the middle of the fifth century the sums involved had increased with temple accounts specifying increased payments for the sanctuary administrators, large rental revenue from sanctuary properties, and interest-bearing loans made to borrowers, all of which was the property of


176 The Delian League treasury was moved from Delos to Athens ca. 454, and Perikles’ temple rebuilding and beautification of Attika commenced soon after. His actions brought condemnation from League members who complained their contributions were being misused: Thuc. 1.99.1-3; Plut. Arist. 25.2-3; Meiggs, 'The Political Implications of the Parthenon', 43-44; W. K. Pritchett, 'The Transfer of the Delian Treasury,' Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte 18, no. 1, 1969, 17-21.


Nemesis: 179 τὸ τῆς Νεμέσ|ξεος ἄργυριο; τὸ δὲ ἄβλο ἄργυριο : τὸ τῆς Νεμέσ|ξεος; or simply ‘sacred money’: τὸ ιέρο ἄργυριο. 180

Taxes, and possibly fines, were another source of sanctuary income, with evidence for the former provided in an Hellenistic inscription stipulating that taxes from leased properties be used to subsidize Nemesis’ cultic temple activity. 181 The deity’s wealth continued to increase so that by the middle of the fourth century temple treasury funds were substantial enough to enable her to subsidize other local cults, 182 such as sacrifices to Zeus Herkeios, 183 Apollo Lykeios, 184 and possibly [The]mis 185 or [Arte]mis. With the exception of Themis these others have no obvious connection with Nemesis, yet her largesse was such that she was able to magnanimously fund other deme cults in addition to her own on account of her considerable wealth.

Within the temple precinct stands a small building to the left and within a few centimetres of Nemesis’ larger temple. It has long been debated whether this


180 IG ii2 248 lines 3-4, 9-12, 17-18 and 21-22 (sacred money); SEG 10.210, 36.27, 42.21; I.Rhamnous II 182. For Rhamnous’ monetary situation, see: Papazokos, Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens, esp. 135-147.

181 SEG 41.75; I.Rhamnous II 7; Stafford, "The People to the Goddess Livia", 212-213; V. Papazokas, PAAH 144, 1989 [1992], 31-32 no. 15; Pouilloux, La Forteresse de Rhammonte, 15.

182 IG ii2 2493 + 2494, lines 22-23 of the latter; I.Rhamnous II 180, lines 82-90; Papazorkos, Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens, 87; Jameson, 'The Leasing of Land in Rhamnous', 66-74.

183 I.Rhamnous II 180, line 87.

184 I.Rhamnous II 180, line 85. Apollo’s appellative Λυκόας was an uncommon personal name for a mortal, except at Rhamnous where it was frequently used; cf. Papazorkos, Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens, 142-144, no. 204; Osborne & Byrne (eds), A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, vol. 2, s.v. Λυκόας.

185 I.Rhamnous II 180, line 88: -- -- -- μύδι.
building functioned as a temple in its own right or whether it served as a treasury. Petrakos suggests it operated in both capacities: originally a temple, probably dedicated to Themis (and perhaps a temporary temple for Nemesis after the destruction of her late sixth-century temple ca. 480 until her new fifth-century temple was completed), and ca. second century this purpose changed when it became a treasury. Whether it was thought Themis no longer needed her own temple or whether she moved in with Nemesis to share hers, is not known, but since there is no mention of her in the inscriptive sources after 100/99 it is probable her influence had declined by this date.

Whatever its function, the building has proved to be a rich source of archaeological artefacts, building materials, and statues: for example, the ca. 460 small headless statuette of a goddess in figure 45, and the previously discussed ca. 520 statuette of a seated goddess (figure 26). Also found were a statue of Themis (figure 57), one of priestess Aristonoe (figure 59), a statue of a youth (figure 60), and several others in differing states of fragmentation. The large number of statutory and votives found strongly supports the hypothesis that at one time in its history it served as a treasury.

---

186 Petrakos, Rhamnous, 20; Travlos, ‘Rhamnous,’ 388.
187 Petrakos, ‘Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα’, 38; Petrakos, Rhamnous, 23.
188 Themis is discussed below, pp. 261-267.
189 Discovered in 1890, the statuette measures 43cms in height; Kaltsas, Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum, 91 no.158.
190 Discussed above, p. 201.
191 Statue of priestess Aristonoe (NAMA no. 232); statue of Themis (NAMA no. 231); statue of a youth dedicated by Lysikleidos (NAMA no. 199): Petrakos, ‘Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα’, 38.
This smaller building dates to the early fifth century. Petrakos suggests a date immediately after the Persian War of 480-479, and Travlos after the battle at Marathon in 490. It measures 9.90m by 6.15m, is built in a polygonal style with local dark marble, and roofed with Corinthian terracotta tiles. These tiles and other architectural features have been found inside the building and scattered throughout the sanctuary site. The building was built on bedrock, was unadorned, and lacked traditional Classical artistic adornments, although paint-remnants indicate that the roof palmettes (and most likely other features) were painted.

---

192 Petrakos, *Rhamnous*, 20; Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 38; Travlos states: 'wurde gleich nach der Schlacht von Marathon erbaut'; Travlos, *Rhamnous*, 388; Miles chooses the safe option by describing the temple as 'a small Archaic temple', allowing for a date of somewhere between 500 and 480; Miles, 'A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous', 139.


Nemesis’ new fifth-century temple, although larger than her previous temples, was sited straight on top of and in the same alignment as the ruins of her late sixth-century poros temple. This would have been consciously done and was consistent with the traditional practice of siting new temples directly on top of the ruins of their predecessors so as to maintain continuity of the sanctity of both the site itself and of the previous temple. As a result, the new larger temple naturally encroached outwards in all directions and towards the small polygonal temple on the south side until it almost touched it; in fact the two buildings stand just 0.084m apart at their nearest point (figure 46) with neither facing exactly true east, the usual orientation of Greek temples.

The temple’s architect is unknown, but the coincidence of several similar technical features, including unusual measurement units, between the Rhamnous temple, the temple to Ares at Athens, the temple to Poseidon at Sounion, and the temple to Hephaistos in Athens, have been taken as an indication that the same architect was responsible for the four temples. The

---

195 Miles notes that the wish for continuity of the sacred place influenced the location of the Classical temple: Miles, ‘A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous’, 153 n. 34.
197 Petrakos, Rhamnous, 18; Boersma, Athenian Building Policy, 143 (temple chronology), 193-194 (architectural details).
198 A study by nineteenth-century academics presented theories that temple orientation may have had religious significance in relation to the sun, moon or stars, so that a celestial body’s light might shine directly into the temple on a special day such as an annual festival or the establishment myth of the cult. The case for Rhamnous is addressed by: F. C. Penrose, ‘On the Results of an Examination of the Orientations of a Number of Greek Temples with a View to Connect these Angles with the Amplitudes of Certain Stars at the Time the Temples were Founded, and an Endeavour to Derive there from the Dates of their Foundation by Consideration of the Changes Produced upon the Right Ascension and Declination of the Stars by the Precession of the Equinoxes,’ Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, A 184, 1893, 808, 813, cf. 823, 827-828. A contemporary discussion is found in: E. Boutsikas, Astronomy and Ancient Greek Cult: An application of archaeoastronomy to Greek religious architecture, cosmologies and landscapes, PhD Thesis, University of Leicester Press, Leicester, 2007, 1-192. The aspect of any celestial reason behind the orientation of the temples at Rhamnous is mentioned at this point in this thesis but is not otherwise addressed.
200 The name Theseion or Temple of Theseus was incorrectly given to what is now known as the temple of Hephaistos. It had been incorrectly thought that the remains of the Athenian hero Theseus had been placed in the temple in 475 after Kimon brought them back to Athens from the island of Skyros. This erroneous labelling has led to the unknown architect being dubbed the ‘Theseum Architect’ in all four instances: Petrakos, Rhamnous, 24; Boersma, Athenian Building Policy, 76, 77-78; Dinsmoor Jr., ‘Rhammoutine Fantasies’, 179; Dinsmoor Sr., ‘The Temple of Ares at Athens’, 40-47; Dinsmoor Sr., ‘Observations on the Hephaisteion’,
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discovery inside the temple precinct of pottery shards that once belonged to
drinking vessels used by the builders of the temple and inscribed with their
names,\textsuperscript{201} adds a nice personal touch.

The new temple was in a Doric peripteral style of six columns wide and twelve
long and measured 10.05m by 21.4m.\textsuperscript{202} The roof was adorned with sculptural
akroteria,\textsuperscript{203} lions’ heads at the gutter-line,\textsuperscript{204} with large double doors at the
temple entrance. Gandy described the fragmented shards of a central
akroterion as originally depicting Boreas’ abduction of Oreithyia, an
interpretation which has been repeated as fact ever since.\textsuperscript{205} Conversely, the

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure47.png}
\caption{Artistic representation of the east facade of Nemesis’ temple at Rhamnous; (drawing: K.
Eliaki).}
\end{figure}

153-154. Miles disagrees with Petrakos that the Theseum Architect was responsible for
\textsuperscript{201} Petrakos, ‘Οἱ Ἀνασκαφὲς τοῦ Ῥαμνοῦντος’, 283.
\textsuperscript{202} Petrakos, \textit{Rhamnous}, 24.
\textsuperscript{203} See the discussion above (p. 191) on the \textit{akroteria} decorated with griffins attacking stags.
\textsuperscript{204} Petrakos, \textit{Rhamnous}, 25.
\textsuperscript{205} NAMA 2348; Kaltsas, \textit{Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum}, 120 no. 218; P.
Schultz, The Akroteria of the Temple of Athena Nike; \textit{Hesperia} 70, no. 1, 2001, 11, n.34; Despinis,
\textit{Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη ἕρου τοῦ Ἀγορακρίτου}, 162-164.
study of a fragment from an *akroterion*, attributed to Agorakritos and dated ca. 430-420 and now in the National Archaeological Museum at Athens, has led Miles to reject Gandy’s Boreas and Oreithyia since the dimensions do not allow for their comfortable placement. Consequently, it is tempting to re-interpret the *akroterion* scene as representing Paris’ abduction of Helen or even Zeus’ violation of Nemesis, but such hypotheses remain speculation. Seemingly the temple doors were badly hung since an incised mark on the marble floor left by one of the doors as it scraped the floor each time it was opened or closed is still visible today. The lower steps were constructed of local dark marble and the main structure built from fine quality white Pentelic marble. From the reassembled remains of the temple, now housed in a specially built *apotheke*, it has been established there were no sculptures on the metopes or pediment (*figures* 47 and 48). According to Ridway their absence should not be seen as particularly unusual since carved metopes in the Classical period were not quite as common as they were in the Archaic period, although they did exist.

**Figure 48: The temple entablature reassembled showing the unsculptured pediment and metopes (photograph: Petrakos).**

---


207 It was not unusual to use different types of marble on the lower steps, for example the same procedure was followed for the Older Parthenon in Athens, the temple to Hephaistos in Athens, and the west facade of the Propylaia also in Athens: Miles, ‘A Reconstruction of the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous’, 145.

208 The reconstruction in *figure* 48 has been completed using a method whereby all the pieces found so far have been placed together without the use of any permanent fixing material allowing for new finds to be added later: Petrakos, *Rhamnous*, 32-33.

Compensating for the lack of architectural sculptural adornments were the painted surfaces on the cella interior, the pediment, the frieze, and the metopes.\(^{210}\) Gandy writes that artistic decoration could still be seen in his time on the more protected surfaces such as the interior frieze and the ceiling coffers of the lacunaria which were painted with green leaves and gold stars on a blue background.\(^{211}\) He further described the cornice of the pronaos as being painted, gilded, and adorned with lotus ornaments, together with sculptured moulding in the capitals of the antae.\(^{212}\) The colours, it seems, were noteworthy even in Gandy’s day, but after having being exposed from their previously protected state they have faded and are now almost indiscernible.\(^{213}\)

It is interesting that while the columns of the pronaos and posticum were fully fluted, the exterior columns are fluted only at the very top and bottom (figures 47 and 49).\(^{214}\) Also, the stylobate blocks that surround the temple seem unfinished, although Hodge and Tomlinson suggest, rightly or wrongly, that the resultant ‘stippled’ effect was a deliberate architectural feature by the


\(^{211}\) See the discussion on the still evident masons’ marks made on to the ceiling coffers to help them set the slabs correctly in place: *SEG* 34,246; V. Pettrakos, *Praktika 8th Congress for Greek and Latin Epigraphy* 1, 1983, 329-330.


\(^{213}\) Pettrakos, ‘Νέες Ἐρευνές στὸν Ραμνοῦντα’, 53, no. 111.

architect. Palagia suggests the unfinished state of the temple indicates Rhamnous’ state of impecunity, especially in view of the story of Nemesis’ cult statue being made from a recycled block of marble whose original purpose had been for use as a Persian victory monument. But, given the previously discussed documented prosperity of the temple treasury this seems doubtful. It is more likely that the Peloponnesian War of 431-404 interrupted the building works which had commenced ca. 436-432. This war was lost by Athens and the subsequent peace in 404 left a weakened Attika having to deal with more pressing issues than completing unfinished temples.

The Cult Statue and Base

The Statue

Ancient authors were divided on the identity of the sculptor of Nemesis’ Parian marble cult statue, with some suggesting the great Pheidias himself and others his pupil, Agorakritos. Despinis’ reconstruction of the statue from the collected fragments has resulted in several detailed examinations and studies of the sculptor’s execution and artistic style which, when compared with confirmed works of Pheidias and Agorakritos, has led to a general consensus of Agorakritos as the more likely candidate. Whoever he was, the fine execution still discernible in the fragments confirm the statue would have been a magnificent testament to a fine sculptor, a conclusion supported by Strabo:

---

Hodge & Tomlinson, ‘Some notes on the temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous’, 185-192.
Pettrakos comments on the value of the temple’s ‘unfinished’ state in allowing archaeologists to study the different stages of ancient building methods: Pettrakos, Rhamnous, 24.
Discussed above, pp. 231-232.
Pliny NH 36.5 (Agorakritos); Paus. 1.33.3, Zen. Centuria 5.82, CPG vol. 1, 153.82 (Pheidias).
LIMC vi.1 Nemesis 734 (P. Karanastassi); Fullerton, Greek Sculpture, 200, 202; Kosmopoulou, Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases, 131; Camp, The Archaeology of Athens, 301; Palagia, ‘Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,’ 53; Stafford suggests there was a temptation in antiquity to give the credit to the more renowned sculptor: Worshipping Virtues, 84; Knittlmayer, ‘Kultbild und Heiligtum der Nemesis’, 2; W. Ehrhardt, ‘Versuch einer Deutung des Kultbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus,’ AntK 40, 1997, 36; Shapiro Lapatin, ‘A Family Gathering at Rhamnous: Who’s Who on the Nemesis Base’, 108; Robertson, A Shorter History of Greek Art, 104, attributes the conflicting views surrounding the identity of the sculptor to the close similarity in style and technique of Pheidias and Agorakritos; Despinis, Συμβολή στη μελέτη του Αγορακρίτου, 111-210; Despinis, ‘Discovery of the Scattered Fragments’, 407-413.
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Rhamnous has the statue of Nemesis, which by some is called the work of Diodotus and by others of Agorakritos the Parian, a work which both in grandeur and in beauty is a great success and rivals the works of Pheidias.\textsuperscript{220}

With the exception of Pausanias, the ancient sources give little descriptive detail about the statue, although they provide some interesting anecdotes. Pliny writes that the statue started out in a contest as a statue of Aphrodite, but ended up renamed as Nemesis:

Another of [Pheidias’] pupils was Agorakritos of Paros, who pleased him also because of his youth and beauty, so that Pheidias is said to have allowed him to put his name to several of his, the master’s, own works. In any case, the two pupils [Alkamenes and Agorakritos] competed with each other in making an Aphrodite, and Alkamenes won the contest not through superior skill but through the votes of the citizenry, who favoured one of their own against a foreigner. So Agorakritos is said to have sold his statue on condition that it should not remain in Athens, and that it should be named ‘Nemesis’. It was set up at Rhamnous, a deme of Attika, and Marcus Varro preferred it above all other statues.\textsuperscript{221}

The truth of the story is impossible to confirm, but it can be argued that since Nemesis’ iconography in Pliny’s time included the later Roman attributes of balancing scales, measuring rod, wheel, and griffin, that he saw in the Classical Nemesis a better likeness to an Aphrodite or a Venus.\textsuperscript{222} Photios credits Pheidias as the sculptor,\textsuperscript{223} as does the Suda which repeats the Aphrodite story:

She was first modelled on the appearance of Aphrodite; that is why she held a sprig from an apple tree. Erechtheus set her up, since she was his mother, but she was named Nemesis and reigned in the place.\textsuperscript{224} But Pheidias made the statue, whose inscription favoured his beloved, Agorakritos of Paros.\textsuperscript{225}

\textsuperscript{220} Strab. 9 1.17: Ῥαμνους δὲ τῇ Νεμέσις ἔσαθεν, ὅ τινες μὲν Διοδότου φασίν ἔργον τινὲς δὲ Αγορακρίτου τοῦ Παρίου, καὶ μεγέθει καὶ κάλλει σφόδρα κατωρθομένοι καὶ ἐνάμμιθλοι τοῖς Φειδίου ἔργοις.
\textsuperscript{221} Pliny NH 36.5.
\textsuperscript{222} LIMC vi.1 Nemesis 734 (P. Karanastassi).
\textsuperscript{223} Phot. Lex. s.v. Ραμνουσία Νέμεσις: αὐτή πρώτων ἄφροτω ἐν Αφροδίτης σχήματι διὸ καὶ κλάδον ἔχει μηλέας ἱδρύσατο δὲ αὐτήν ἐρέχθεους μητέρα ἐκατού ὄνομαν ὁμοιωμένην δὲ Νέμεσιν καὶ βασιλεύσασαν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τὸ δὲ ἄγαμα Φειδίου ἔποιησεν οὗ τὴν ἐπηγραφήν ἐκμετάλλευσεν Αγορακρίτου τοῦ Παρίου ἐρωμένου δὲ καὶ Ὀλυμπίας τῷ δικτύλῳ τοῦ Δίως εἰςέχρασεν Παντάρτης καλοῖς ἢν δὲ οὕτως Ἀργείδας, ἐρωμένος αὐτοῦ (‘Pheidias made the statue, and his signature was a favour to Agorakritos of Paros, his beloved’).
\textsuperscript{224} Nemesis as Erechtheus’ mother is found nowhere else. Hom. II. 2.545-550 records Erechtheus’ mother as Earth but that he was raised by Athena, while other sources quote his
Zenobios provides a little more information about the attributes of the statue, which he thinks was made by Pheidias, of whom he is rather derogatory:

In Rhamnous there stands an image of Nemesis, ten cubits in height, stone throughout, the work of Pheidias; she holds an apple branch in her hand. Antigonos of Karystos claims that a little tablet hangs from this, and is inscribed as follows: ‘Agorakritos of Paros made [me].’ Yet this is no wonder, for many others have inscribed someone else’s name upon their own work. It is likely that Pheidias conceded this to Agorakritos because he was his lover, and was generally much excited over boys.  

---

Figure 50: Artistic representation of Nemesis’ cult statue within the fifth-century temple (source: Petrakos).

---


Zen. Centuria 5.82, CPG vol. 1, 153.82 s.v. Ῥαμνοσία Νέμεσις: ἢς οὖ ἤφην Αντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος πτήσαν τι μικρὸν ἐξηρήσατα τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχουν Ἀγοράκριτος Πάριος ἐποίησαν’ οὐθεμαστόν δὲ: καὶ ἄλλοι γὰρ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἔργων ἔτερον ἐπιγράφασιν οὔνομα. εἰκὸς οὖν καὶ τὸν Φειδίαν τὸ Ἀγοράκριτη συγκεχωρηκέναι ἣν γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἐρώμενος, καὶ ἄλλος ἐπιτύπτην περὶ τὰ παιδικὰ.
The Parian marble statue stood 4.44m tall with its base (3.55m without) and from Roman copies it is known she wore a chiton and himation.\textsuperscript{227} Invariably she was portrayed as having her hair coiffured into a chignon at the nape of her neck, a conclusion confirmed by the remains of her head, now in the British Museum.\textsuperscript{228} Originally Despinis dated the statue to ca. 430s on stylistic grounds and its base to approximately a decade later.\textsuperscript{229} The logistics of how this would have been achieved are fraught with difficulties and can only be speculated: did the statue originally stand on an unadorned base that was later carved, or did the statue initially have no base but once one was completed some mechanical mechanism hoisted the statue up to facilitate its placement, something hesitantly suggested by Despinis writing some time later and where he indicates a reluctant willingness to accept the possibility both were made at the same time?\textsuperscript{230} I would suggest that if the statue and its base are stylistically and thus chronologically different, it is possible that, despite statue and base being credited as the work of Agorakritos, they were in fact executed at the same time by different sculptors, with the base the work of a younger man using more modern and innovative techniques, possibly a pupil of Agorakritos.

The statue on its base would have been placed towards the back of the inner-sanctum of the temple with the sacred trapeza in front (\textit{figure 50}) where Nemesis would have projected a dominating presence.\textsuperscript{231} Although the temple interior shown in \textit{figure 50} is very plain, the walls and floor area would

\textsuperscript{227} Paus. 1.33.3-6; \textit{LIMC} vi Nemesis 1 (P. Karanastassi); \textit{ThesCRA} iv: 60 no. 21; \textit{OCD\textsuperscript{I}} 1034 s.v. Nemesis; Smith, \textit{Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art}, 43-44, 145 S 2, fig. 4.1, list of statue copies:145-146; Camp, \textit{The Archaeology of Athens}, 113-114; Stafford, \textit{Worshipping Virtues}, 84-86; Knittlmayer, \textit{Kultbild und Heiligtum der Nemesis}, 1-3, 7-9, fig. 1; Ehrhardt, \textit{Versuch einer Deutung des Kultbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus}, 29-39, fig. 1; Petrakos, \textit{Rhamnous}, 28 fig. 18; Ridgway, \textit{Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture}, gives a statue height of 3.50m, 173; Despinis, \textit{Συμβολὴ στὴ μνήμη τοῦ Ἀγορακρίτου}, 1-82; Despinis, \textit{Discovery of the Scattered Fragments}, 407-413.

\textsuperscript{228} BM 1820,0513.2. Ridgway erroneously describes her hair in the Archaic fashion as: ‘massive braids hanging over the shoulders at the back’: Ridgway, \textit{Fifth Century Styles in Greek Sculpture}, 173. By the fifth century this style of dressing the hair was out of date. The chignon mentioned above would have been more chronologically appropriate.


\textsuperscript{230} Petrakos, \textit{Προβλήματα τῆς βάσης τοῦ Ἀγορακρίτου τῆς Νεμέσας}, 107.

\textsuperscript{231} \textit{Trapeza} fragments have been found in the sanctuary well: Petrakos, \textit{PAAH} 138, 1982 [1984], 133.
originally have been adorned with dedicated weaponry, as well as strategically placed votive offerings to the goddess.

It is regrettable that in the Christian era, during the purge of all things pagan, Nemesis’ statue and temple were destroyed. The impetus was likely to have been Arcadius’ edict of ca. AD 399, ordering the demolition of pagan temples. From the fragmented state of the hundreds of pieces so far found it seems Nemesis’ statue and base came in for an extremely frenzied attack; no doubt the Christian vandals were making a statement of defiance against the goddess of retribution; an interpretation reinforced by the almost unscathed and largely intact female statue who may represent Themis, found in the smaller temple. The degree of fragmentation done to Nemesis’ statue and base has added to the enormity of the reconstruction process, although this has been aided by inexact Roman copies and ancient descriptions.

232 The stone from the temple was plundered for new building works: Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νέμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 40. Rhamnous had been in decline before this and the temple would not have been the grand monument to the goddess it had been: Petrakos, *Rhamnous*, 54.

233 Edicts ordering the destruction of pagan temples began ca. AD 324 after Constantine’s conversion to Christianity. Arcadius’ edict specifically mentions the pagan temples in the countryside: ‘If there should be any temples in the country districts, they shall be torn down without disturbance or tumult. For when they are torn down and removed, the material basis for all superstition will be destroyed’: C. Pharr, T. S. Davidson & M. B. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*, New Jersey, 2001, 474-475, no. 16.

234 An account of the destruction of the pagan temples is recorded by Libanius ca. AD 386: ‘[Christian monks] ... hasten to attack the temples with sticks and stones and bars of iron, and in some cases, disdaining these, with hands and feet. Then utter desolation follows, with the stripping of roofs, demolition of walls, the tearing down of statues and the overthrow of altars, and the priests must either keep quiet or die. After demolishing one, they scurry to another, and to a third, and trophy is piled on trophy, in contravention of the law [there had previously been a law that protected temple buildings but not the associated pagan religion which was illegal]. Such outrages occur even in the cities, but they are most common in the countryside’: Libanius: *Or*. 30.8-10. This frenetic hatred against other beliefs and disdain for historical significance is seen today in the violent destruction of ancient monuments and museum artefacts by marauding members of the cult of ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) intent on the obliteration of all evidence of other religious faiths, tolerance, and peoples of other beliefs.

235 NAMA no. 231.


237 Despinis, *Συμβολή στή μελέτη έργου τού Αγορακρίτου*, 28-44; Smith, *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*, 145-146. A copy of the head of Nemesis’ cult statue: Agora S 1055. A list of known Roman copies are found in: *LIMC* vi Nemesis 1 and 2a-o (P. Karanastassi) The most complete copies are: *LIMC* 2d (NAMA cat. no. 3949, Antonine period), *LIMC* 2a (Copenhagen Glytotheck cat. no. 2086, early Imperial), and *LIMC* 2n (Messene Museum cat. no. 240, Antonine); E. Brigger, ‘Roman Adaptations of Classical Cult Statues: the Case of Nemesis of Rhamnous,’ *Mediterranean Archaeology* 15, 2002, 74-79.
Of the ancient sources Pausanias provides the most comprehensive description of the statue, although this is superficial and lacks any real depth of detail:

τοῦτον Φειδίας τὸν λίθον εἰργάσατο ἀγάλμα μὲν εἶναι Νεμέσεως, τῇ κεφαλῇ δὲ ἔπεστι τής θεοῦ στέφανος ἐλάφους ἔχον καὶ Νίκης ἀγάλματα οὐ μεγάλα: ταῖς δὲ χερσὶν ἔχει τῇ μὲν κλάδων μηλέας, τῇ δεξιᾷ δὲ φιάλην, Αἰθιοπεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ φιάλῃ πεποίηται.238

Pheidias carved this stone to make a statue of Nemesis, on the head of the goddess is a crown with deer and images of small Nikai. In her left hand she holds an apple-branch, and a phiale in the right hand, on which Ethiopians have been worked.

Pausanias’ reference to the Ethiopians is intriguing; why Ethiopians, and how did he know they were Ethiopian and not some other African peoples? From Snowden’s work it seems peoples of obvious African origin were generally referred to as ‘Ethiopians’ regardless of their actual origin.239 Homer describes Ethiopians as ‘noble’ or ‘incomparable’ (ἀμύμονας Αἰθιοπίας) and as friends of the gods, possibly reason enough for them to be linked iconographically to a goddess who represents the upholder of virtuous qualities:240

And they say that they [the Ethiopians] were the first to be taught to honour the gods and to hold sacrifices and festivals and processions and festivals and the other rites by which men honour the deity; and that in consequence their piety had been published abroad among all men, and it is generally held that the sacrifices practised among the Ethiopians are those which are the most pleasing to heaven … And they state that by reason of their piety towards the deity, they manifestly enjoy the favour of the gods, inasmuch as they have never experienced the rule of an invader from abroad; for from all time they have enjoyed a state of freedom and of peace one with another, and although many and powerful rulers have made war upon them, not one of these has succeeded in his undertaking.241

---

238 Paus. 1.33.3.
239 F. M. Snowden, Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience, Cambridge MA, 1970, vii. Snowden adds (p. 2) that Ethiopians were the yardstick by which the ancient Greeks measured all peoples of darker skin.
240 Zeus was fond of visiting them: Hom. Il. 23.205-207; 1.423-424; Poseidon also visited them: Hom. Od. 1.22-25; Iris makes plans to visit them to share in the hecatombs being sacrificed to the gods: Hom. Il. 23.205-207; cf. Diod. 3.2.2-3.3.1.
241 Diod. 3.2.2-3.3.1. According to Aelian, Ethiopia is where the gods bathe: Ael. NA 2.21; Dionysius Periegetes described Ethiopians as ‘godlike’ and ‘blameless’: K. Broderson (ed.), Das Lied von der Welt: Dionysios von Alexandria, ‘Orbis terrae descriptio’, Hildesheim, 1994, 559-561; Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀἰθιοψ 47, says they were the first to honour the gods; Seneca
Snowden suggests the Ethiopians represent the black soldiers in Xerxes’ army and symbolize the great Greek victory over the Persians, with Nemesis’ aid.\textsuperscript{242} Fisher sees the Ethiopians representing Athenian power extending towards distant barbarians,\textsuperscript{243} and others that the Ethiopians may be a visual analogy of Nemesis’ influence and retributive power reaching to the ends of the world.\textsuperscript{244} If this were so, why are other Attic phialai, with no connection to Nemesis, similarly embossed with African heads?\textsuperscript{245} Possibly, the perception of Ethiopian piety made them appropriate as adornments on sacred religious items in the hope that such piety would, by association, permeate the temple, its precinct, and the people worshipping there. One such example is the exceptionally beautiful fourth-century finely worked gold mesomphalos phiale adorned with African heads (\textit{figure 51}) from Panagyurishte in Bulgaria.\textsuperscript{246}

Despite its find spot, metallurgical assay studies have established it was made in Attika, and importantly, it is thought to be a replica of the phiale once held by the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous.\textsuperscript{247} If correct, posterity is now able to admire their tenacity: \textit{De Ire} 3.20.2; see also, Statius \textit{Thebais} 5.426-428; Luk., \textit{Prom.} 17, \textit{Zeus Rants} 37.

\textsuperscript{242} Hdt. 7.69-70. Snowden, \textit{Blacks in Antiquity}, 125.

\textsuperscript{243} Fisher, \textit{Hybris}, 503 n. 47.


\textsuperscript{245} For example, four fourth-century inventories of the treasurers of Athena record Ethiopian phialai: IG ii\textsuperscript{2} 1413 lines 6-7, 1424a lines 30-31, 1425 lines 25-26, 1443 line 127, with the latter made of gold: Harris, \textit{The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion}, 175 no. 337. Von Bothmer’s dubious argument that a Greek visitor to Egypt may have seen Negroes in Egyptian art and taken this idea back to Greece is not supported: D. von Bothmer, 'A Gold Libation Bowl,' \textit{Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin} 21, no. 4, 1962, 161.


see Nemesis’ *phiale* and is not solely reliant on Pausanias’ inadequate description.

An examination of the head of Nemesis’ statue shows that the now lost crown or head-dress would have been metal, perhaps bronze or gold, with spikes that inserted into the still visible holes to secure the head-piece.\(^{248}\) The small Nikai described by Pausanias could have been an ever-present reminder of her perceived victory over the hybristic Persian invasionary force of 490, or they may have represented Nemesis’ own retributive powers, in that she will always have victory over arrogance and *hybris* wherever it is found. The deer or stags are an enigmatic inclusion: perhaps added as a reference to the futility of trying

\(^{248}\) My personal observation: BM 1820,0513.2.
to escape the longevity of Nemesis’ retributive power since, according to Pausanias in a different context, deer live longer than elephants,\(^{249}\) i.e. no amount of time would allow an offender to escape her justice. Or, possibly they were a retrospective acknowledgement of her former agrarian nature.

Photios, Zenobios, Pausanias, and Pliny, all mention the apple branch held in her hand. Since the apple is an attribute of Aphrodite its presence here has been interpreted as evidential proof of the story of the statue having been initially sculpted as a statue of Aphrodite.\(^{250}\) On the other hand, the apple was also mythology significant to Nemesis: Eris’ apple of Discord was the catalyst that sparked the Trojan War,\(^{251}\) a war in which Nemesis was directly involved through Zeus’ orchestrated rape of her (at Rhamnous) as a means to produce a beautiful daughter who would be his *cause célèbre* to destroy mankind; Hera’s golden apples were tended by the Hesperides, siblings of Nemesis according to Hesiod,\(^{252}\) and daughters of Hesperos in other accounts\(^{253}\) (the same Hesperos who was present when Zeus and Themis were plotting the destruction of mankind through warfare);\(^{254}\) and, apples were connected to the land located at the ends of the earth,\(^{255}\) where those pious Ethiopians and long-lived deer reside. Consequently, the apple branch held by Nemesis was a visual reminder of Nemesis’ potent retributive powers that stretch into every corner of the earth; her violation by Zeus at Rhamnous; and, her subsequent role in the Trojan War. It was this Trojan War role that was the theme depicted on the frieze of her statue base.

\(^{249}\) Paus. 8.10.10.

\(^{250}\) Phot. Lex. s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις; Zen. Centuria 5.82, CPG vol. 1, 153.82, s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις; Paus. 1.33.3; Suda s.v. Ῥαμνουσία Νέμεσις (rho 33); Pliny NH 36.5.

\(^{251}\) Apollod. Ep. 3.2.

\(^{252}\) Apollon. Argon 4.1396-1400; Paus. 5.11.6, 5.18.4, 6.19.8; Apollod. Bibl. 2.5.11; Hyginus, Astron. 3. Hes. Theog. 215.

\(^{253}\) Diod. 4.27.2; Servius on Virgil Aen. 4.484.

\(^{254}\) Discussed above at: pp. 97-98.

\(^{255}\) Hes. Theog. 275 (at the edge of night), 517 (at the limits of the earth), 744 (Tartaros); Virgil Aen. 4.480 (farthest of lands); cf. Eur. Hipp. 742.
THE STATUE BASE

According to Kosmopoulou, fifth-century Rhamnous was unique amongst Attic demes in possessing a quality cult statue with a superbly sculpted base; and Shapiro Lapatin writes that the reliefs on the base were executed ‘to a greater degree than the sculptures which adorned the bases of other fifth-century cult statues’. An analysis of the architectural execution of the base has generally concluded it was the work of Pheidias’ pupil, Agorakritos of Paros, and has been stylistically dated to ca. 420s, an aspect discussed in more detail above. It measures 0.5 metres high by 2.43 metres wide by 1.66 metres deep and consists of three parts: a white Pentelic marble decorative socle, i.e. a short supporting plinth; a central base of two large white Pentelic marble slabs decorated with a frieze of highly carved figures described as almost ‘in the round’; and, a cavetto crown of dark Eleusinian limestone on which the cult statue stood. Three sides (the back was plain) were adorned with figures carved into the blocks.

---

257 Pliny NH 36.5; Strab. 9.1.17; Smith suggests Agorakritos but admits to the possibility of Pheidias: Smith, Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art, 142 R1; O. Palagia, 'Πρόβληματα των Αγαλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακού Κόκλου,' Αριάδνη 9, 2003, 10; Kosmopoulou, Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases, 131, 141 n. 49; Camp, The Archaeology of Athens, 301, says base and statue were probably by Agorakritos; Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 53; Knittlmayer, 'Kultbild und Heiligtum der Nemesis', 2, figs 1-3; Ehrhardt, 'Versuch einer Deutung des Kultbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus', 36, fig. 2; Shapiro Lapatin, 'A Family Gathering at Rhamnous: Who's Who on the Nemesis Base', 108, fig. 1, pl. 27 b-d; Despinis, Συμβολὴ στὴ μιλήτη ἔργον τοῦ Ἀγορακρίτου, 68-69.
258 Above p. 242.
259 Paus. 1.33.7-8; LIMC vi Leda 234 no. 33 (L. Kahil/N. Icard-Gianolio); LIMC vi Nemesis 210 (P. Karanastassi); LIMC vi Neoptolemos 1 (O. Touchefeu-Meynier); LIMC iv Helene 14 (L. Kahil/N. Icard); LIMC iii Dioskouroi 187 (A. Hermary) LIMC iii Epichos II 1 (N. Icard-Gianolio); LIMC i Agamemnon 4 (O. Touchefeu-Meynier/I. Krauskopf); I.Rhamnous I 251-266; Smith, Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art, 44; Palagia, 'Classical Athens,' 124-125; Palagia, 'Πρόβληματα των Αγαλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακού Κόκλου', 10-14, 23 fig. 2; Kosmopoulou, Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases, 130-135, cat. 62, 244-248, figs. 101-104; Camp, The Archaeology of Athens, 113-114, 301; Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 62-68; Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 86-87; Knittlmayer, 'Kultbild und Heiligtum der Nemesis', 2-4, figs. 1-3; Ehrhardt, 'Versuch einer Deutung des Kultbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus', 29-39, 34-36 fig. 2; Karanastassi, 'Wer ist die Frau Hinter Nemesis?', 121-131; Shapiro, Personifications in Greek Art, 176-177, 256 no. 115, fig. 133; Shapiro Lapatin, 'A Family Gathering at Rhamnous: Who's Who on the Nemesis Base', 107-119, 108 n. 2, pl. 27b-c; Petros, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νέμεσος', 89-107, figs 1-7, pls. 111-116; Petros, 'La base de la Némésis d’Agorakrite', 237-253; Robertson, A Shorter History of Greek Art, 103-106; V. G.
As previously mentioned, the base and the statue it supported were deliberately smashed to pieces in a seemingly frenetic assault by Christians in late antiquity; and although many fragments have been re-discovered, countless others remain lost. Had it not been for Pausanias’ second-century AD eyewitness description of the figures, together with a restored Roman copy depicting four figures from the left-hand section of the front of the base (figure 52), interpretation and identification would have proved impossibly problematic especially given the lack of distinguishing attributes for any individual figure. (A comparison between the Roman copy and the first four figures of the base in figure 53a reveals, with some small differences, a very close likeness between the two, leading to the conclusion the relief is indeed a copy of the original.) One re-discovered fragment which uniquely does have identifiable features is a male head complete with pilos, which credibly identifies it as once having belonged to one of the Dioskouroi, although its correct placement has proved elusive. This head and numerous other pieces of unknown placement have been shelved in the Rhamnous storage apothēke until such time as they can be accurately placed.


261. The copy measures 0.54 x 1.2 metres. It was found in Rome’s Tiber river AD 1763. Stockholm National Museum SK 150; *LIMC* iv Helene 15 (L. Kahlil/N. Icard); Fullerton, *Greek Sculpture*, 200, 201 fig. 9.11; Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 64-65, n. 32, fig. 4.7; Shapiro Lapatin, 'A Family Gathering at Rhamnous: Who’s Who on the Nemesis Base', 110-111, pl. 27a; J. Boardman, *Greek Sculpture: The Classical Period*, London, 1985, fig.123; Robertson, *A Shorter History of Greek Art*, 105, fig. 144; M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art*, Cambridge, 1975, 353 pl. 118c; H. Brising, *Antik Konst i Nationalmuseum*, Stockholm, 1911, 75 no. 150, pl. 32 no. 150.


264. There are an additional 97 unplaced pieces, and Petrakos notes that if the pieces taken by the Dilettanti expedition were returned a more comprehensive interpretation could be made: Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως', 105; cf. Kallipolitis, 'Η βάση του αγάλματος της Ραμνουσίας Νεμέσεως', 1-90, pls 1-32.
Pausanias describes the frieze scene as Helen being introduced to Nemesis, her true mother, by Leda, her foster mother, in the company of others:

"Ἑλένη Νέμεσιν μητέρα εἶναι λέγουσιν Ἑλληνες, Λήδαν δὲ μαστὸν ἐπισχεῖν αὐτῇ καὶ θρέψαι πατέρα δὲ καὶ ὦτοι καὶ πάντες κατὰ ταύτα Ἑλένης Δία καὶ οἱ Τυνδάρεων εἶναι νομίζουσι. ταῦτα άκηκοος Φειδίας πεποίηκεν Ἐλένην ὑπὸ Λήδας ἀγομένην παρὰ τὴν Νέμεσιν, πεποίηκε δὲ Τυνδάρεων τε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας καὶ ἄνδρα σὺν Ἰππῷ παρεστηκότα Ἰππέα δόμομα· ἔστι δὲ Ἀγαμήμονον καὶ Μενέλαος καὶ Πῦρρος ὁ Ἀχιλλέως, πρῶτος οὗτος Ἐρμύρην τὴν Ἑλένης γυναῖκα λαβὼν Ὄρέστης δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐς τὴν μητέρα τόλμημα παρείθη, παραμεινάσῃς τε ἐς ἄπαν Ἐρμύρην αὐτῷ καὶ τεκούσης παῖδα. ἔξεστι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ βάθρῳ καὶ Ἐποχος καλούμενος καὶ νεανίας ἐστίν ἔτερος ἐς τούτους ἄλλο μὲν ἥκουσα υὐδέν, ἀδέλφοισκε δὲ εἶναι σφᾶς Ὀινὸς, ἀφ ἓς ἔστι τὸ ὅνομα τὸ δῆμο."

The Greeks say that Nemesis was the mother of Helen, while Leda suckled and nursed her. The father of Helen the Greeks like everybody else hold to be not Tyndareos but Zeus. Having heard this legend, Pheidias has represented Helen as being led to Nemesis by Leda, and he has represented Tyndareos and his children with a man Hippeus by name standing by with a horse. There are Agamemmon and Menelaos and Pyrrhos, the son of Achilles and first husband of Hermione, the daughter of Helen. Orestes was passed over because of his crime against his mother, yet Hermione stayed by his side in everything and bore him a child. Next upon the pedestal is one called Epochos and another youth (νεανίας); the only thing I heard about them was that they were brothers of Oinoe, from whom the parish has its name.

---

265 Paus. 1.33.7-8.
Omitted from Pausanias’ account is the exact sequential order for each of the figures; a topic which has generated debate for over one-hundred and fifty years, and produced several conjectural attempts at reconstruction.266 The first was Posnansky (1888), followed by Staïs (1891), Pallat (1894), Rossbach (1897), Robert (1897), Svoronos (1905), Kallipolitis (1979), and Petrakos (1985).267 The latter’s painstaking work has exposed a scene of, not the twelve figures mentioned by Pausanias but fourteen high relief figures (figures 53a-c).268 Despite all modern-day attempts to identify the figures, no conclusion is definitive and the subject continues to stimulate discussion.269

The general consensus is for symmetry in the arrangement of the figures: the left and right sides each with three males and a horse (figures 53b and c); and the front (figure 53a) a central group of four female figures with two males on either side.270 Ehrhardt counters this theory by suggesting the figure at position 9, indeed a mere shadow, is not female but male, which would result in a composition of two males, three females, and three males.271 Regardless of any aesthetic reservations, his conclusion is invalidated by the just visible remnants of a veiled head,272 suggesting, more plausibly, a female.

266 A detailed analysis is found in: Petrakos, Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως, 89-107; Petrakos, 'La base de la Némésis d’Agoracrite', 227-253; Despinis, Συμβολή στη μελέτη άγαλματος του Αγορακρίτου, 1-110, esp. 66-72; or more briefly: Despinis, 'Discovery of the Scattered Fragments', 407-413.

267 Petrakos, Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως, 89-107, pls. 111-116, 106 figure 8; Petrakos, 'La base de la Némésis d’Agoracrite', discusses the various arguments over the base's reconstruction stretching back over one hundred years, 227-253; H. Posnansky, De Nemeseos Monumentis, Whitefish, 1888, 13-17. Additional bibliography: Kosmopoulou, Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases, 142 n.64.

268 Petrakos, Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως, 103.

269 The theories are discussed by: Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 64-67; Karanastassi, 'Wer ist die Frau Hinter Nemesis?', 121-131; Shapiro Lapatin, 'A Family Gathering at Rhamnous: Who's Who on the Nemesis Base', 107-119. Petrakos discusses the variant theories, and describes how he arrived at his proposed identifications: Petrakos, Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως, 89-107, figs 2, 6-7. See the discussion in: Kosmopoulou, Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases, 244-248; Kallipolitis, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Ραμνούσιας Νεμέσεως', 1-90, pls 1-32.


271 Ehrhardt, 'Versuch einer Deutung des Kultbildes der Nemesis von Rhamnus', 34.

272 Petrakos, Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως, pl. 111, and very clearly in pl. 112.4; Petrakos, 'La base de la Némésis d’Agoracrite', 237 fig. 5.
Figure 53a: Drawing of the front of the fragmented statue base illustrating extant fragments above with Petrakos’ interpretational sketch of the eight figures below.²⁷³

Figure 53b: Drawing and sketch of the left-hand side of the Rhamnous statue base.

²⁷³ This and the following sketches are found in: *I.Rhamnous* 1 260-262 figs 169-172, 174-177; Petrakos, *Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέας*, 96 fig. 4 (figure 63a), 99 fig. 6 (figure 63b), 100 fig. 7 (figure 63c).
In an attempt to explain the disparity between Pausanias’ twelve figures and Petrakos’ fourteen, Shapiro Lapatin has suggested Pausanias’ Τυνδάρεων τε και τοῦς παῖδας (Tyndareos and his children) is a reference to not only the Dioskouroi, Kastor and Polydeukes, but that παῖδας may include Tyndareos’ female child Klytemnestra, and possibly his grand-daughter, Hermione. If so, he argues that the number of figures on the base would then total the fourteen identified by Petrakos.\(^{274}\) On the other hand, Karanastassi is inclined to believe that since Nemesis and Themis shared the sanctuary at Rhamnous the figure at position 9 should logically be Themis standing next to Nemesis;\(^{275}\) a view challenged by Palagia who argues that Nemesis and Themis were not shown together in Greek art before the fourth century.\(^{276}\)

The table below lists the most recent theories on the identification of the fourteen figures and demonstrates that, with the exception of Nemesis, whose

---


\(^{275}\) Karanastassi, 'Wer ist die Frau Hinter Nemesis?', 127-131.

\(^{276}\) Palagia, Πρόβληματα των Αγαλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακοῦ Κύκλου', 13.
head is so similar to her cult statue that her identification is secure, there is no consensus on the remaining figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Petrakos 1986(^{277})</th>
<th>Shapiro Lapatin 1991(^{278})</th>
<th>Ehrhardt 1997(^{279})</th>
<th>Palagia 2003(^{280})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agamemnon or Menelaos</td>
<td>Neanias</td>
<td>Epochos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pyrrhos</td>
<td>Oinoe</td>
<td>Neanias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hippeus or Epochos</td>
<td>Hippeus</td>
<td>Hippeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tyndareos</td>
<td>Zeus</td>
<td>Menelaos</td>
<td>Zeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dioskouros</td>
<td>Kastor</td>
<td>Dioskouros</td>
<td>Pyrrhos (Neoptolemos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leda</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Hermione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Helen</td>
<td>Leda</td>
<td>Leda</td>
<td>Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nemesis</td>
<td>Nemesis</td>
<td>Nemesis</td>
<td>Nemesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Oinoe</td>
<td>Klytemnestra</td>
<td>Tyndareos</td>
<td>Leda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dioskouros</td>
<td>Polydeukes</td>
<td>Dioskouros</td>
<td>Menelaos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Menelaos or Agamemmon</td>
<td>Tyndareos</td>
<td>Agamemmon</td>
<td>Agamemmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Epochos or Hippeus</td>
<td>Pyrrhos</td>
<td>Kastor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. unknown male (Theseus?)</td>
<td>Hermione</td>
<td>Polydeukes or Klytemnestra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Neanias</td>
<td>Epochos</td>
<td>Tyndareos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is clearly evident is that the majority of the figures, whether in their correct positions or not, have some connection to the mythology that surrounds

\(^{277}\) Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέας', 95, 97-101, note his table on 104-105 listing the identifications given by his predecessors and contemporaries.


\(^{280}\) Palagia, 'Πρόβλημα των Αγάλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακού Κύκλου', 23 fig. 2; Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 67, fig. 4.6.
Cult Centre at Rhamnous

Nemesis, Helen, and/or the Trojan War, with just a few figures having no obvious link. Belonging to this latter category are Neanias, Hippeus, and Epochos. Although not always given the capital letter by translators, it is the opinion of Petrakos and others that Pausanias’ νεανίας was not simply ‘a youth’ but the local Rhamnousian hero Νεανίας who, together with Epochos, was a brother of Oinoe and enjoyed a heroon at either Marathon or Rhamnous in which capacity he is mentioned epigraphically in several documents.

Before presenting my own theory on Νεανίας I discuss the ancient extant evidence on this local hero.

In one very fragmented document his name has been restored as [Δ]ι Νε[ανίαι], which would indicate his perception as semi-divine. At line 27 of the sacrificial calendar attributed to the deme at Thorikos he is spoken of as having sacrifices made to him in the month of Pyanopsion:

\[ \text{Νεανίαι τέλεον, Πυανοψίοις, Π[... 6 ...]} \]

For Νεανίας, a full-grown victim at the Pyanopsia [to be sold?]

He was similarly named in the Marathonian Tetrapolis sacrificial calendar as having been the recipient of three sacrificial animals – a bovine, a sheep, and a piglet during the month of Mounychion:

---


282 Paus. 1.33.8; Palagia, 'Προβλήματα των Αγάλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακού Κύκλου', 11; Kosmopoulos, Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases, 131-133; Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 63; Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέας', 73-75. Although given a capital letter by Lambert, he interprets Νεανίας as ‘the Youth’ and a counterpart of Kore: S. D. Lambert, 'Another Look at the Sacrificial Calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis', paper presented at: 'Feasting and Polis Institutions', Utrecht, 16-18 January 2014, 6.

283 SEG 21.540 1B, Ag. 4310.1 1a, line 10.


285 Price’s translation has included ‘to be sold’ which he sees as an obvious inclusion for the lacuna: Price, Religions of the Greeks, 172.
Cult Centre at Rhamnous

Another mention of Νεανίας is found on a lease stele:

τέλμα τὸ παρὰ [τ]-
[ὁ ἠρώιον τοῦ] Νεανίου ἔξω τείχους ἐ. [.-]
[. . . . . .] εἰς τὸ τέλμα φέρον τὸ δ[. . .]-
[. . . . . ., μισθ]ω

Evidently Neanias was a figure of some significance and importance, a view supported by his inclusion in a scene on the red-figure ‘Basel Cup’ (figure 54). Here he is labelled as the male standing on the extreme left, naked, with a khlamys over his left arm and holding a staff in his right hand in the company of individuals connected with the Theban Cycle.288 As a local hero from the Rhamnous area his presence on the cup is enigmatic, although Kron plausibly suggests he stands as ‘a topographical reference’ to the Athenian epheboi who trained at Rhamnous,289 i.e. Neanias, a local Rhamnousian hero whose name means ‘a young man’ is a metaphor for the youths in the Athenian militia supporting Thebes, and who are stationed at the military fort at Rhamnous.


287 Ca. fourth century, Agora 19, Leases L 6, F. c, col. III, lines 140-141; SEG 33.167 F3 col. III, lines 9-10; the stele was thought to have come from the Athenian Agora, but Walbank speculates that the inclusion of Neanias’ name is an indication it originated from the Marathonian area; Walbank, 'Leases of Sacred Properties in Attica, Part I', 122-123.


Hippeus, another of the ‘unknowns’ is otherwise unattested, although a ‘Hippeus’ is mentioned at line 144 on the same lease document as Neanias. As for Epochos, whom Pausanias names as a brother of Neanias and Oinoe, he appears not to be mentioned in any other extant reference.

The specific occasion at which Helen was being introduced to her true mother by her adoptive mother is a matter for speculation since the incident is not addressed in the existing literature. Several theories have been put forward: Simon and Kjellberg argue the event took place on Helen’s return from Troy; with Schefold advocating Helen’s marriage to Menelaos, i.e. before the Trojan War – a theory which seems invalidated by the fact that Achilles’ son Pyrrhos, mentioned by Pausanias as one of the figures on the base, was probably not born at this point. A more likely theory is the occasion of Helen’s daughter Hermione’s wedding to this same Pyrrhos (also known as Neoptolemos), a returned hero of the Trojan War. That the occasion is a

---

290 Agora 19, Leases L 6, F. c, col. III, lines 144; SEG 33.167 l. 13.
294 Kypria F19 (Pyrrhos as a hero of the Trojan War); Paus. 1.11.1, 1.33.8 (marriage of Pyrrhos and Hermione).
wedding is suggested by the female figure at position 6 who has her head uncovered, signifying an unmarried maiden, and who raises the edge of her garment in a typical bridal gesture as she appears to be about to veil herself. Palagia is confident the wedding concerned is that of Hermione and Pyrrhos and that it is taking place in Sparta. Certainly all Hermione’s relatives are present: Helen (mother), Menelaos (father), Nemesis (grandmother), Tyndareos (step-grandfather), Leda (step-grandmother), the Dioskouroi (uncles), Agamemnon (uncle), possibly Klytemnestra (aunt), and possibly Zeus (grandfather), along with a few unrelated local Attic heroes to add a topographical reference to Rhamnous.

This supposition has much to recommend it, and is one way to explain the otherwise enigmatic over-abundance of Lakedaimonians on an Attic statue base carved during a time of hostilities between the two city-states. In this scenario the scene should be viewed as a deliberate Athenian stratagem to appropriate the mythology of their enemy by usurping Sparta’s divine Helen, in an attempt not only to goad but also to emasculate Sparta psychologically. Even Leda, queen of Sparta, collaborates with the Athenians as she acknowledges the Helen she raised in Sparta is not her own but the true daughter of Attic Nemesis and thus rightly Rhamnousian Helen, named for the place where she was conceived by Nemesis. The tradition of appropriating deities from other city-states was a practice used at various historical junctures in Greek history. For example, in the sixth century, the Athenians established

295 Palagia, 'Πρόβληματα των Αγαλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακού Κύκλου', 14; Palagia, 'Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle,' 62-68, esp. 67. Palagia further suggests a ‘Helen Cult’ at Rhamnous, an idea which is no-where else attested: Palagia, 'Πρόβληματα των Αγαλματικών βάσεων του Φειδιακού Κύκλου', 11. The only known Attic Helen cult for which there is clear evidence is at Thorikos where it is mentioned on a sacrificial calendar of the fifth or fourth century: SEG 33.147; IG i3 256 bis; Kearns, 'The Heroes of Attica', 158 s.v. Ἑλένη.


297 There were several Lakedaimonian Helen cults. A selection of references include: Hdt. 6.61; Paus. 3.15.3; Theok. 18.43-48; Pind. Ol. 3.1-2; M. P. J. Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, London, 2002, 212, 289; Burkert, Greek Religion, 205. As an anti-Spartan propaganda tool its influence would have been limited to the Rhamnous-Athenian region, and it is unlikely that many Spartans would have even seen the statue base.

298 Kallimachos’ epithet ‘Rhamnousian’ in relation to Helen in his Hymn to Artemis exposes the close inseparable ties between Nemesis and Helen: Kallim., Hymn to Artemis 3.232.
cults of Eurysakes and Aiakos in Athens, deities that originated in Salamis and Aigina, to justify claims on those islands; similarly, in order to lay claim to Tegea the Spartans introduced their own cult of Athena Alea, a Tegean deity. By extension, I suggest the frieze on Nemesis’ statue base is a depiction of the usurpation of Helen and symbolically represents Athens claiming Sparta, i.e. the Athenian forces winning the current war. Stafford interprets the statue and its base as monuments to celebrate the Athenian victory over the barbarians at Marathon, done without aid from Sparta. In this light she sees the monument as representing Attic solidarity and a political gesture of scorn against Sparta, something which would have meaning only to those in Attika who viewed it, since few Spartans would have ever seen it.

To me the relief figures in the scene on Nemesis’ statue base reveal facets of mythology on several levels. They tell of the events surrounding the Trojan War, where Helen through the unwitting machinations of her mother Nemesis, herself a tool of Zeus, was the catalyst that brought retributive destruction upon Troy. They also tell of the avenging nature of Nemesis who similarly brought retributive justice upon the Persians, and who will, now that she has reclaimed Helen and taken her away from Sparta, bring revenge on that city-state for its current aggression against Athens. Aiding Nemesis will be the local heroes, Hippeus, Neanias, and Epochos, who are interpreted here (and not previously identified in the existing scholarship) as allegorical representations of: the horsemen of the Athenian cavalry (Ἱππεός), the young men of the Athenian infantry (Νεανίας), and the sailors of the Athenian navy (“Επόχος”), i.e. all the Athenian armed forces, who stand forged into stone in perpetual readiness to defend Attika. Thus, Rhamnousian Nemesis stands ready to bring swift retributive justice to the hybristic, be they Trojan, Persian, Spartan, or indeed any foe of Attika.


300 Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 88-89.

301 LSJ' 833, col. 2 s.v. Ἰππεός (2) ‘horseman, rider, cavalryman’.

302 LSJ' 1163, col. 2 s.v. Νεανίας ‘young man’.

303 LSJ' 677, col. 2 s.v. Ἑπόχος ‘mounted upon (horses, chariots, ships)’. 
Figure 55: Reconstruction of the statue of Nemesis together with its base (source: Petrakos).\textsuperscript{304}

\textsuperscript{304} I. Rhamnous I 249 fig. 162; Smith, Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art, pl. 4.1; Petrakos, 'Προβλήματα της βάσης του Αγάλματος της Νεμέσεως', 92, fig. 2; Despinis, Σύμβολη στή μελέτη έργων τοῦ Ἀγορακρίτου, 63. Nemesis’ head is in the British Museum: BM 1820.5-13.2, cat 460; LIMC iv Helene 14 (L. Kahl/N. Icard).
NEMESIS AND THEMIS

The Archaic and Classical evidence overwhelming confirms the simultaneous worship of Themis together with Nemesis, and it is thought the smaller of the two sanctuary buildings functioned as her temple for part of its history. Yet, Pausanias, in his description of Rhamnous, omits any mention of the goddess Themis. His omission may be rationalized by the fact that her influence had probably waned by his time, and may have ceased altogether, especially since there is no mention of her in the inscriptive sources after 100/99.

Nemesis and Themis were an appropriate and complementary pair, acting as balancing augments to each other: Themis the goddess of Justice and Law and the personification of Right Order, with Nemesis, goddess of Retribution and avenger of Themis’ transgressors. Fullerton appropriately defines the allegorical functionality of the two deities as: ‘divine retribution = cosmic order’. The earliest inscriptive evidence of this affiliation is found on the previously mentioned sixth-century perirrhanterion, which reads: Φιλόδορος ἐστὶ ἄνεθε μὴ καὶ Νεμέη, and while it confirms a connection between the two deities from at least this date, her mention on the perirrhanterion presupposes she was already established at the sanctuary before this date.

A late fourth or early third-century inscription on the base of a female statue (figure 56) found inside the smaller sanctuary building further verifies a

305 Petrakos, 'Το Ιερό της Νάμεσης στον Ραμνούντα', 38; Petrakos, Rhamnous, 23. Petrakos and the SEG authors believe the building may also have functioned as a treasury to store dedications made to Themis and Nemesis: SEG 40.178.
306 Paus. 1.33.2-8. Detailed discussions on Themis are found in: Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 45-73; Harrison, Themis, passim; and more briefly in: Munn, The Mother of the Gods, 337-340.
307 Fullerton, Greek Sculpture, 287.
308 Above pp. 202-203.
309 IG i³ 1018.5; SEG 38.26, 49.65; LRhamnous II 75; Knittlmayer, 'Kultbild und Heiligtum der Nemesis', 5; Chaniotis, Mylonopoulos & Stavrianopoulou, 'Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion 1996', 276-277; no. 220; Petrakos, PAAH 140, 1984 [1988], 200 no. 129. Note Pimpl’s alternative reading of -θε- as a restoration of the verb ἄνεθε of καὶ Νεμέη, i.e. Φιλόδορος ἄνεθε μὴ καὶ Νεμέη. His idea is not supported by the editors of SEG and is considered an unlikely restoration by Mylonopoulos: Pimpl, Perirrhanteria und Louteria, 96.
310 The statue and base are traditionally dated ca. late fourth or early third century but Ridgway’s analysis concerning the sculptor provides a date of ca. 315, i.e. more late fourth
joint veneration and also names two priestesses connected with the pair.\textsuperscript{311} The large size of this statue, at 2.22 metres tall, and its dedication to Themis has encouraged a theory it may represent the deity herself, although this is not confirmed.\textsuperscript{312} The inscription reads:

\begin{verbatim}
Μεγακλῆς Μεγακλέους Ῥαμνούσ[ιος ἄνεθηκεν Θεμίδι στεφαγωθεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν δικαιοσύνης ἔνακε ἑ[πὶ] εἰρείας Καλλιστοῖς καὶ νικήσας πασί καὶ ἀνδράσι γυμνασιαρχῶν καὶ Χαϊρέστρατος Χαιρεδήμου Ῥαμνούσιος ἐπόησε\textsuperscript{313}
\end{verbatim}

Opinions vary over the correct interpretation of the wording, especially since it is badly executed, the layout of the lines do not naturally fit within the prescribed area, and there is evidence of two scribes. Indeed, the layout has been deduced to be so out of alignment that it is generally restored as follows with a rearrangement of the highlighted lines:

\begin{verbatim}
Μεγακλῆς Μεγακ[λέους Ῥαμνούσιος ἄνεθηκεν Θεμίδι στεφανωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν δικαιοσύνης ἔνακε ἑ[πὶ] εἰρείας Καλλιστοῖς καὶ Φειδοστράτης Νεμέσει εἰρέας κομιοδοῶς χορηγῶν ναχ. 0.04 Χαϊρέστρατος Χαιρεδήμου Ῥαμνούσιος ἐπόησε\textsuperscript{314}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{311} NAMA 231; J. Ma, \textit{Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World}, Oxford, 2013, 18-19. Petrakos suggests the statue may originally have held a libation flask in one hand and bronze scales in the other identifying her as goddess of justice: Petrakos, \textit{National Museum: Sculpture - Bronzes - Vases}, 112; Mantēs, \textit{Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερέων στην αρχαία Ελληνική τέχνη}, 104, fig. 46a.

\textsuperscript{312} The statue as Themis is suggested by: Fullerton, \textit{Greek Sculpture}, 287; Kaltas, \textit{Sculpture in the National Archaeological Museum}, 272 no. 568; Ridgway, \textit{Hellenistic Sculpture: Styles of ca. 331-200 B.C.}, III vols, vol. I, Wisconsin, 2001, 55-57. \textsuperscript{313} I.Rhamnous II 120; SEG 40.178, 47.207, 48.197; \textsuperscript{314} IG ii 3109; Pouilloux, \textit{La Forteresse de Rhammone}, no. 39.
Obviously correct word placement affects the intended meaning, yet in whichever way it is read there is no dispute that both Themis and Nemesis are mentioned as deities. Hornum translates the inscription as:

Megakles, son of Megakles, Rhamnousian, dedicated (this) to Themis, having been crowned by the people on account of righteousness, having won both as gymnasiarch among boys and men, and as choregos in comedy performances, at the time of the priestess Kallisto and Pheidostrate, priestess to Nemesis. Chairestratos, son of Chairodemos, Rhamnousian, made (this).315

Hornum’s reading suggests the offering was made by Megakles for events that took place in close proximity to a single point in time when the two priestesses, Kallisto and Pheidostrate, simultaneously held office. Conversely, a different meaning is extracted from Ma’s translation:

Megakles, son of Megakles, of Rhamnous, dedicated (this statue of Themis) to Themis, having been crowned by the demesmen on account of his righteousness, when Kallisto was priestess, and also having been victorious as gymnasiarch for the boys and the grown men, (added on) and when Pheidostrate was priestess of Nemesis, (having been victorious) as choregos of comedies. Chairestratos, son of Chairodemos, of Rhamnous, made this.316

The difference is not negligible. Contrary to Hornum’s close point in time Ma’s reading indicates two events being commemorated at two very different times, possibly at some distance apart: the first when Kallisto was priestess,

---

315 Hornum, Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games, 204 no. 95.
316 Trans: Ma, Statues and Cities, 19. For the theatre at Rhamnous where comedies and drama would have been performed, see: J. Paga, ‘Deme Theatres in Attika and the Trittys System,’ Hesperia 79, no. 3, 2010, 351-384, esp. 354, 361-364, 366-367, Rhamnous theatre dating to fifth century and before, 373.
followed by a second when Pheidostrate\textsuperscript{317} was priestess to Nemesis. Ma’s reading has the added inference that at one time Kallisto held the office for both goddesses and at another time this role was performed by Pheidostrate, although the latter is named as Nemesis’ priestess only.

Then again, Mantēs’ analysis of the inscription and study of the grammatical variations has led him to propose an alternative textual restoration. Picking up the Greek at the first καὶ he suggests:

\begin{center}

Καὶ Νεμέσει (ἀνέθηκεν) νικήσας παισὶ καὶ ἀνδράσι γυμναισιαρχῶν καὶ κωμῳδοῖς χορηγῶν (ἐπὶ) ἱερέας Φειδοστράτης.

or

Καὶ (ἐπὶ) ἱερέας Φειδοστράτης (ἀνέθηκε) Νεμέσα νικήσας παισὶ καὶ ἀνδράσι γυμναισιαρχῶν καὶ κωμῳδοῖς χορηγῶν.
\end{center}

And (he dedicated) to Nemesis, after victory as \textit{gymnasiarch} for boys and men and as \textit{choregos} of comedies in the time of priestess Pheidostrate.

or

And in the priestesshood of Pheidostrate (he dedicated) to Nemesis after victory as \textit{gymnasiarch} for the boys and men and as \textit{choregos} of comedies.\textsuperscript{318}

This rearrangement has led Mantēs to argue that: the two datives in Θέμιδι and Νεμέσει indicate the statue was a joint dedication to both Themis and Nemesis, and the more commonly accepted arrangement of καὶ Φειδοστράτης Νεμέσει ἱερέας ought to be replaced by either of his proposals above. He suggests the words should not be read as evidence of Pheidostrate as priestess to Nemesis but as confirmation of a dedication by Megakles to Nemesis when Pheidostrate was priestess,\textsuperscript{319} a reading Palagia, without explanation, calls ‘impossible’.\textsuperscript{320}

The following is my reading of Mantēs’ analysis: Megakles made a dedication to Themis on account of having been crowned by the people for his righteousness in the time of Kallisto as priestess, and later he made a

\textsuperscript{317} The name Pheidostrate is the only female name inscribed on the third-century grave \textit{peribolos} of Diogeiton at Rhamnous. It is possible that this Pheidostrate and the priestess were one and the same; as a priestess this would have been a matter of pride for the family, so they inscribed her name for all to see: SEG 26.304; Petrakos, \textit{Rhamnous}, 39, 41, figs 22-24.

\textsuperscript{318} Translation: author.

\textsuperscript{319} Mantēs, \textit{Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερών στην αρχαία Ελληνική τέχνη}, 108-111.

\textsuperscript{320} Palagia, ‘No Demokratia’, 119.
dedication to Nemesis when Pheidostrate was priestess after winning as gymnasarch and choregos.\textsuperscript{321} I find this interpretation sits well with the attributes of the two goddesses: Megakles appropriately dedicates to the goddess of righteousness when he is honoured by his fellow demesmen as being righteous; and, he dedicates to the goddess of retribution when he wins victory, no doubt as thanks to the deity but also that he not become too conceited and deserving of punishment.

In addition, Mantēs’ further suggests the statue was not a representation of any one deity or person but of both goddesses combined into one:\textsuperscript{322} in effect a Themis-Nemesis drawing on the strengths of each goddess into one omnipotent deity. The only other mention of a combined Themis-Nemesis comes seven hundred years later in fourth-century AD Hesychios’ definition of Ἀγαθή Τύχη as ἡ Νέμεσις καὶ ἡ Θέμις,\textsuperscript{323} perhaps meaning ‘good luck’ is having a respect of Themis and all she represents, together with a fear of Nemesis and her retributive power consequent upon too much boastful exuberance as was, for example, demonstrated by Kroisos, whose previously discussed boastful articulation of his good fortune earned him the retribution of nemesis.\textsuperscript{324} The total absence of any other contemporary evidence for a Themis-Nemesis leaves this aspect of Mantēs’ hypothesis a little implausible, though not impossible.

A proposal by Palagia puts forward the hypothetical thought that the statue may even be a representation of Nemesis being dedicated to Themis.\textsuperscript{325} At first the idea seems unlikely, but on reflection it is not wholly unreasonable that a statue of Nemesis, goddess of retribution towards those who violate the values of themis, should be dedicated to the service of its personification Themis. Whatever the original intention, for the time being the statue and the meaning of its inscription remain enigmatic.

\textsuperscript{321} Cf. Mantēs, Προβλήματα τῆς εἰκονογραφίας τῶν ἱερεῶν καὶ τῶν ἱερέων στὴν ἀρχαία Ἑλληνική τήχνη, 106-108.

\textsuperscript{322} Mantēs, Προβλήματα τῆς εἰκονογραφίας τῶν ἱερεῶν καὶ τῶν ἱερέων στὴν ἀρχαία Ἑλληνική τήχνη, 112. Karastassi also mentions the ‘doppelnatur’ and ‘zweiheiten’ of the goddesses: Karanastassi, ‘Wer ist die Frau Hinter Nemesis?’, 129.

\textsuperscript{323} Hesych. vol. 1, 11.45 (Schmidt), vol. 1, 11.46 (Latte) s.v. Ἀγαθὴ Τύχη.

\textsuperscript{324} Kroisos is discussed above, pp. 169-179.

\textsuperscript{325} Palagia, 'No Demokratia', 119.
The priestesses, Pheidostrate and Kallisto, are again mentioned in connection with the two goddesses on two fourth-century stone chairs (figure 57):³²⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>έπι ἱερείας Φειδοστράτης</th>
<th>έπι ἱερείας Καλλίστου</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Θέμιδος</td>
<td>Νεμέσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σώστρατος</td>
<td>Σώστρατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέθηκεν</td>
<td>ἀνέθηκεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the priestesshood of Pheidostrate, Sostratos dedicated [this] to Themis
In the priestesshood of Kallisto, Sostratos dedicated [this] to Nemesis

The stone chairs may have been offerings made on one occasion by Sostratos to each of the goddesses who each had her own priestess, as argued by Wilhelm.³²⁷ Then again, following Mantēs’ reading of Megakles’ inscription, there may have been one priestess for both goddesses at any one time, and the chairs were two separate dedications at two separate times during the tenure of two different priestesses who each served both goddesses, with the phrase ‘in the priestesshood of’ reading as a dating formula.³²⁸ For example, Thucydides dates the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War to: ‘the forty-eighth year of the priestesshood of Chrysis, woman priest of Hera, at Argos’.³²⁹

A further votive, discussed in more detail below, concerns a third-century statue of the priestess Aristonoe dedicated to the two goddesses, Themis and Nemesis by Aristonoe’s son Hierokles:³³⁰

Hierokles, son of Hieropoios of Rhamnous, dedicated to Themis and Nemesis

---

³²⁶ IG ii² 4638a-b; SEG 34.193, 47.230-231; I.Rhamnous II 121, 122; V. Petrakos, Ο Δήμος του Ραμνούντος. Σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών Ι: Τοπογραφία; ΙΙ: Οι Επιγραφές, 1999, Athens, 1913-1998, 121-122; Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 73; Mantēs, Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερέων στην αρχαία Ελληνική τέχνη, 108-109, pl. 48a-b; Petrakos, PAAH 139, 1983 [1986], 125; Petrakos, PAAH 138, 1982 [1984], 159 no. 3; Pouilloux, La Forteresse de Rhamnonte, no. 40; Society of the Dilettanti, The Unedited Antiquities of Attika, 51, pl. v.


³²⁸ Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 73; Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 57.

³²⁹ Thuc. 2.2; cf. Hellanik. FGrH 323a, who uses the priestesses of Hera at Argos as chronological markers; J. B. Connelly, Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece, Princeton and Oxford, 2007, 57; Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 73.

³³⁰ IG ii² 3462; I.Rhamnous II 133.
[this statue of] his mother Aristonoe, priestess of Nemesis, daughter of Nikokratos of Rhamnous.\textsuperscript{331}

The recognition of, and dedications to, Themis and Nemesis continued through the third century, and into the second,\textsuperscript{332} but after 100/99 all mention of Themis ends. For reasons unknown, her veneration at Rhamnous declined during the late Hellenistic and early Roman eras,\textsuperscript{333} so that by the time Pausanias was writing of his visit to Rhamnous it may have ceased altogether.

**THE SANCTUARY PRIESTESSES**

Words probably spoken by Melanippe in Euripides’ fragmentary play, *Melanippe Desmotis*, argue the importance of women in religious roles, especially those connected with ‘the Fates and Nameless Goddesses’:

Now as for dealings with the gods, which I consider of prime importance, we have a very great role in them. Women proclaim Loxias’ mind in Phoebus’ halls, and by Dodona’s holy foundations, beside the sacred oak, womenkind conveys the thoughts of Zeus to those Greeks who want to know it. Those rituals, too, which are performed for the Fates and the Nameless Goddesses are not open to men, but are promoted by women entirely. That is how the rights of women stand in dealings with the gods.\textsuperscript{334}

At Rhamnous the goddesses were not nameless as were those spoken of by Melanippe, they were Nemesis and Themis, and were appropriately attended by priestesses of whom three can be named: the previously mentioned Kallisto, Pheidostrate, and Aristonoe. The names of the first two are inscribed on the aforementioned base of the Themis statue (figure 56) and on the two fourth-century stone chairs discovered by Gandy in situ (concluded from the exactly

\textsuperscript{331} Translation: author.

\textsuperscript{332} For example: *SEG* 41.90 (222/221); *IRhamnous* II 151 (late second century), 150 (101/100); *IG* ii\textsuperscript{2} 2869 (ca. 100); *SEG* 49.200 (ca. 100/99).

\textsuperscript{333} *IG* ii\textsuperscript{2} 2869; *SEG* 49.200; Karanastassi, ‘Wer ist die Frau Hinter Nemesis?’, 131.

\textsuperscript{334} Trans. Collard/Cropp F494.12-21 (*TGrF* 5.1 F494.12-21): ἃ δ’ εἰς θεοὺς οὖ - πρῶτα γὰρ κρίνω τάδ' - μέρος μέγαστον ἔχομεν· ἐν Φοίβου τε γὰρ δόμως προσφητεύουσι Λοξίου φρένα γυναῖκες, ἀμφι δ' ἀγα Λοδώνυτο<κο< βάθρα φηγο παρε' ἤρυθηθή τάξις Δι' ὑπὸ φρένας γένος πορείας τὸς θέλουσιν Ἑλλάδας. ἃ δ' εἰς τε Μοίρας τὰς τ' ανοιγόμενος θέας ἤρα τελεῖται, τάττε' ἐν ἀνδράσιν μὲν οὖ<χ> δείκα καθέστηκ', ἐν γυναῖκι δ' αύξεται ἄκαντα. ταύτη τάν θεοὺς ἔχει δίκη θηλεία.
matching grooves on the floor) on the front-porch of the small temple building (figure 57). 335

The stone seats recall the votive statuette of the seated goddess depicted in figure 26 as the Rhamnous priestesses would have rested in their seats in a similar fashion. The special privilege of a dedicated seat 336 would have given the priestess a prime position from which to view the spectacle of festivals, including almost certainly aspects of the Nemeseia festival (to be discussed) 337 as the road immediately in front of the temple became a processional way which meandered down towards the town of Rhamnous. 338

Although not known absolutely, it is confidently presumed the priestesshood at Rhamnous followed similar rules and formats to those at other Greek sanctuaries. For example: an adulteress would not have been eligible for a priestesshood; 339 any aspiring priestess would have been required to be physically healthy and of sound body: ἀ πριαμένα ἔστω ὑγιῆς καί

335 IG ii² 4638a-b; SEG 34.193, 47.230-231; I.Rhamnous II 121, 122; Petrakos, PAAH 138, 1982 [1984], 148; Society of the Dilettanti, The Unedited Antiquities of Attika, 52, pl. v.
337 Below pp. 279-287.
338 Athena’s priestess at Athens was similarly privileged to have a stone chair on the Parthenon’s porch from which to view her realm: Hdt. 5.72: ἥ δὲ ἱερή ἐξαναστᾶσα ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου (‘the priestess rose from her throne’).
339 Dem. 59.85-86.
Cult Centre at Rhamnous

sterolcharos, a stipulation similarly applicable to any offering made to the deity; the role was likely to have been hereditary and held by local women of high standing and; it would have been held for life. Documented evidence of priestesses with life tenure include the priestess of Athena Nike, priestess of Athena Polias (Lysimache served for sixty-four years), the priestess of Demeter, and the priestess of Aphrodite Pandemos on Kos bought her priestesshood for life and paid for it in instalments. Chrysis, priestess of Hera, served for more than fifty-six years but had to flee from a fire she accidentally started. The longevity of priestesses’ tenure enabled Hellanikos to use them as a chronological dating system, for example, the priestesses of Hera at Argos. The benefit of life tenure ensured priestesses became expertly proficient and highly experienced in their duties.

Virginity, occasionally obligatory in a priestess, was not a prerequisite for the Rhamnous priestesses, as an inscription inscribed on the base of a third-century statue of the priestess Aristonoe (figure 58) dedicated by her son.

340 Pl. Laws 759c; this topic is discussed in relation to Kos, by: Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 74; M. P. J. Dillon, 'Post-Nuptial Sacrifices on Kos (Serge, ED 178) and Ancient Greek Marriage Rites,' ZPE 124, 1999, 65.
341 For example, from Andania in the Peloponnese: LSGC 65.70 (first century).
342 The distinction between priestesses from aristocratic families and those publicly elected is discussed in: Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 76.
344 IG i 3 35, ca. 448; Meiggs & Lewis 44; R. Garland, 'Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens,' AM 79, 1984, 90.
345 Garland, 'Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens'. Evidence for Lysimache: Pliny NH 34.76; cf. IG ii 3453, SEG 30.140.
346 Hellanik. FGrH 323a; Thucydides, who had read Hellanikos (Thuc. 1.97.2), notes that Chrysis had served as priestess for forty-eighth and a half years at the commencement of the Peloponnesian War: 2.2.1, 4.133.2-3.
347 Hellanik. FGrH 323a.
348 Plut. Mor. 435d, 438c; Paus. 2.10.4, 33.2; Paus. 7.19.1, 26.5; Paus. 8.5.11-13, 8.13.1, 5. A discussion on virgin priestesses is found in: Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 75, 77; Turner, Hiereiai, 181-205.
Hierokles, confirms.\(^{351}\) Chastity for the tenure of the office may have been stipulated, in which case the incumbents were possibly older women,\(^{352}\) but it is more likely the priestesses were able to carry out their religious duties whilst still married.\(^{353}\) Contrary to the practice in places like Miletos, its colonies, the Aegean islands, and other eastern Greek settlements, where a priestesshood could be purchased,\(^{354}\) there is no evidence for this practice on the mainland.

Priestess Aristonoe’ portrait statue (figure 58) has been dated to the third century, but argued by Dillon as stylistically replicating late Classical dress style and sculptural traditions.\(^{355}\) The statue was a private dedication to Nemesis and Themis by the priestess’ son, Hierokles, in tribute to his mother. The dedication reads:\(^{356}\)

\(^{351}\) IG ii\(^2\) 3462; B. E. Goff, *Citizen Bacchae: Women's Ritual Practice in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2004, 150; Dillon, *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*, 77. Several cults permitted the priestess to be married, for example: Hyp. F199 (Artemis Brauronia); SEG 16.160 (Eleusis); SEG 32.115.10-11 (IG ii\(^2\) 775+803) (cult of Athenian Agauros); IG ii\(^2\) 1316.7 (Mother of the Gods cult); Lysimache, Priestess of Athena Polias had children: Pliny NH 34.76, cf. IG ii\(^2\) 3453, SEG 30.140.

\(^{352}\) Chastity or otherwise in various cults is discussed in: Dillon, *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*, 77-78; Turner, *Hiereiai*, 206-214; cf. Kron, 'Priesthoods, Dedications and Euergetism: What Part Did Religion Play in the Political and Social Status of Greek Women?,' 140. Chastity in older woman was thought natural since the Greeks considered these women to be past such desires: '[Demeter] looked like an old crone, debarred from motherhood and the blessings of garland-loving Aphrodite': *Hom. Hymn Dem*. 2.101-102. Other centres where the priestess is described as ‘old’ include: Paus. 2.10.4 (Sikyon); Paus. 6.20.2 (Elis); Paus. 7.25.13 (Achaia); Aischyl. *Eum*. 38 (Delphi); cf. Diod. 16.26.6.

\(^{353}\) See the discussion on married women as priestesses in: Turner, *Hiereiai*, 215-224.

\(^{354}\) A selection of documentary evidence is found in: *LSG* 175 (Antimachaia), 160-161 (Kos); *LSS* 77 (Khios); *LSA* 23 (Erythrai), 40 (Mykale), 44 (Miletos); Connelly, 'In Divine Affairs - the Greatest Part: Women and Priesthoods in Classical Athens,' 188-189; Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess*, 50-55; the sales of priesthoods on Kos is discussed in: R. Parker & D. Obbink, 'Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I,' *Chiron* 31, 2001, 229-252; R. Parker & D. Obbink, 'Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I,' *Chiron* 30, 2000, 415-449 (a sanctuary to Adriasteia and Nemesis, and the sale of two priestesshoods); Dillon, 'Post-Nuptial Sacrifices on Kos', 64-65; Turner, *Hiereiai*, 141-173, appendix 4 (pp. 421-423) provides a table of prices paid for priesthoods.


Hierokles, son of Hieropoioi of Rhamnous, dedicated to Themis and Nemesis [this statue of] his mother Aristonoe, priestess of Nemesis, daughter of Nikokratos of Rhamnous.357

The statue and inscribed base were found inside the doorway of the small ‘temple’ building during the 1890 excavations by the Society of the Dilettanti under Gandy’s direction.359 She stands 1.62 metres high in a frontal position, with her left knee slightly bend as she shifts her weight onto the right leg. She wears a chiton with himation, and her hair is styled with a middle parting and wavy tresses that are rolled back and over a band, a tainia, that is tied around her head in a way that conceals the tainia except where the hair is parted. The statue was originally discovered intact with just the fingers of the left hand missing, but the right forearm and hand with phiale were subsequently lost.360 Corresponding to the view that the Rhamnous priestesses may have been women of more mature years, Aristonoe is a matronly woman past the first

357 IG ii² 3462; I.Rhamnous II 133; Pouilloux, La Forteresse de Rhamnonte, 155 no. 44, pl. 60.4.
358 Translation: author.
359 The team dug the ground beneath and around Aristonoe’s statue and recorded fragments of bone, bronze, spearheads, and small lachrymal vases of uncertain date, all subsequently lost: Petракos, PAAH 138, 1982 [1984], 151; Society of the Dilettanti, The Unedited Antiquities of Attika, 51.
bloom of youth with a double chin and wrinkle folds around her neck, she is slightly portly and has ‘bags’ under her eyes.\footnote{Little is known of the statue’s dedicant, Hierokles, his father Hieropoios, or his mother Aristonoe, but they were possibly descendants of another Hierokles living in the fourth century. This earlier Hierokles had a family peribolos sited next to the road leading from the sanctuary down towards the town of Rhamnous with several inscribed family grave markers.\footnote{Archaeologists have confirmed the peribolos contained fifteen cremations stretching over four generations, which is more than those named on the grave inscriptions.\footnote{Yet as Parker rightly cautions it can never be stated absolutely that all persons interned have been uncovered, or that an inscribed list is complete.\footnote{Although possibly an over-interpretation, it is noted that the ἰερός root in the names of Ἰεροκλῆς and Ἰεροποιός translates as ‘manifesting divine power’,\footnote{with the name Ἰεροποιός having the added meaning of ‘overseer of temples and sacred rites’.\footnote{Consequently, ἰερός may have been a deliberate inclusion by a proud family who traditionally held hereditary priestly roles from one generation to another.\footnote{This theory has tenuous support from the discovery, immediately in front of Hierokles’ peribolos from where it may have originated, of a fragmentary fourth-century funereal marble lekythos.\footnote{It depicts individuals with religious paraphernalia making their final farewells to}}}}}}}}

Little is known of the statue’s dedicant, Hierokles, his father Hieropoios, or his mother Aristonoe, but they were possibly descendants of another Hierokles living in the fourth century. This earlier Hierokles had a family peribolos sited next to the road leading from the sanctuary down towards the town of Rhamnous with several inscribed family grave markers.\footnote{Archaeologists have confirmed the peribolos contained fifteen cremations stretching over four generations, which is more than those named on the grave inscriptions.\footnote{Yet as Parker rightly cautions it can never be stated absolutely that all persons interned have been uncovered, or that an inscribed list is complete.\footnote{Although possibly an over-interpretation, it is noted that the ἰερός root in the names of Ἰεροκλῆς and Ἰεροποιός translates as ‘manifesting divine power’,\footnote{with the name Ἰεροποιός having the added meaning of ‘overseer of temples and sacred rites’.\footnote{Consequently, ἰερός may have been a deliberate inclusion by a proud family who traditionally held hereditary priestly roles from one generation to another.\footnote{This theory has tenuous support from the discovery, immediately in front of Hierokles’ peribolos from where it may have originated, of a fragmentary fourth-century funereal marble lekythos.\footnote{It depicts individuals with religious paraphernalia making their final farewells to}}}}}}}}

\footnote{Little is known of the statue’s dedicant, Hierokles, his father Hieropoios, or his mother Aristonoe, but they were possibly descendants of another Hierokles living in the fourth century. This earlier Hierokles had a family peribolos sited next to the road leading from the sanctuary down towards the town of Rhamnous with several inscribed family grave markers.\footnote{Archaeologists have confirmed the peribolos contained fifteen cremations stretching over four generations, which is more than those named on the grave inscriptions.\footnote{Yet as Parker rightly cautions it can never be stated absolutely that all persons interned have been uncovered, or that an inscribed list is complete.\footnote{Although possibly an over-interpretation, it is noted that the ἰερός root in the names of Ἰεροκλῆς and Ἰεροποιός translates as ‘manifesting divine power’,\footnote{with the name Ἰεροποιός having the added meaning of ‘overseer of temples and sacred rites’.\footnote{Consequently, ἰερός may have been a deliberate inclusion by a proud family who traditionally held hereditary priestly roles from one generation to another.\footnote{This theory has tenuous support from the discovery, immediately in front of Hierokles’ peribolos from where it may have originated, of a fragmentary fourth-century funereal marble lekythos.\footnote{It depicts individuals with religious paraphernalia making their final farewells to}}}}}
a seated man who is shaking hands with a standing male figure dressed in the long ungirded tunic of a priest, and to the right a female dressed in a chiton with cloak holding a temple key, identifying her as a kleidouchos who was entrusted with the deity’s domain and its treasures. If, as I surmise, the lekythos originated from Hierokles’ peribolos it would indicate this family’s religious associations date back to at least the fourth century, and those interned within the peribolos are the predecessors of the same Hierokles who dedicated a portrait statue of his priestess mother, Aristonoe, in the third century.

In a patriarchal society such as ancient Greece, and Attika in particular where the highest honour that could be bestowed on a woman was to be neither praised nor censured or indeed even spoken about at all, a priestesshood was the only public office which gave her an authoritorial voice and to which she could aspire. Priestesshood gave her equal standing in leadership roles with her male counterparts elsewhere, and it was an office which brought public esteem as well as unique privileges such as designated theatre seats, and on rare occasions, the provision of a house. The priestess performed a valued and important role and acted as a link between the people and the gods in a manner which led Plato to say of priests generally: ‘they are supposed to be interpreters of the gods’, and ‘priests know how to give the gods, by means of sacrifices, the gifts that please them from us, and by prayers to ask for us the gain of good things from them’. Despite this, the role of a priestess was not pastoral in the modern-day sense, and the spiritual well-being of those who worshipped and sacrificed at the temple was not her concern. Her duties

---

370 Thuc. 2.45.
371 Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 97. A Roman era inscribed seat in the theatre of Dionysos at Athens, sixteen rows from the front, is reserved for a ‘priestess of Nemesis in Rhamnous’: *IG ii²* 5143; *SEG* 36.276; Petrakos, ‘Τὸ Νεμέων τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος,’ 325. A front row seat reserved for a ‘priest of Nemesis Ourania’ is not thought to have been connected with the sanctuary at Rhamnous: *IG ii²* 5070; *I. Rhamnous I* 154; Hornum, *Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games*, 193 no. 72; Stafford, *Worshipping Virtues*, 94.
372 The priestesses at Delphi and Eleusis enjoyed this privilege: *IG ii²* 1672.17-18, 74, 127, 293; Dillon, *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*, 78.
374 Pl. *St*. 290c-d.
would have included, but not limited to: leading processions, offering prayers, tending altar fires, pouring libations, adorning sacrificial animals, overseeing or performing the sacrifices, distribution and dispensing the sacrificial meat, conducting purification rites, guardianship of the sacred articles, keeping an inventory of the dedicated offerings from worshippers, and especially the care of the cult statue.\footnote{375} Remuneration for her services may have been monetary, for example Myrrhine, the priestess of Athena Nike, received fifty drachmas a year for her services plus extra benefits from the sacrifices.\footnote{376} Or possibly she received no actual monetary payment but was rewarded in kind with meat and pelts from the sacrificed animals, grain, fruit, cakes, wine, oil, and honey.\footnote{377}

At several cult centres the priestesses had an assistant or assistants to help her in her duties. The priestess of Demeter at Phigalia in Arkadia had the help of three female ‘sacrifices’ the youngest of whom, most likely a \textit{parthenos}, was present with the priestess to aid in the sacrifices:

\begin{quote}
ιέρεια δὲ σφισίν ἐστιν ἡ δρόσσα, σὺν δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ τῶν ἱεροθυτῶν καλουμένων ὁ νεώτατος · οἱ δὲ εἰσὶ τῶν ἀστῶν τρεῖς ἀριθμόν.\footnote{378}
\end{quote}

They have a priestess who performs the rites, and with her is the youngest of their ‘sacrificers’, as they are called, who are citizens, three in number.

In Athens, Athena Polias had assistants known as the \textit{Κοσμώ} and \textit{Τραπεζώ} (or \textit{Τραπεζοφόρος}),\footnote{379} whose role presumably related to the care of the \textit{τράπεζα}, or sacred table, possibly the altar itself, on which sacrifices were set out.\footnote{380}

\footnotesize
\begin{center}
\begin{threeparttable}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
\hline
\textbf{376} & \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{2} 24, 25; \textit{IG} i\textsuperscript{3} 35, 36; Meiggs & Lewis 44, 71; cf. epitaph to Myrrhine, priestess of Athena Nike: \textit{SEG} 12.80.
\hline
\hline
\textbf{378} & Paus. 8.42.12.
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{threeparttable}
\end{center}
I have argued that the sanctuary at Rhamnous had one life-serving incumbent priestess at any given time who attended both Themis and Nemesis, and that the sanctuary rituals followed those found elsewhere in the Greek world. Whether the priestess had help in her duties from an assistant is not known, but once the significance of the cult centre grew after both the Greek victory at Marathon and the establishment of the training centre for ephebes at the fort in the town below, it would be reasonable to presume that such assistance was forthcoming since her duties would have increased commensurately.

**GRAVE STELAI FROM RHAMNOUS**

The oldest grave-stele from Rhamnous dates to the sixth century. It is inscribed with just one word, the name of the deceased: Σέλιθος, together with three incised strokes on either side.\(^{381}\)

Another stele, discovered inside the small building within the sanctuary by Gandy in 1812, can be dated to the fourth century judging from its stylized capital. *Figure 59* depicts his finely worked drawing (with obvious reconstructive artwork) of this stele.\(^{382}\) It shows a standing man farewelling a seated woman, presumably his mother or his wife. Unfortunately it has never

---

380 IG ii² 1245.6, 1534.163, 1933.2.
381 SEG 48.86; V. Petrakos, *PAAH* 153, 1998 [2000], 32; Petrakos, Εἴσηγης 45, 1998 [1999], 16; G. Touchais, S. Huber, Y. Varalis, *et al.*, 'Chronique des Fouilles et Découvertes Archéologiques en Grèce en 1998,' *BCH* 123, no. 2, 1999, 664. A point of interest is that the greatest number of Attic funerary-stelai outside Athens have been found at Rhamnous, eighty-two thus far. There are some individual graves but most are family groups dating to the fourth century with inscriptions limited to names and family relationships: Euphranor (8 burials, 3 generations), Pytharchos (6 burials, 3 generations), Athenodoros and Dromakles (5 burials, 2 generations), Diogeiton (8 burials, 5 generations), Phanokrates (7 burials, 2 generations), Hierokles (15 cremations, 4 generations), Mnesitheos (at least 1 burial), Diophantides (NA), and Lysippos and Mnesikrateia (3 burials, 2 generations): Osborne, *Athens and Athenian Democracy*, 153-155; Hildebrandt, *Die attischen Namenstelen*, 396-396, pls 132-142.
been seen since, although Pettrakos believes Gandy sent it with numerous other remains from Rhamnous to the British Museum, despite its firm denial in 1908.\footnote{Petrakos, 'Νέας Ἑρευνας στὸν Ραμνοῦντα', 53 no. 136; W. R. Lethaby, Greek Buildings Represented by Fragments in the British Museum, London, 1908, 176-178.} Whether the stele was inscribed is unknown.

One valuable discovery is the restored fourth-century grave-stele of a priestess\footnote{NAMA 2309; J. B. Grossman, Funerary Sculpture (The Athenian Agora 35), Princeton, New Jersey, 2013, 95 no. 51, p. 147; Connelly, 'In Divine Affairs - the Greatest Part: Women and Priesthoods in Classical Athens,' 191-192, 210 no. 87; Connelly, Portrait of a Priestess, 232, fig. 8.6, 350 no. 31, pl. 21; Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion, 80; Kosmopoulou, 'Working Women: Female Professionals on Classical Attic Gravestones', 297; A. Scholl, Die attischen Bildfeldstelen des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den kleinformatigen Grabreliefs im spätklassischen Athen, Berlin, 1996, 277 no. 206, pl. 38, 2; Clairmont, Classical Attic Tombstones, vol. 1, 310-311, no. 1.316; Mantēs, Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερέων στην αρχαία Ελληνική τέχνη, 40-41, pl. 11b.} (figure 60), shown as a kleidouchos with a temple key being held in an upright position in her left hand and resting against her shoulder.\footnote{Connelly, 'In Divine Affairs - the Greatest Part: Women and Priesthoods in Classical Athens,' 191; Connelly, Portrait of a Priestess, 232; Mantēs, Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερέων στην αρχαία Ελληνική τέχνη, 40-41.} The large Hymettian marble fragment measures 337cms high by 350cms wide, and was found immediately below the fifth-century temple retaining wall.

The priestess is an older woman who stands with her right knee slightly bent, her head turned to the right as she looks down towards the ground which now holds her. A tainia is tied around her head, and she wears a sleeved chiton with a himation draped over her left shoulder, which is then caught up around the waist and arranged over her left forearm. The temple key, the tainia, the manner in which her himation is worn with a thick twist of fabric around the waist, all identify her as a priestess who, would have been in the service of

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure60.png}
\caption{Grave-stele for a priestess; from Rhamnous; ca. 380-370; NAMA 2309; (source: museum).}
\end{figure}
Nemesis. Her name, which would have been inscribed on the now broken upper part of the stele, is lost and thus unknown, and as such she stands as the representative of all priestesses who served at the sanctuary.

Although not grave-stelai, inscribed altar votives might be dedicated as a form of personal piety and homage. The statue in figure 61 from Nemesis’ temple, has an inscription on the base which concludes with the assumption that the un-named deity is known by all:

Λυσικλείδης ἀνέθηκ-εν Ἐπανδρίδο θὸς ἄπτεν ἐπὶ ἀρχὴν τὸν θεία τῇ-δε, ἡ τόδε (Ε)χει τέμενος. 388

Lysikleides, son of Epandrides, dedicated a first gift to this goddess here who owns this sanctuary here. 389

Presumably, since Nemesis was the primary deity at Rhamnous the dedicator felt no necessity to include her name.

All that remains of a final votive offering from the sanctuary is its large fifth-century marble base. The dedicated statue the base once supported has long since been lost, and all that remains of its fragmented inscription, is:

[- - - -]Μ[- - - -] [Νεμέας]Ει ἀνέθης[σαν] 390

386 Kosmopoulou, ‘Working Women: Female Professionals on Classical Attic Gravestones’, 297; Mantēs, Προβλήματα της εικονογραφίας των ιερείων και των ιερέων στην αρχαία Ελληνική τέχνη, 41; Petraros, ΡΑΗ 138, 1982 [1984], 149.

387 School of Agorakritos. N. Bookidis, ‘The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: The Terracotta Sculpture,’ Corinth 18, no. 5, 2010, 4, 25, 29, 156, 184. The statue may represent Neanias, a local hero, or perhaps the youth’s right hand held a statuette of Neanias. Neanias is also depicted on the base of Nemesis’ statue at Rhamnous, discussed above pp. 255-259.

388 IG i3 1021; IG i2 828; I.Rhamnous II 88; CEG 1 320; Lazzarini, no. 643; Pouilloux, La Forteresse de Rhammonte, 151, no.36.

That it was a dedication to Nemesis is confirmed, but nothing more is known of either the nature of the statue that stood upon it or the name of the dedicant.

**The Nemeseia**

The Nemeseia was an annual festival held at Rhamnous and as its name suggests was associated with, and connected to, the goddess Nemesis. It is included here, even though the majority of evidence is Hellenistic and thus outside the chronological sphere of this thesis, because the festival is pertinent for the way in which it exemplifies the changing roles of the goddess over time. It demonstrates how the worship of a largely agrarian goddess, as she was prior to the sixth century, developed over the centuries until finally she not only had her own temple, cult statue, and cult personnel, but also a festival named for her where she and her priestesses presided.

Literary, epigraphic, and iconographic evidence dating from the fourth to the first century confirms a festival so named, but what is less certain is the festival’s precise purpose or format, although there are a few ambiguous clues. Ancient indications variously point to a festival to honour the dead, an agonistic event involving the Attic epheboi stationed at Rhamnous during their second year of training, or possibly a combination of both.

A festival for the dead under the auspices of Nemesis would be a tidy extension of her role as guardian of the wronged dead and as the protector of graves, previously discussed, a supposition advanced by Petrakos. With such a connection the festival may have originally been a means of appeasing the dead for any funereal ritual oversight, in an attempt to avoid any retribution from Nemesis, or, perhaps the festival, together with sacrifices and libations, served ‘to placate those who had come to a violent end’; or, possibly it was a way of averting Nemesis’ wrath and calming the dead who might wish to bring

---


391 Above, pp. 142-146, 151.


393 A. Baumeister, *Denkmäler des klassischen Altertums zur Erläuterung des Lebens der Griechen und Römer in Religion, Kunst und Sitt*, vol. 2, München, 1887, 1008.

vengeance upon the living for some personal outrage inflicted during the deceased lifetime.\footnote{Johnston, Restless Dead, 46.} I would further postulate that it may even have originated as a sort of harvest festival some time in \textit{ca.} the seventh or sixth century, given Nemesis’ agrarian origins at Rhamnous, and that this developed over time to incorporate her role among the dead, until eventually it included agonistic games for the benefit of the \textit{ephebes} stationed at Rhamnous. All or none of these suppositions may be correct for very little is known about the Nemeseia, and what is known only increases speculative argument.

Demosthenes, writing in the mid fourth century, provides the earliest literary reference for the Nemeseia as a festival honouring the dead in a speech before a jury against Spoudias concerning a property and dowry dispute. A witness, the unnamed brother-in-law of Spoudias, argues that his wife but not Spoudias’ gave a large contribution of one \textit{mna} of silver (one hundred \textit{drachmai},\footnote{[Arist.] \textit{Ath. Pol.} 10.2; \textit{LSJ} 1138, col. 2, s.v. νμᾶ.} about a third of a year’s wages for the average worker in the mid fifth century) for the Nemeseia to commemorate her dead father:

\begin{quote}
τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ἐἰσενεγκόσθης τῆς ἐμῆς γυναικὸς εἰς τὰ Νεμέσεια τῷ πατρί μνήμονα ἄργυρίου καὶ προαναλωσάσης, οὐδὲ ταύτης ἄξιοὶ συμβαλέσθαι τὸ μέρος.
\end{quote}

And finally, although my wife advanced a \textit{mna} of silver and expended it on her father’s behalf at the Nemeseia, he \[the defendant\] refuses to contribute his \[wife’s\] share even of this.\footnote{Dem. 41.11; cf. Johnston, Restless Dead, 46, n. 29; Parker, \textit{Athenian Religion}, 246-247, n. 101, cf. 254, n. 126. \textit{(Translation: author.)}}

The \textit{Suda}, referring to the Demosthenes’ passage, explains that the Nemeseia was:

\begin{quote}
μὴποτὲ ἐορτὴ τις Νεμέσεως, καθ’ ἴδιον τοις κατοιχομένοις ἐπετέλουν τὰ νομιζόμενα. Νεμέσεια οὐν ἡ ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς γινομένη πανήγυρις, ἐπεὶ ἡ νέμεσις ἐπὶ τῶν νεκρῶν τέτακται.
\end{quote}

Perhaps (μὴποτὲ) a particular festival of Nemesis, at which they used to perform the customary rites for the dead. So the Nemeseia was the celebration held for the dead, since Nemesis is assigned to the dead.\footnote{\textit{Suda}, s.v. \textit{Νεμέσια} (nu 159). Cf: Parker, \textit{Polytheism and Society at Athens}, 476, s.v. Nemesia.}
The word μήποτε indicates the Suda authors acknowledged the possibility of such a festival although they knew very little else about it. Hornum’s translation of this passage has μήποτε as a negation for the festival, i.e. ‘There was never a feast of Nemesis, at which they celebrated the customary things for the deceased.’ An analysis of the word μήποτε reveals it has the potential to be ambiguous since it is construed as ‘never’ in early writers such as Homer, Hesiod and Aischylos, but as ‘perhaps’ in later authors, such as Aristotle, Arrian, Apollodoros Dyskolos, and the Suda. Consequently, the later interpretation of ‘perhaps’ is preferred to that of Hornum’s ‘never’. Although not actually voiced, Hornum’s reading infers support for Parker’s theory that Demosthenes’ Nemeseia festival might not have been known by this name but was a textual corruption of the word ‘Genesia’ a confirmed Attic festival of the dead, a theory rejected by Johnston, but considered feasibly by Friend. For the current discussion I believe Demosthenes knew the religious festivals and their names, and was referring to a celebration that honoured the dead.

The lexicographers, Photios (ninth-century AD) and Harpokration (first-second century AD), and the philologist Bekker (1785-1871), all mention the Nemeseia as a commemoration of the dead. Whether they were influenced by Demosthenes or whether they had access to other contemporary sources is not known:

Νεμέσεια: Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ κατά Σπουδίου. μήποτε ἔορτή τις ἦν Νεμέσεως, καθ’ ἣν τοῖς κατοιχομένοις ἐπετέλουν τὰ νομίζόμενα.

---

399 Hornum, Nemesis, The Roman State, and the Games, 151.
400 Hom. Il. 9.133, 275, 455; Hes. WD 86; Aischyl. Eu. 882, 977, Choe. 182, Suppl. 617; LSJ 1129, col. 1, s.v. μήποτε.
401 Arist. EN X 1.3.1; Arr. Epict. 3.22.80; Apoll. Dys. de Pron. 18; LSJ 1129, col. 1, s.v. μήποτε.
402 Parker, Athenian Religion, 246-247, n. 101, cf. 254, n. 126. A detailed discussion together with further references on the Genesia is found in: F. Jacoby, ‘ΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ: A Forgotten Festival of the Dead,’ CQ 38, no. 3/4, 1944, 65-75. If Parker’s theory is valid he could similarly have argued that ‘Nemeseia’ was a textual corruption of ‘Nekusia’ another festival of the dead: LSJ 1166, col. 2, s.v. νεκόσιον.
403 Johnston, Restless Dead, 46, n.29.
405 Harp. s.v. Νεμόσεια.
The similarity between the tenth-century AD Suda passage and these earlier extracts confirms them as sources from which the Suda drew. Worth discussion is the word πανήγυρις, which is used by Photios, Bekker, and the Suda in their description of the Nemeseia as a festival celebrated by ‘an assembly of people in honour of a god’. However, the word has seemingly been misinterpreted by Friend and Johnston who translate it as a description of the festival as going ‘all night’ (i.e. a παννυχεύω), with Friend stating: ‘the scholiast to the passage and the lexicographers define it as a night long commemoration of the dead’, which is incorrect. The word παννυχεύω as an all-night festival in connection with the Nemeseia was not used by the lexicographers, but it was mentioned in an unpublished second-century stele fragment from Rhamnous. The stele honours Euxitheos, strategos in 184/3 who had, as Petrakos comments: γιὰ τὴ μέριμνά του γιὰ τὸν καλότερο ἐορτασμὸ τῶν Νεμεσείων, τὰ ὑπὸ στὸ ψήφισμα ὁμομάζονται γιὰ πρώτη φορὰ, παννυχίς (‘taken care for the better celebration of the Nemeseia which the decree, for the first time, named as an all-night festival’). This inscription continues with an account of the epheboi participating in torch races at the celebrations of the Diogeneia and the Ptolemaia and the winners receiving prizes. (Torch races were run to celebrate the bringing of fire to sacrificial altars.) Although the lexicographers did not describe the Nemeseia as an all-night festival, the Rhamnous inscription confirms it began to be celebrated in this manner ca. the second century. Also to be noted is that,

---

406 Phot. Lex. s.v. Νεμεσία.
408 LSJ 1297, col. 2, s.v. πανήγυρις: ‘a national assembly in honour of a national god’, ‘to hold such festivals, keep holy-days’.
409 LSJ 1298, col. 2, s.v. παννυχεύω: ‘celebrate a night festival, keep vigil’.
412 Translation: author.
413 Greagan, 'Inscriptions: The Dedicatory Monuments', 70.
Contrary to Parker’s assertion of the παννυχίς as a predominately female festival,\(^{414}\) the three festivals named in the Rhamnous inscription, i.e. the Nemeseia, the Diogeneia, and the Ptolemaia,\(^ {415}\) were competitive agonistic all-night festivals in which the male *epheboi* participated.\(^ {416}\) Further evidence confirming male participation at the παννυχίς is found in a passage of Athenaios: ‘those that stay awake ἐν ταῖς παννυχίσιν will ‘kiss any woman he wishes of those who are there’\(^ {417}\).

The earliest indirect attestation for the Nemeseia as an agonistic festival dates to the fourth century, with the third century providing firm and specific epigraphical evidence. The fourth-century evidence comprises two votive herms from Rhamnous. The first, dated to 333/332, is an inscribed rounded votive base now attached to a male hip-herm dressed in *chiton* and *khamys* that commemorates a victory in the *ephebic* torch race event (λαμπάδις νικήσαντες) at Rhamnous. The inscription lists forty-six names from the *phyle* of Erechtheis (i.e. not from Rhamnous which belonged to the Trittys of Aiantis),\(^ {418}\) who have made this dedication to a deity whose name is now lost.\(^ {419}\) Another fourth-century votive herm from Rhamnous is made up of two uninscribed adjoining fragments depicting victorious torch race athletes approaching three goddesses credibly identified, though not verified, as Nike, Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, 166, n. 42.

\(^{414}\) The Diogeneia was a festival at Athens in honour of Diogenes the Macedonian: *LSJ* \(\S\) 432, col. 1, s.v. Διογένεις, τά, *IG* ii\(^ 2\) 1028.14; the Ptolemaia was a festival held in several Greek cities: *LSJ* \(\S\) 1548, col. 2, s.v. Πτολεμαῖα, τά; (Athens), *IG* ii\(^ 2\) 891.14; cf. *SEG* 49.200, an inscription on a *stele* found within Rhamnous fort which honours three *epheboi* who were victorious in the torch races of the Diogeneia and the Ptolemaia at Athens, ca. 100, and includes a dedication to Themis and Nemesis.

Themis and Nemesis. Unfortunately the festival’s name has not survived, or never existed, on either of these votive herms but the specific mention of the Nemeseia on later inscriptions in identical contexts presupposes that these two were associated with the same festival.

The third century provides definitive evidence for the Nemeseia, with the most significant a stele that mentions a ‘Great Nemeseia’. This is the sole extant use of the term and nothing is known about why this festival was so unique that it was singled out as ‘Great’. I suggest that since the Nemeseia festival was not confined to Rhamnous, with evidence affirming its celebration in other centres, for example, a decree from Athens dated 187/6: γινομένων δὲ καὶ τῶν Νεμεσίων - - - - , and a possible restoration of Νήμεσιον in an Attic inscription dated 337/334, that it was most likely an annual event held in various cities but that these cities all gathered together every four years, logically at Rhamnous, with their teams to hold combined games at the Great Nemeseia. A parallel is drawn with the Lesser and Greater Panathenaic games, where the former is an annual event and the latter a festival held every four years. Similarly, the Lesser and Greater Eleusinian mysteries, although these may have both been held annually. The celebrations at the Nemeseia (from ca. second century onwards), the Panathenaic, and the Eleusinian mysteries, all held παννυχις festivals which, for the latter two at least, included both males and females.

The Great Nemeseia inscription honours the Macedonian ruler Antigonos Gonatas, and suggests sacrifices were made at the Great Nemeseia which was

420 BM 1953.0530.1 + Rhamnous 530 (ex NAMA 2331 + Rhamnous 267, 457 and fragments of additional pieces); Friend, 'The Nemeseia in Lyceuran Athens,' 102; Stafford, Worshipping Virtues, 95, fig. 11; Palagia & Lewis, 'The Ephebes of Erechtheis', 340-344; Pet Akron, PAAH 138, 1982 [1984], 162 no. 2, pl. 101; B. Ashmole, 'Torch-Racing at Rhamnus,' AJA 66, no. 3, 1962, 233-234, pl. 59 1-3; cf. this votive with Rhamnous 531 (ex NAMA 2332) which appears to depict the same subject matter, and mentioned in: Palagia & Lewis, 'The Ephebes of Erechtheis', 340.

421 SEG 21.435 line 24 (187/6); SEG 18.13 line 8 (336/334), which would indicate polis games called the Nemeseia from at least this date.

422 Thuc. 6.56.2 (Greater); Pl. Euthyphr. 6c (Greater); Pl. Tim. 21a (Lesser); Suda s.v. Παναθηναία (πι 152) (Greater and Lesser); OCD 1104 s.v Panathenaia (Greater and Lesser).

423 IG i² 6B lines 36-40; IG i² 6C lines 10-15; Plut. Demetr. 26.1.
celebrated on the 19th Hekatombaion together with athletic contests. As convenient as the inscription appears for confirmation of sacrifices, athletic contests, and date of the Great Nemesia, it is observed that the wording is ambiguous as to whether these events were all held together on the 19th Hekatombaion, or whether they were held separately:


Elpinikos son of Mnēsippos, of Rhamnous, proposed: since Antigonus, 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, and to crown him at the athletic contests of the Great Nemesia, and to raise resources for the sacrifice from their fellow-demesmen, from their commercial profit; 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 beside the altar of king Antigonus …

---

424 SEG 41.75 lines 8-9, 42.115, 46,159; _LRhamnous_ II 7 lines 8-9; Stafford, "The People to the Goddess Livia", 212-213; Stafford, _Worshipping Virtues_, 94-96; Mikalson, _Religion in Hellenistic Athens_, 156, 160; Parker, _Athenian Religion_, 254, n. 126; Petrakos, _PAAH_ 144, 1989 [1992], 31-34 no. 15, pl. 12b.

425 SEG 41.75; Friend, 'The Nemesia in Lycurgan Athens,' 103; Parker, _Polytheism and Society at Athens_, 476; Stafford, _Worshipping Virtues_, 96.

What is certain is that Antigonos was to be crowned at the athletic contests of the Great Nemeseia, and he was to have a sacrifice made to him on the 19th Hekatombaion; what is not clear is whether these events were to occur on the same day. Stafford’s translation quoted above has been amended by her in a later publication to align better with the conclusion that the events were conducted on the same day:

… 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 …

A further third-century stele, dated 235/234, honours the garrison commander, Dikaiarchos of Thria, and this time there is clear confirmation of sacrifices made at the Nemeseia. The proposer is the same Elpinikos:

έδωκεν δὲ καὶ ἱερεῖα εἰς τὴν θυσίαν τῶν Νεμεσίων καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἕκ τῶν ἰδίων, ἐγελευο- [σ] ὀ τῶν θυσίων διὰ τὸν πόλεμον, ὅπως ἔχει καλὸς τὰ πρὸς [τ] ἃς θεάς Ραμνουσίως, …

and he also gave offerings towards the sacrifice for the Nemeseia and the king from his own resources, since the sacrifices had been abandoned because of the war, in order that it be well with the goddesses [Nemesis and Themis] for the Rhamnousians …

With the names of the goddesses, Nemesis and Themis, restored, specific meaning and purpose is given to the festival as a celebration to again honour the goddesses after a period of neglect so that the deities will be placated and all will be well with the inhabitants of Rhamnous.

Lack of detailed extant contemporary evidence hinders a definitive understanding of the Nemeseia. Whether it was a combined celebration of the dead with athletics for the epheboi, a theory supported by Dietrich, or whether, as suggested by Takati, Petrakos, Fisher, and Herter, it was

427 Stafford, "The People to the Goddess Livia", 213.
429 Translation: author.
430 Dietrich, Death, Fate and the Gods, 166-167.
exclusively an athletic festival without reference to the dead, is not known. In
my opinion, the Nemeseia may have originated as a harvest festival in line
with Nemesis’ Archaic agrarian nature, but it later became a festival to
celebrate and honour both the dead and Nemesis as their champion. With the
later influx of Attic epheboi the festival was extended to incorporate
appropriate athletic events such as torch races to better entertain these youths,
until eventually this variation dominated. As such, and despite Hornum’s
views to the contrary, Nemesis’ well-documented later association with
gladiatorial games throughout the Roman world\textsuperscript{432} may possibly have had its
origins in the Nemeseia.

**CONCLUSION**

While Rhamnous is not the only sanctuary of Nemesis, it is the most important
one, with evidence of an extensive cult and organised priestesshood. It has a
significant major temple with ancillary buildings, together with another
building conjectured to have originally been a temple but which later became a
treasury. The main temple went through three successive building phases: this
and its size indicates the importance of her cult not just locally but for the
Athenian state as a whole.

This major site has produced a rich archaeological record which sheds crucial
light on the nature of Nemesis’ cult and ritual. Of especial significance are the
large number of high-quality funereal loutrophoroi shards mostly dating to the
sixth century, but including examples from the late seventh century. These
reflect a chthonic role for the goddess, with the quantity suggesting this was a
significant role in these centuries. The fifth century forward saw a sharp
decline in the number of loutrophoroi, a date which chronologically
corresponds to the perceived aid she afforded the Greeks in the events of 490
and the battle of Marathon, and is seen as an indication she was becoming a
more potent deity who increasingly concerned herself with punishment for the
hybristic.

\textsuperscript{432} A comprehensive examination of this topic is found in: Hornum, *Nemesis, The Roman
State, and the Games*, 43-90.
A significant archaeological discovery from Rhamnous is the sixth-century *perirrhanterion* dedicated to Nemesis and Themis which establishes the combined worship of these two goddesses from at least this date. The miniature votive wheel of the same date, although it does not name the deity to whom it is dedicated can logically be concluded to have been Nemesis. My discussion on the large number of votive wheels found throughout the Greek world of a similar date and dedicated to various deities with no connection to retribution establishes that attempts to connect this votive wheel, at this early stage in the history of the Rhamnous cult, to retributive punishment and torture, as suggested by Faraone are invalid, especially when his argument is based on the discovery of a single votive wheel at Rhamnous.

The helmet dedicated to Nemesis by the Rhamnousians on the island of Lemnos, dated by Petrakos to *ca.* 499, would have been made in a military context. I agree with Petrakos in that it was a thanksgiving offering made by the Rhamnousians who formed part of the combined Athenian contingent who had won a victory over Lemnos. The dedication of the helmet to Nemesis would not have been made with a sense of future retribution towards the Lemnians, but in the belief that the goddess had actively supported them as their champion. Yet, the goddess’s retributive quality would begin to evolve over the following years until it culminated with her assistance in the defeat of the hybristic Persians intent on invading and occupying Greece. This retributive quality now became, not only more prominent, but also a more definitive aspect of Nemesis in her campaign against injustice. It is from this period forward that Nemesis increasingly concerned herself with punishment for acts of consciously enacted deeds of hybris, i.e. a *hybris/nemesis* dichotomy, and her new focus transformed her from a largely local goddess into an Athenian one, and from there to panhellenic status.

Nemesis’ fifth-century temple was built *ca.* 436-432, and replaced the late sixth-century temple that had more than likely been destroyed by the advancing Persian forces in 480. This new temple was larger and more magnificent, thereby reflecting her new found status post Persian war – she was now important and potent throughout Attika. Inside the temple her
magnificent and almost twice life-size statue stood on a base carved with relief figures depicting her mythology. As with other larger than life cult statues she would have awed worshippers. In her hands she held two cult attributes, an apple branch and a phiale depicting negro heads which was very possibly identical to the Panagyurishte phiale and reinforced the assertion of Nemesis’ newer attribute of retribution was wide-ranging and reached to the ends of the earth.

As for the statue base itself, we are told by Pausanias that the relief sculptures are figures taken from the myth of Helen being introduced to her mother Nemesis by her foster mother Leda, in the company of some of the protagonists from the Trojan war. Helen’s presentation to Nemesis is an affirmation that Attika had usurped Helen from Sparta where she was revered. Now claimed by Rhamnous she and her mother Nemesis will bring revenge on Sparta for their current aggression against Athens. Aiding them will be those local heroes depicted on the statue base, Hippeus, Neanias, and Epochos, whom I have interpreted as allegorical representations of: the horsemen of the Athenian cavalry (Ἱππεύς), the young men of the Athenian infantry (Νεανίας), and the sailors of the Athenian navy (Ἔποχος), i.e. all the armed Attic forces. The base is a clear representation of Rhamnousian Nemesis who brings retributive justice to the hybristic, be they Trojan, Persian, Spartan, or indeed any foe of Attika.

Themis was worshipped at Rhamnous alongside Nemesis. The two goddesses acted as a complementary pair who balanced each others attributes: Themis the goddess of Justice and Law and the personification of Right Order, with Nemesis, goddess of Retribution and avenger of Themis’ transgressors. The deities were served by a succession of priestesses, some with her own throne seat on the porch of the smaller temple, and who were honoured with inscribed grave stelai upon death. Nemesis’ cult was clearly important enough to justify its own priestess with many ritual duties, including a special role at the Nemeseia festival.

Temple, cult statue, cult personnel, and festival all signify the ultimate transformation of nemesis as an emotion experienced by mortals and divinities,
to a specific deity acting in her own persona, and empowered to do so, in order to deliver retributive justice. The site of Nemesis’ temple at Rhamnous and the archaeological discoveries found there bring all aspects together: the myth is reflected in the archaeology, and the archaeology compliments the myth.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

[ἔστι θεός Νέμεσις· πρὸς τὰ δίκαια βλέπε.

There is a goddess Nemesis
Observe righteousness!  

SEG 30.1480

Through an examination of the available evidence namely, literary, iconographic, epigraphic, and archaeological, the chronological and thematic analysis undertaken in this thesis has sought to ascertain how it was that an intangible emotional abstract concept of ‘righteous indignation’, later developing into ‘divine retribution’, became a personification who was subsequently worshipped as a powerful and potent deity with a role to punish the hybristic and the violators of the customary laws pertaining to society, i.e. themis. My diachronic analysis has further sought to reveal how it was that this goddess, whose original role at Rhamnous was as a defender of rural order through the fair allocation of pastures, developed to not only adopt these later retributive qualities, but was able to simultaneously adapt to become a more complete chthonic deity with a reputation for avenging the dead.

Such a study is not without its methodological problems. In common with any specific study within the genre of ancient history the challenges have, for the literary evidence, included the limited contemporary sources which, for the eighth and seventh centuries, are reliant almost exclusively on the works of Homer, Hesiod, and the fragmentary Kypria. The later literary evidence from the dramatists, historians, and comedians supplements what is known about Nemesis, although this has naturally been manipulated by genre and the literary purposes of each author. Epigraphy, as a source, is invaluable but its fragmentary nature can lead to debatable, even contradictory, readings – for example, the fourth-century Megakles’ inscription on the base of the Themis statue which I discussed in line with its modern-day variant interpretations.  

The challenge presented by the archaeological discoveries at Nemesis’

---

1 From Roman Iulia in Phrygia. (Translation: author.)
2 Above pp. 261-265.
principal cult centre at Rhamnous has been to decide why it was that she was ever worshipped there at all: what was it that made Rhamnous so important to be chosen as the place for a sanctuary dedicated to a retributive deity?

In order to resolve these issues, I have undertaken a close textual reading of the early literary evidence, in particular Homer, Hesiod and the Kypria, which has established that Nemesis, the goddess of the Archaic and Classical periods, developed from an abstract concept. Through my exhaustive study, particularly of Homer and his use of nemesis-words (presented in Appendix 1), it has been established that nemesis was an emotion originally felt by witnesses of shameful behaviour that was consciously performed, but that it could also be felt by oneself at reprehensible personally enacted deeds. Consequently, as an abstract emotion, nemesis could be experienced subjectively or objectively. In particular, while the Thersites’ episode has been examined countless times in many languages, beginning with Eustathios in the sixth-century AD, I situate and contextualize this episode within the framework of nemesis studies. This has resulted in my original conclusion which argues that the nemesis spoken of by Homer in this episode is the embodiment of the collective nemesis felt by the Achaians towards their own audacious behaviour and their verbal insults against their basileus. In other words, I reason that Thersites is not a person, and nor is he a soldier, for indeed his very deformities preclude him from such a role, and as such he could never have been at Troy among the fighting Achaian forces and boasting of his exploits.\(^3\) This is a new conclusion which has not previously been addressed in the scholarship which I develop from an interpretation of Thersites as the embodiment of the root of his name, θέρσος, i.e. the over-confidence or brazen audacity of the common Achaian soldiers and the fear they had for this collective emotion, once unleashed. This linguistic analysis of the etymological derivation of the name, together with a tight analysis of the grammatical structure of the relevant passage, especially of νεμέσσεσθέν as an aorist in the passive voice within its sentence, has enabled me to argue for the validity of this new interpretation.

\(^3\) Discussed above pp. 34-43.
As an abstract concept I discuss *nemesis* in relation to its development in Homer. Homeric *nemesis* could be invoked by violations of the correct societal standards of behaviour assigned to people and situations, and where it is able to take on a range of nuances: from the relatively mild sense of bashfulness or awe shown by Telemachos in the presence of an elder; to the reaction of the common Achaian soldiers who instinctively feel it when witnessing their unchecked arrogance and brazen audacity; to the justified anger felt by Odysseus against Penelope’s suitors for their violent excesses, and the gods who threaten *nemesis* against Achilles for his violation of Hektor’s body.\(^4\) I conclude that these different nuances can often only be detected through an analysis of Homer’s use of various word combinations. For example, *nemesis* expressed as an emotion within an individual’s *thumos* or, where the abstract is described as being felt within the physical ‘heart’, the *kȇr*, gives added strength and potency to the sentiment being expressed or experienced.\(^5\) Consequently, to understand better the emotional strength of the *nemesis* intended by Homer it is not only necessary to undertake a close reading of the context, but also to study the grammatical structure of the word within its sentence.

My discussion on Hesiod exposes an additional dimension of the abstract: a deep moral consciousness that originally dwelt within mankind’s psyche but which he finds lacking in that corrupt age of mankind he termed the iron *genos*. It is Hesiod who first personifies and deifies Nemesis, and as I have sought to demonstrate, it is the point at which mankind rejects all moral consciousness, including the values inherent in those abstract concepts of *nemesis* and *aidōs*, that these moral guardians, already personified, leave the earth to its own evil machinations and depart for the realm of the gods, whereupon they achieve deification.\(^6\) I have argued that Hesiod leaves a moral and didactic lesson for all ages of mankind, since his iron *genos* may have been at some point in the past, it may be our present, or it may be still yet to come. The conclusion drawn from the lesson of Hesiod’s N/nemesis, is that this moral


\(^5\) Above pp. 43-50 (*thumos*); pp. 46-47 (*kȇr*).

\(^6\) Discussed above pp. 86-87.
guardian is relevant in every age, and that the point at which society rejects all that is good and moral and chooses evil and depravity in its place is a point of no return, for at that very instant every spark of decency will be extinguished, redemption will be beyond hope, evil will perpetuate, and the world will become a moral graveyard strewn with the detritus of ethical concepts destroyed by evil intent.

My treatment of the fragmentary *Kypria* first analyses the extended mythology that surrounds Nemesis found there, and how it was that the goddess developed to become ultimately a fully formed retributive deity, a moral judge and punisher of human excesses wherever found in order to restore natural order and balance on the earth. I argue that to implement his plan to punish mankind for impiety Zeus consciously and wantonly violated Nemesis in order to produce, not only Helen as his agent of destruction, but also to generate within Nemesis an extreme retributive essence that would be spawned from those Homeric interpretations of *nemesis* – her righteous indignation, her blame, her shame, and her anger – to enable these resultant emotive forces to emerge with intensity, with resentment, and to transform into a new incarnation, Nemesis as Divine Retribution. Nemesis now emerged as a more concrete persona, and in this form she became judge and punisher of excesses so that natural order and balance could be restored. It was in this intensified form that the fifth-century playwrights, especially the tragedians, exploited her to dramatic effect as a punisher to be feared.

Although Nemesis’ chthonic characteristics can be dated to the late seventh century from the archaeological discoveries at Rhamnous, it is only in the fifth century that this aspect of the goddess is evident in the extant literary sources. Tragedy is an appropriate medium to draw out this aspect of Nemesis, and the tragedians use it by expounding Nemesis’ chthonic role as the champion and avenger of those now dead but who had been wronged in life, with Aischylos saying of her that she ‘exacts the penalty for the wrath of the dead’.  

---

7 Above pp. 97-102 (Zeus’ plan); pp. 103-110 (rape of Nemesis).
8 Discussed above pp. 142-151 (tragedians); pp. 194-200 (archaeology).
9 Aischyl., *Phrygians* F266.4 (Sommerstein).
In the historical sources, where the presence or absence of a *hybris/nemesis* dichotomy as cause and effect has been discussed, I conclude that insofar as *N/nemesis* existed in the Kroisos *logos*, it was the moment Kroisos articulated his belief that he was the most fortunate of men that his words became a direct challenge to Nemesis as the punisher of boastful and unbridled speech. Polykrates suffered similarly, but was, in addition, guilty of *hybris*. I have argued that although Polykrates discarded a ring in an attempt to bring some misfortune into his constantly fortunate life so that the gods’ *phthonos* would be placated, he was not contrite. The meagre choice of this sacrifice, and the manner of its execution merely served to intensify the gods’ anger since they saw his ineffectual attempts to bring balance to his life as insulting, and in this he was guilty of an unarticulated *hybris* by committing an assault on the honour of another (the gods). I argue that Herodotos purposely used Kroisos and Polykrates as two examples of the inescapable fate that results from human conceit; and how blindness to the dangers of self-important and arrogant thoughts, words, and actions, will at some time in future result in punishment and ruin.

Fifth-century comedy does not reflect Nemesis’ reputation for retribution and punishment as found in the tragedies. In Kratinos’ fragmentary play, *Nemesis*, profanity is rife and the goddess’s mythical story as related in the *Kypria* is turned into a parody full of satirical mockery and sexual innuendo. Although the plot itself is only broadly known, it has been confidently concluded that Perikles and Aspasia are the main protagonists where, by means of innuendo and double-*entendre*, they are satirized and ridiculed. The explicit nature of the play is, by today’s standards, obscene and vulgar, and in my discussion I argue that in assigning the goddess’ name to such a play demonstrates a more light-hearted approach to religious subjects had begun to take hold in the literary sources of the fifth century, if it was not already present.

My iconographical studies in the thesis were not solely utilised to illustrate the literary evidence, but represented an independent enquiry into and analysis of

---

11 Above pp. 169-179 (Kroisos); pp. 179-184 (Polykrates).
what this artistic evidence can reveal in its own right in regards to the study of Nemesis. One example is my discussion on the Berlin *amphoriskos* which, apart from Nemesis’ reconstructed cult statue and its base, is the only known artistic representation of the goddess, but where, had she not been labelled, it would have been impossible to identify her since iconographically she looks much like any other generic Classical era female. My study of this *amphoriskos* presents the various arguments of previous scholars, and provides my own original analysis of the figures represented there, together with my discussion on what their presence adds to the story being told in the scene as a whole. Since the names or fragments of names belonging to the figures are invisible to the naked eye, I have consulted detailed photographs made with specialist enhancing techniques to aid in my discussion of this vessel. These photographs, together with Immerwahr’s book on Attic scripts, has enabled a competent discussion of what remains of the letter fragments but which, because of their degree of fragmentation still defies a definitive conclusion. Consequently, although no absolute decision is reached, my discussion has resulted in proposed conjectural alternatives not previously considered, which has widened the debate over both the identification of the figures and the interpretation of the scene as a whole as it relates to Nemesis.

Furthermore, in a detailed and analytical examination, with full discussions of the relevant material evidence, I have identified some key problems and issues relating to additional artefacts, with many of these having been studied by me *in situ* or in relevant museums. More significantly, while I have acknowledged and presented the findings and opinions of the previous scholarship, my focused analysis has led not only to the supplementation of, or to arguments against, existing ideas, but has also advanced new and original interpretations validated within the context of my studies of Nemesis as a whole. For example, by studying the inscribed miniature votive wheel from Rhamnous, not as a stand alone object, but by contextualizing it within a study of votive wheels from sanctuaries from throughout the Greek world, I have argued against Faraone’s interpretation of this wheel as proof of a connection between Nemesis and judicial torture and punishment in the sixth century, since the numerous votive wheels found in temples of other deities with no connection
to punishment, as catalogued in this thesis, negate his argument. Although the wheel did come to represent Nemesis’ punishing aspect ca. late Hellenistic period, this single sixth-century find at Rhamnous does not connect her with this attribute at this early date. Consequently, I have argued that this wheel should be seen for what it is and nothing more – a votive offering to the deity, either as a demonstration of piety, or for the dedicant’s future prosperity. In other examples, I have offered interpretational variances on the frieze-scene on Nemesis’ statue base at Rhamnous, and my presentation of archaeological evidence for Nemesis’ chthonic nature evident at Rhamnous from at least the seventh century forward, all of which has significantly contributed to and developed a fuller understanding of this goddess.

Although the archaeological material confirms the area was continuously inhabited from at least the Early Helladic period, the earliest documented evidence for the worship of Nemesis is an inscribed sixth-century fragmented *perirrhanterion* and a bronze helmet of a similar or slightly later date. Petrakos has determined Nemesis was originally an agrarian goddess who concerned herself with agriculture. From these beginnings I argue that since crops originate from beneath the earth and livestock feed on the produce of the earth, that this is the credible origin of her later more multifaceted chthonic attributes. I content that from this genesis her agricultural and chthonic role developed and began to overlap into areas such as the dead buried within the earth, an attribute that is clearly evident in the seventh and sixth-century funereal *loutrophoroi* shards found at Rhamnous. From this connection her chthonic role expanded further until ultimately she came to be seen as a champion and avenger of the wronged dead, a role which amalgamated her original association with the earth together with her later retributive qualities, i.e. Nemesis was able to balance her original agrarian role as the fair allocator of the earth with her attribute of avenging the dead that lay within that earth by acting on their behalf in allocating retributive punishment towards those who had wronged them.

---

13 Discussed above pp. 203-216.
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The Greek victory at Marathon in 490, where Nemesis was credited with having played a seminal role in the defeat of the enemy through her retributive punishment of the hybristic Persians, is argued as the motive behind the building of her new fifth-century temple, cult statue with carved base, and for the flourishing of her sanctuary and the nearby town. I have argued that the relief scene on the statue base was not only aesthetically pleasing but also an Attic political propaganda tool. The scene depicts the introduction of Helen to her true mother Nemesis by her step-mother Leda in the company of numerous Trojan War personages, but it is also an implicit metaphor of an Athenian usurpation of Helen from Sparta as Spartan Leda hands her over to Attic Nemesis, a tacit representation of Sparta’s emasculation by Athens during a time of mutual hostilities, the Peloponnesian War. The Trojan War inference tells of Rhamnousian Nemesis who will bring retributive justice to all those guilty of *hybris*, be they Trojan, Persian, or Spartan. I further argue that aiding Nemesis in her mission to keep Attika safe will be those local heroes depicted on the frieze, Hippeus, Neanias, and Epochos, interpreted here for the first time as allegorical representations of the horsemen of the Athenian cavalry (Ἱππεύς), the young men of the Athenian infantry (Νεανίας), and the sailors of the Athenian navy (Ἐποχος), i.e. all the Athenian armed forces stand perpetually at the ready to protect Attika.

These new literary and iconographic analyses and interpretations are all the more important as there is no full-length monograph treatment of Nemesis in any modern European language. As such, this thesis is a substantial and significant contribution to the scholarship, not only on detailed points concerning Nemesis, her origins, attitude towards, and cult worship, but the goddess overall. This holistic treatment of the sources, with new interpretations advanced, reveals a Nemesis with more complex facets than hitherto recognized.

In this thesis I have argued for the development of *nemesis* from an abstract concept of ‘righteous indignation’ in Homer and Hesiod, to a representation of ‘divine retribution’ in the *Kypria*, into a specific concrete cult deity with the usual apparatus of worship attendant upon being a Greek goddess from the
fifth century forward. Nemesis was the maintainer and restorer of good order and balance, and the distributor of what is due, attributes which extended to both the living and to the dead. She became the punisher of both the hybristic and the violators of the customary laws pertaining to society, i.e. *themis*. And, in the lives of individuals she would be appealed to whenever they thought events in their lives had run contrary to good order and balance.

As an abstract concept *nemesis* is still relevant, although its meaning has taken on a new nuance. Today the word is used almost exclusively as a noun, for everything from names of ships,\(^\text{15}\) movie titles,\(^\text{16}\) board-games, books and plays,\(^\text{17}\) music, and as the name of a roller-coaster.\(^\text{18}\) These reflect the modern interpretation of an opponent or rival who cannot, without difficulty, be overcome, or as something that cannot be conquered: meanings not evident in antiquity. Although these aspects are not discussed and are outside the chronological scope of this thesis, they are mentioned here to illustrate the enduring nature of what was originally an abstract concept interpreted as an emotion of righteous indignation with moral significance in an age of heroes, but which transformed through an act of violence into divine retribution, and how these interpretational nuances altered over time until finally today they represent a powerful force that cannot be surmounted without fearless tenacity: demonstrating a chronological progressive development through to the modern era which could warrant future study.

For the goddess Nemesis, and the principles she embodies, I have argued that her relevance remains timeless: she is the guardian of order, of balance, of moderation in all things – attributes as pertinent in Archaic and Classical Greece as they are now. She is a reminder that should mankind or individuals abandon these moral values for a path of wickedness and immorality then retributive justice will assuredly bring punishment and ruin.

\(^\text{15}\) For example: HMS *Nemesis* (name of several Royal Navy ships); USS *Nemesis* (U.S. Navy ship); *Nemesis* (British warship of the East India Company); OPV *Nemesis*, an offshore patrol vessel of the Australian Water Police.
\(^\text{16}\) The name was used in the *Star Trek* series.
\(^\text{17}\) Authors that have used the title include Agatha Christie, Isaac Asimov, and Alfred Nobel.
\(^\text{18}\) At Alton Towers, England.
APPENDIX 1

FORMS OF NEMESIS FOUND IN HOMER’S ILIAD AND ODYSSEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb νεμεσ(σ)άω</th>
<th>Loeb Translation</th>
<th>Possible Grammatical Constructions</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILIAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2.223</td>
<td>ἐκπάγλως κοτέοντο νεμέσηθέν τ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ</td>
<td>With him were the Achaians exceedingly angry, and indignant in their hearts.</td>
<td>aor ind pass 3rd pl epic ionic unaugmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37, 39, 40, 40 n. 154, 42, 45, 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 4.413</td>
<td>οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ νεμεσῶ Ἀγαμέμνονι</td>
<td>I do not fault Agamemnon</td>
<td>pres imperat mid/pass 2nd sg contr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4.507</td>
<td>νεμέσησε δ’ Ἀπόλλων Περγάμων ἐκκατιδόν, Τρώεσσι δὲ κέκλετ’ ἀύσας</td>
<td>Apollo looking down from Pergamos had indignation and called with a shout to the Trojans</td>
<td>aor ind act 3rd sg attic ionic unaugmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 8.198</td>
<td>ὅς ἔφατ’ εὐχόμενος, νεμέσησε δὲ πότνια Ἡρη</td>
<td>So he spoke boastfully, and queenly Hera was indignant</td>
<td>aor ind act 3rd sg attic ionic unaugmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.115</td>
<td>εἴ πέρ μοι νεμεσῆσαι</td>
<td>even if you should be angry with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.129</td>
<td>οὐδεὶς οὖς τίς οἱ νεμεσῆσαι οὐδ’ ἀπαθήσει Ἀργεῖων</td>
<td>So will no man be indignant at him or disobey him of all the Argives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.145</td>
<td>διογενὲς Λαερτίδη πολυμήχαν’ Ὀδυσσεῦ μὴ νεμέα</td>
<td>son of Laertes, Odysseus of many wiles, do not be indignant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.543</td>
<td>Ζεὺς γὰρ οἱ νεμέσασθι δὲ άμείνοι φοτί μάχοιτο</td>
<td>For Zeus was indignant with him, when he would fight with a better man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>Δίδὲ κρατέρως ἐνεμέσσα</td>
<td>and against Zeus he was mightily indignant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.119</td>
<td>ὤμην δὲ νεµεσσόμαι περὶ κήρι</td>
<td>but with you I am exceedingly angry at heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.293</td>
<td>ἀλλ’ ἂγε μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγώμεθα νηπίτουι δὲ ἐστατεῖς, μὴ ποῦ τὶς ὑπερφιάλως νεµεσῆσῃ</td>
<td>But come, no longer let us loiter here and talk in this way like children, lest perhaps some man reproach us excessively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Although quoted by Aristotle who attributes it to Homer, this line is not found in any extant copies of the *Iliad*: Arist. *Rh.* 1387a.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Part of Speech</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.353</td>
<td>Δι άντί δὲ κρατερὸς ἐνεμέσσαν</td>
<td>and against Zeus was he mightily indignant</td>
<td>imperf ind act 3rd sg epic ionic contr.</td>
<td>47, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.103</td>
<td>πάσιν δὲ νεμεσθείσα μετηύδα</td>
<td>but her forehead above her dark brows relaxed not and moved with indignation</td>
<td>aor part pass fem nom sg ionic aor part pass fem voc sg ionic</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.115</td>
<td>μὴ νῦν μοι νεμεσθέσετ’ Ὀλύμπια δόματ’ ἔχοντες</td>
<td>Do not blame me now, you who have dwellings on Olympus</td>
<td>aor subj mid 3rd sg attic epic ionic short subj fut ind mid 3rd sg attic ionic</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.211</td>
<td>ἀλλ’ ἦ τοι νῦν μέν κε νεμεσθείς ύποείξω</td>
<td>But in fact I will yield for now, despite my indignation</td>
<td>aor part pass masc nom sg ionic aor part pass masc voc sg ionic</td>
<td>50, 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.227</td>
<td>ὦτί πάροιτε νεμεσθείς ύποείξε χείρας ἐμὰς</td>
<td>he yielded to my hands despite his indignation</td>
<td>aor part pass masc nom sg ionic aor part pass masc voc sg ionic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>ὦ Αχιλεῦ Πηλῆς υἱὲ, μέγα φέρτατ’ Ἀχαϊῶν μὴ νεμέσα</td>
<td>Achilles, son of Peleus, far the mightiest of the Achaians, be not indignant</td>
<td>pres imperat act 2nd sg contr: imperf ind act 3rd sg homeric ionic contr unaugmented</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.544</td>
<td>ἀλλὰ φίλοι πάροιτε, νεμεσθήτε μὲν θυμῷ</td>
<td>But friends, take your stand beside him, and fear disgrace at heart</td>
<td>aor imperat pass 2nd pl ionic unaugmented</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>μὴ τίς μοι Δαναῶν νεμεσθέσετα δὲς κεν ἴδηται</td>
<td>I fear that many a Danaan may find fault with me, whoever sees it</td>
<td>aor subj mid 3rd sg attic epic ionic short subj fut ind mid 3rd sg attic ionic</td>
<td>22 n. 74, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.100</td>
<td>τῷ μ’ οὖ τις Δαναῶν νεμεσθέσετα δὲς κεν ἴδηται</td>
<td>Therefore will no man of the Danaans find fault with me</td>
<td>aor subj mid 3rd sg attic epic ionic short subj fut ind mid 3rd sg attic ionic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Tense and Mood</th>
<th>Greek Case</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.494</td>
<td>καὶ δ’ ἄλλω νεμεσάτον ὅτις τοιαῦτα γε ῥέζοι</td>
<td>You would be indignant with anyone else who acted like this</td>
<td>pres imperat act 2nd dual contr.</td>
<td>pres ind/subj act 2nd/3rd dual contr.</td>
<td>imperf ind act 2nd dual homeric ionic contr unaugmented</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>οὐ μὴν οἱ τὸ γε κάλλιον οὐδὲ τ’ ἀμεινον· μὴ ἄγαθο περ ἑόντι νεμεσσηθεμέν οἱ ἡμεῖς</td>
<td>Let him beware lest we grow angry with him, valiant though he is; for in his fury he disfigures the mute earth</td>
<td>aor subj pass 1st epic doric ionic aeolic</td>
<td>55, 143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ODYSSEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>βὴ δ’ ἴθες προθύροιο, νεμεσήθη δ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ ἐξίνον δήθα θύρησιν ἐφεστάμεν</td>
<td>for in his heart he counted it shame that a stranger should stand long at the gates</td>
<td>aor ind pass 3rd sg ionic unaugmented</td>
<td>46, 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>ἢ καὶ μοι νεμεσῆσαι ὅτι κεν εἶπω</td>
<td>Will you be angry with me for the word that I shall say</td>
<td>aor subj mid 2nd sg attic epic ionic short subj</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>νεμεσησατό κεν ἀνήρ αἰσχεα πόλλ’ ὤρον</td>
<td>Angered would a man be at seeing all these shameful acts</td>
<td>aor opt mid 3rd sg ionic</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>νεμεσησήθητε καὶ αὐτοὶ, ἄλλους τ’ ἀιδέσθητε περικτίων ἀνθρώπους, οἱ περιναιετάουσι</td>
<td>Be ashamed yourselves, and feel shame before your neighbors who dwell round about</td>
<td>aor imp pass 2nd pl ionic unaugmented</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>μὴ τίς μοι κατὰ δήμον Ἀχαιάδων νεμεσήσῃ</td>
<td>for fear any of the Achaian women in the land should cast blame upon me</td>
<td>aor subj mid 2nd sg attic ionic</td>
<td>aor subj act 3rd sg attic ionic fut ind mid 2nd sg attic ionic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 4.158</td>
<td>ἀλλὰ σαύρφοιν ἔστι, νεμεσσάται δ᾽ ἐνι θυμῷ ὄδη ἔλθων τὸ πρῶτον ἐπεσβολίας ἀναφαίνειν ἄντα σέθεν, τοῦ νῦν θεοῦ ὡς τερπόμεθ᾽ αὐθῆ</td>
<td>he is of prudent mind and feels shame at heart thus on his first coming to make a show of forward words in the presence of you, in whose voice we both take delight as in a god’s</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 3rd sg epic ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 3rd sg epic ionic contr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 4.195</td>
<td>νεμεσσάμαι γε μὲν οὐδὲν κλαίειν ὡς κε θάνησι βροτῶν καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπη</td>
<td>I count it indeed no blame to weep for any mortal who has died and met his fate</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 1st sg epic ionic contr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 6.286</td>
<td>καὶ δ᾽ ἄλλη νεμεσῶ, ἤ τις τοιαύτα</td>
<td>I, too, would blame another maiden who should do likewise</td>
<td>pres imperat mid/pass 2nd sg contr pres subj act 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr pres ind act 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr imperf ind mid/pass 2nd sg homeric ionic contr unaugmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 14.284</td>
<td>ἠ μὲν μοι μάλα πολλοὶ ἐπίμεσσον μέλησαν, ἵμημον κτείναι – ἐν γὰρ κεχωλόστο λίμν - ἄλλ᾽ ἀπὸ κείνος έρυκε, Διὸς δ᾽ ὀπίζετο μὴν ἐξείνου, ὡς τε μάλλιστα νεμεσσάται κακὰ ἔργα</td>
<td>But he warded them off, and had regard for the wrath of Zeus, the stranger’s god, who above all others feels indignation at evil deeds</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 3rd sg epic ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 3rd sg epic ionic contr 55 n. 224, 64 n. 274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 15.69</td>
<td>νεμεσσῶμαι δὲ καὶ ἄλλῳ ἀνδρὶ ἔξυπνῳ, δὲς κ᾽ ἐξογή μὲν φιλέησιν, ἐξογὴ δ᾽ ἐχθαίρησιν</td>
<td>I should blame another, who, as host, loves too greatly or hates too greatly; better is due measure in all things</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 1st sg epic ionic contr 23 n. 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.481</td>
<td>ὡς ἔφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἁρὰ πάντες ύπερφιάλοις νεμέσησαν</td>
<td>So he spoke but they all were filled with exceeding indignation</td>
<td>imperf ind act 3rd pl homeric ionic unaugmented aor ind act 3rd pl attic ionic unaugmented 48, 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.227</td>
<td>μήτερ ἐμή, τὸ μὲν οὗ σὲ νεμεσῶμαι κεχολόσθαι</td>
<td>My mother, I do not blame you for being angry</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 1st sg epic ionic contr 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.121</td>
<td>μή τίς μοι δημῶν νεμεσήσεται, ἢ σὺ γ’ αὐτή</td>
<td>I do not wish one of your maids or your own self to be vexed with me</td>
<td>aor subj mid 3rd sg attic epic ionic short subj fut ind mid 3rd sg attic ionic -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.146</td>
<td>μή τίς μοι κατὰ δῆμον Ἀχαιῶν νεμεσής</td>
<td>for fear anyone of the Achaian women in the land should cast blame upon me</td>
<td>aor subj mid 2nd sg attic ionic aor subj act 3rd sg attic ionic fut ind mid 2nd sg attic ionic -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.264</td>
<td>νεμεσῶμαι γε μὲν οὐδέν</td>
<td>I count it indeed no blame in you</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 1st sg epic ionic contr -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.147</td>
<td>ἀτασθαλίαι δὲ οἱ οὐφ ἐχθραὶ ἐσαν, πᾶσιν δὲ νεμέσσα μνηστήρεσσιν</td>
<td>acts of wanton folly were hateful to him alone, and he was full of indignation at all the suitors</td>
<td>pres imperat act 2nd sg epic ionic contr imperf ind act 3rd sg epic ionic contr unaugmented 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.169</td>
<td>νεμεσῶμαι δὲ τ’ ἀκούων</td>
<td>I am angered to hear</td>
<td>pres subj mid/pass 1st sg attic epic doric ionic contr pres ind mid/pass 1st sg epic ionic contr 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Part of Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.285</td>
<td>ὡς ἔφαθ’, ὦ δ’ ἀρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλοις νεμέσθησαν, δείσαντες μὴ τόξον ἐυόδουν ἐντανύσειεν</td>
<td>So he spoke, and they all became exceedingly angry, fearing that he might string the polished bow</td>
<td>imperf ind act 3rd pl homeric ionic unaugmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.213</td>
<td>αὐτάρ μὴ νῦν μοι τόδε χώοε μηδὲ νεμέσσα</td>
<td>But do not now be angry with me for this, nor full of indignation</td>
<td>pres imperat act 2nd sg epic ionic contr imperf ind act 3rd sg epic ionic contr unaugmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.136</td>
<td>μὴ τίς μοι κατὰ δήμον Αχαιάδων νεμεσίσῃ</td>
<td>for fear any of the Achaian women in the land should cast blame upon me</td>
<td>aor subj mid 2nd sg attic ionic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verb νεμεσίζομαι**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **ILIAD** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43  | 2.296 | τῶ ὅ νεμεσίζομ’ Ἀχαιοῦς ἄσχαλαν παρὰ νησὶ κορονίσσιν | so I do not blame the Achaians for becoming impatient beside their beaked ships | pres ind mid/pass 1st sg |  |  |  |
| 44  | 5.757 | Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔ νεμεσίζη Ἀρη τάδε καρτέρα ἔργα | Father Zeus, are you not indignant at Ares for these violent deeds | pres subj mid/pass 2nd sg |  |  | 52 |
| 45  | 5.872 | Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔ νεμεσίζη ὁρῶν τάδε καρτέρα ἔργα | Father Zeus, are you not indignant at seeing these violent deeds | pres subj mid/pass 2nd sg |  |  | 52 |
| 46  | 8.407 | Ἡρή δ’ οὔ τι τόσον νεμεσίζομαι οὐδὲ χολούμαι | But against Hera have I not so great indignation nor wrath | pres ind mid/pass 1st sg |  |  | 52 |
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| 47 | 8.421 | Ἡρὴ δ’ οὐ τι τόσον νεμεσίζεται οὐδὲ χολούται | But against Hera he has not such great indignation or wrath | pres imperat mid/pass 3rd sg | 52 n. 212 |
| 48 | 17.254 | ἄλλα τις αὐτὸς ἵπτω, νεμεσιζέσθω δ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ Πάτροκλον Τρῳῆσι κυσίν μέλπηρα γενέσθαι | But let every man go out himself, and be indignant at heart that Patroklos should become the sport of the dogs of Troy | pres imperat mid/pass 3rd sg | 46 |

**ODYSSEY**

| 49 | 1.263 | ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν οὐ οἱ δῶκεν, ἐπεὶ ὡς θεοὺς νεμεσίζετο αἰὲν ἐόντας | But he did not give it to him, for he stood in awe of the gods that are forever | imperf ind mid/pass 3rd sg | - |
| 50 | 2.138 | ὑμετέρος δ’ ἐὶ μὲν θυμὸς νεμεσίζεται αὐτῶν | And for you, if your own conscience is offended at these things | pres ind mid/pass 3rd sg | 50 |
| 51 | 2.239 | νῦν δ’ ἄλλῳ δήμῳ νεμεσίζομαι | it is with the rest of the people that I am indignant | pres ind mid/pass 1st sg | 60 |

### Noun νέμεσις

**ILIAD**

| 52 | 3.156 | οὐ νέμεσις Τρὸς καὶ ἑυκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοῦς τοιῇ δ’ ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὸν χρόνων ἄλγεα πάσχειν | It is not shame that Trojans and well-greaved Achaians should for such a woman long suffer woes | fem nom sg | 22, 67 |
### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>οὖ τοι ἐγώ Τρώων τόσσον χόλῳ οὐδὲ νεμέσσι ἤμην ἐν θαλάμῳ</td>
<td>Not so much because of wrath and indignation against the Trojans sat I in my chamber</td>
<td>fem dat sg epic doric ionic aeolic contr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ἀνδρὸς ἐπειτ’ ὀφελλον ἀμείνονος εἶναι ἀκοτίς, ὡς ἤδη νέμεσίν τε καὶ αἰσχεα πόλλ’ ἀνθρώπων</td>
<td>I wish that I had been wife to a better man, who could feel the indignation of his fellows and their many revilings</td>
<td>fem acc sg 69, 112 n. 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>ἄλλ’ ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθε ἐκαστος αἰδὸ καὶ νέμεσιν</td>
<td>But take in your hearts, each man of you, fear of shame and reproach</td>
<td>fem acc sg 27, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>οὖ γάρ τις νέμεσις φυγέειν κακόν, οὖδ’ ἀνά νύκτα</td>
<td>For it is no shame to flee from ruin, even by night</td>
<td>fem nom sg 28, 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ODYSSEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>τοῦτῳ δ’ οὖ νέμεσις Δαναῶν κακόν οἶτον ἀείδειν</td>
<td>With this man no one can be angry if he sings the evil doom of the Danaans</td>
<td>fem nom sg 22 n. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>νέμεσις δὲ μοι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἔσσεται</td>
<td>and I shall have blame, too, from men.</td>
<td>fem nom sg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>οὖ τις νέμεσις μενέμεν τ’ ἣν ἵσχέμεναι</td>
<td>there was no ground for blame that you waited</td>
<td>fem nom sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ὦ κύνες, … οὐτε θεοὺς δείσαντες, οἱ οὐρανόν εὕρην ἔχουσιν, οὔτε τιν’ ἀνθρώπων νέμεσιν κατόπισθεν ἔσσεθαι</td>
<td>You dogs, … having no fear of the gods, who hold broad heaven, or that any indignation of men would follow</td>
<td>fem acc sg 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Adjective νεμεσητός

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iliad</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Line Numbers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.410</td>
<td>κεῖσε δ’ ἐγών οὐκ εἰμι - νεμεσητόν</td>
<td>There I will not go – it would be shameful – to share that man’s be</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>70, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.523</td>
<td>πρὶν δ’ οὗ τι νεμεσητόν κεχολῶσθαι</td>
<td>though before now no man could blame you for being angry</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.649</td>
<td>αἰδοῖος νεμεσητός ὁ με τροέηκε πυθέσθαι</td>
<td>Respected and to be dreaded is he who sent me out to learn</td>
<td>masc nom sg</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>14.336</td>
<td>νεμεσητόν δὲ κεν εἰη</td>
<td>that would be a shameful thing</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.182</td>
<td>οὗ μὲν γὰρ τι νεμεσητόν βασιλῆα ἀνδρ´ ἀπαρέσσασθαι, ὅτι τις πρότερος χαλεπὴν</td>
<td>for in no way is it blame for a king to make amends to another, when he is the first to grow angry</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.463</td>
<td>νεμεσητόν δὲ κεν εἰη ἀθανάτον θεόν ὡδε βροτοὺς ἀγαπαζέμεν ἄντην</td>
<td>it would be a shameful thing that an immortal god should thus openly be entertained by mortals</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>22.59</td>
<td>πρὶν δ’ οὗ τι νεμεσητόν κεχολῶσθαι</td>
<td>but till then no one could blame you for being wrathful</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>22.489</td>
<td>νεμεσητόν δὲ κεν εἰη</td>
<td>that would be a cause for blame</td>
<td>masc acc: neut/voc/acc sg poetic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1

### Forms of NEMESIS found in HESIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works and Days</th>
<th>Loeb Translation</th>
<th>Possible Grammatical Constructions</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 197-200</td>
<td>καὶ τότε ὁ Ὀλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐφυοδείς λευκοίσιν φάρσεσι καλοπημαένω χρόα καλὸν ἀθανάτων μετὰ φύλον ἵτων προλιπόντι ἀνθρώπους Αἴδῳ καὶ Νέμεσις</td>
<td>Then indeed will Reverence and Indignation cover their beautiful skin with white mantles, leave human beings behind and go from the broad-pathed earth to the race of the immortals, to Olympus</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 302-303</td>
<td>Λιμὸς γὰρ τοι πάμπαν ἀεργὸν σύμφορον ἀνδρὶ, τῷ δὲ θεοὶ νεμέοντο καὶ ἀνέρες</td>
<td>For famine is ever the companion of a man who does not work; and gods and men feel resentment against that man</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 740-741</td>
<td>δὸς ποταμὸν διαβῇ κακότητι ἰδὲ χεῖρας ἀνυποτος, τῷ δὲ θεοὶ νεμέοντο καὶ ἄλγεα δὸκαν ὀπίσθῳ</td>
<td>Whoever crosses a river, unwashed in evil and in his hands, against him the gods feel resentment</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 756</td>
<td>θεός νῦ τε καὶ τὰ νεμέσσω</td>
<td>For a god feels resentment against this too</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theogony**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>τίκτε δὲ καὶ Νέμεσιν πῆμα θνητοίς βροτοίς Νῦξ ὀλοή</td>
<td>Deadly Night gave birth to Nemesis (Indignation) too, a woe for mortal human beings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalogue of Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ό μέντοι Ἡσίοδος οὔτε Λήδας οὔτε Νεμέσεως δίδωσι τὴν Ἑλένην, ἀλλὰ θυγατρὸς Ὀκεανοῦ καὶ Διὸς</td>
<td>But Hesiod says that Helen was born neither from Leda nor from Indignation but from a daughter of Ocean and from Zeus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ἄνθρωποι τε θεῶν νέμ[εσιν θνηη]τῶν τ’ ἄνθρωπον</td>
<td>The indignation of the immortal gods and of mortal human beings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[..... .....νέμεσις τ’ ἀ[νθρώπων]</td>
<td>The <em>nemesis</em> of men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>νέμεσιν τ’ ἀπ[ο]θεῖτο καὶ αἰδῶ</td>
<td>and set aside <em>indignation</em> and shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ζ[εῦς δὲ ἵδων νεμέ[έσεων ἀπ’ αἰχμήνετος Ὀλύμπων]</td>
<td>Zeus seeing this] from Olympus, felt <em>nemesis</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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