

SKRIFTER UTGIVNA AV SVENSKA INSTITUTET I ATHEN, 4°, 59
ACTA INSTITUTI ATHENIENSIS REGNI SUECIAE, SERIES IN 4°, 59

The stuff of the gods

The material aspects of religion
in ancient Greece

Edited by Matthew Haysom,
Maria Mili & Jenny Wallensten

STOCKHOLM 2024

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Prof. Henrik Gerding, Lund, Chairman
Dr Mikael Johansson, Gothenburg, Vice-chairman
Mrs Kristina Björkstén Jersenius, Stockholm, Treasurer
Dr Susanne Carlsson, Stockholm, Secretary
Prof. Gunnel Ekroth, Uppsala
Dr Therese Emanuelsson-Paulson, Stockholm
Dr Johan Eriksson, Uppsala
Dr Ulf R. Hansson, Rome
Prof. Christer Henriksén, Uppsala
Dr Jenny Wallensten, Athens
Mr Julian Wareing, Stockholm
Dr Lewis Webb, Gothenburg

EDITOR

Dr Julia Habetzeder, Stockholm

SECRETARY'S & EDITOR'S ADDRESS

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
106 91 Stockholm, Sweden
secretary@ecsi.se | editor@ecsi.se

DISTRIBUTOR

Eddy.se AB
Box 1310
621 24 Visby, Sweden

For general information, see <https://ecsi.se>. For subscriptions, prices and delivery, see <https://ecsi.bokorder.se>

Published with the aid of grants from Enboms donationsfond (Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities), and Stiftelsen Långmanska kulturfonden

The English text was revised by Robert Spittlehouse

ISSN 0586-0539

ISBN 978-91-7916-068-5

© Svenska institutet i Athen and authors

Printed by PrintBest (Viljandi, Estonia) via Italgraf Media AB (Stockholm Sweden) 2024

Dust jacket illustration: © Martin von Wagner Museum der Universität Würzburg, photograph: C. Kiefer.

ABSTRACT

The “material turn” in the humanities and social sciences has brought about an expanded understanding of the material dimension of all cultural and social phenomena. In the Classics it has resulted in the breaking down of boundaries within the discipline and a growing interest in materiality within literature. In the study of religion cross-culturally new perspectives are emphasising religion as a material phenomenon and belief as a practice founded in the material world. This volume brings together experts in all aspects of Greek religion to consider its material dimensions. Chapters cover both themes traditionally approached by archaeologists, such as dedications and sacred space, and themes traditionally approached by philologists, such as the role of objects in divine power. They include a wide variety of themes ranging from the imminent material experience of religion for ancient Greek worshippers to the role of material culture in change and continuity over the long term.

Keywords: Greek religion, Etruscan religion, Mycenaean religion, materiality, religious change, *temenos*, temples, offerings, cult statues, terracottas, *omphalos*, cauldrons, sacred laws, visuality, purity, pollution, gods' identities, divine power, inscribed dedications

<https://doi.org/10.30549/actaath-4-59>

BOOK EDITORS

Matthew Haysom, Newcastle University
Maria Mili, Glasgow University
Jenny Wallensten, Swedish Institute at Athens

8. Decisive dedications

Dedications outside of sanctuary contexts

Abstract

We tend to strongly associate the presence of votive material with the presence of a sanctuary, since gifts to the gods were presumably mostly offered and kept in sacred space. However, many dedications were never placed in sanctuaries proper, but in the agora, the gymnasium, etc. This paper discusses the implications of placing gifts outside of sanctuary context. Taking dedications from two groups of magistrates, *agoranomoi* and *nomophylakes* (specifically the *nomophylakes* of Cyrene), as my case studies, I will argue that the materiality of the gifts affect the character of the space surrounding them and that the gifted objects can express the identity and power of the donors, as well as the relationship between gods and men, by means of a tangible thing.*

Keywords: votive gifts, offerings, dedications, Greek religion, Greek epigraphy, Greek sanctuaries, inscribed dedications, dedicatory language, *agoranomoi*, *nomophylakes*, Cyrene, Greek magistrates

<https://doi.org/10.30549/actaath-4-59-08>

Introduction

Dedications belong to sanctuaries. Dedications can define a sanctuary: even the smallest votive depot can be allowed to identify a sacred space. And it is an oft-repeated statement that after dedication, gifts to the gods were never to be taken out of the sanctuary in which they were offered, having become the property of the deity. All these statements are of course, with some case-to-case modification, valid. But they leave aside quite a large group of dedications, which were never placed in sanctuaries, not even in the first place.

* I wish to thank the conference audience and the anonymous reviewers for valuable comments. Maria Mili read earlier versions of this paper and I am very grateful for her advice. Any mistakes of course remain my own.

Dedications were of course frequent in public spaces. John Ma has recently examined the multitude of honorific monuments that filled areas like for example the agora. Many of these gifted objects were in essence offerings to the gods although simultaneously and ostentatiously statues celebrating mortals.¹ Certainly, the agora was a clearly defined space with special status. Like a sanctuary, it was marked off by *horos* stones and lustral stoups, and there were rules stipulating who could enter and who could not.² Murderers and those deprived of civil rights for other reasons were not welcome: there was a clear concern to keep the agora free from polluting elements. This was perhaps due to the many altars and sanctuaries that could exist within the borders of any given agora.³ But, even though we could call an agora a religious domain because of purity regulations and because of the sacred precincts on its grounds, the agora in itself was not a sanctuary.⁴

The gymnasium was likewise a very popular place for putting up dedications. Inventories show how they housed gifts varying from victors' torches to large scale statues such as the Aphrodite of Melos.⁵ A third more specific and interesting case is the *Odos Tripodon* in Athens, the Road of the Tripods, which joined the sanctuary of Dionysos on the south slope of the Athenian Acropolis to the "semi-sacred space" of the Agora.⁶ This street was lined by choregic monuments that started out as dedications to Dionysos; the monuments in fact

¹ Ma 2013. Naturally, the same double function adheres to many gifts, such as portrait statues, placed in sanctuaries.

² *Agora* XIX, 7–10; Parker 1983, 19.

³ Parker 1983, 19, 125; Dem. 20.158.

⁴ *Agora* XIX, 9.

⁵ Ma 2013; Kousser 2005, 229–232; Martini 2004; Von den Hoff 2004; Ridgway 1997, 310.

⁶ Possibly the old, unidentified agora, see Wilson 2000, 212–213, but recent articles take the agora to be the identified one to the north of the Athenian Acropolis: Choremi-Spetsieri 1994; Agelidis 2009, 112–115; Csapo 2016, 278–279.

gave this road its identity, known in antiquity as the Street of the Tripods.⁷ The size of the elaborate stone bases supporting and exhibiting the prize bronze tripods furthermore show us that they were not supposed to be moved from their place of dedication; the Street of the Tripods was not a temporary exhibition space of dedications.⁸ But what did placement of offerings outside sanctuary ground entail? By placing your dedication in the agora or the gymnasium, did you seek if not a bigger, then perhaps another audience? And, could it possibly be argued that these dedications were less inviolable, less sacred, than the ones placed in a sanctuary? In a certain sense, a votive gift should have created a sacred space around itself, at the very least at the moment of dedication, even when offered outside a regular sanctuary. But did this wear off, leaving the dedication less of an offering to the gods and more as a proof, to the surrounding mortal community, of a duty well-performed?⁹

This study presents two case studies of inscribed dedications placed outside proper sanctuary context and discusses some implications of this choice of location. The objects stem from all over the Greek world during a period of about 400 years¹⁰ and both collections concern the dedicatory patterns of magistrates. The first example investigates dedications of Greek *agoranomoi* in general and the second is a case study specifically of dedications offered by the *nomophylakes* of Cyrene. The first dossier includes 61 dedications from *agoranomoi* of a wide geographic variety of Greek cities, while the second only studies a few inscribed gifts from a single room.¹¹ The different characters of the case studies thus do not allow for comparison. Rather, I wish to show different examples of interaction between humans, gods and things and the manifold ways this could take shape.¹² I argue that the relationship between mortals and immortals could not only be expressed by means of materiality, but an object could, in a sense, be the very relationship.

⁷ Paus. 1.20.1; Choremi-Spetsieri 1994; Wilson 2000, 209–213.

⁸ I follow Agelidis 2009 in understanding the choregic monuments to be dedications: 120–121, see however Wilson 2000, and Csapo 2016, for comments on how the frequent omission of *anetheke* and the name of the god downplayed their role as dedications. Wilson does not seem to argue that they were only victory monuments, however, but dedications that “present themselves” as victory monuments (Wilson 2000, 209; Csapo 2016, 259–260).

⁹ One could perhaps again compare with the choregic monuments in the Street of the Tripods, dedications in the original agonistic festival context, but, as time went on, taking on the character of victory monuments.

¹⁰ I limit the investigation chronologically to the period 4th century BC–1st century AD.

¹¹ Among the *agoranomoi* dedications, I have not included cases where the giver is an “*agoranomos* of the *thiasos*” probably responsible for a festival, see for example *IBeroia* 22 = *SEG* 58 562; *SEG* 11 50.

¹² Hodder 2012 is now a classic starting point for any discussion on the matter.

Magistrates’ religious participation

The magistrates of any Greek *polis* participated widely in its religious life with religious ritual acts embedded in their official functions. Their participation ranged from the more spectacular and outward-looking, such as the libations performed by the *strategoï* before a major audience at the opening of the Athenian City Dionysia, to the more an inward-looking routine sacrifice offered by the *prytaneis* to Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia before the assemblies.¹³ Other common occasions for magistrates to worship the gods as part of their official functions can be identified upon their taking up or leaving office, sometimes institutionalized through sacrifices and offerings known as the *eisiteria* and the *exiteria* respectively.¹⁴

Inscribed dedications

Not all gifts to the gods were inscribed, nor needed to be.¹⁵ The reasons behind the choice of adding an inscription were certainly manifold, ranging from an almost automatic adherence to a local custom, to a personal one-time choice. In the same way, the wording could be formulaic and repeated in accordance with tradition or it could give personal details. Inscribed dedications in their most simple form consist only of the name of the deity in the dative,¹⁶ and can then be elaborated as wished, to include of the dedicator’s name and reason for dedication, perhaps, or mention of the dedicated object. For this article, I have looked exclusively at inscribed dedications, where the dedicator, when presenting his gift, has wished to connect this object to his role as an official—an *agoranomos* or a *nomophylax*—through mention of his office¹⁷ in the dedicatory text. In this dossier, the examined votive language, with some interesting exceptions, mentions the dedicator by name and title (expressed by a participle, i.e., *agoranomesas*, or a noun, i.e., *agoranomos*), the recipient god, and sometimes the dedicated object. The reason for dedication is not stated explicitly, although we can assume that dedications whose inscriptions include an aorist participle, indicating that the term

¹³ Plut. *Cim.* 8; Mikalson 2016, 66; Currie 2011, 294; Parker 2005, 404; *Agora* XV, 4–5.

¹⁴ Currie 2011, 293–294; Mili 2012; Detienne 2003, 63–64. *Eisiteria* before a naval expedition: Jameson 2002, 226, n. 47. *Dem.* 21. 114–115; Veyne 1976, 163 n. 71.

¹⁵ See Whitley, *Chapter 14* in this volume

¹⁶ The inscribed name of a deity in the genitive can also mark a gift, but is not an inscribed dedicatory act, rather the result of such. Cf. *Ma* 2013, 21, on altars and cult statues.

¹⁷ In this collection of inscriptions, the dedicators are all male, but see *note 42* for later examples.

in office is over, was presented to the gods when a magistrature had been fulfilled.¹⁸

Dedications of the *agoranomoi*

The *agoranomia* magistracy is widely attested in the Greek world.¹⁹ Evidence of active *agoranomoi* has been found in at least 120 cities around the Mediterranean. Their number varied from *polis* to *polis* and was not constant through time. In Athens, for example, the ten *agoranomoi* of the Classical and Early Hellenistic period (five for the city and five for Piræus), became two in Late Hellenistic times, whereas a single *agoranomos* in 4th-century BC Thasos has a colleague a century later.²⁰ Their authorities could differ, but generally the *agoranomoi* were responsible for the activities and dealings in the marketplace. They regulated commercial transactions, settled disputes between buyer and seller and controlled measures and weights, as well as the quality of goods on sale.²¹ According to the author of the *Athenian Constitution*, the ten Athenian *agoranomoi* were supposed to guarantee the sale of unadulterated and authentic products, for example.²²

The identified and examined inscribed dedications presented by one or several *agoranomoi* date from the 4th to the 1st centuries BC/early 1st century AD (see *Table 1*).²³ Out of these, about a third have a reported find context that is neither secondary nor too general (i.e., descriptions in the manner of “from the excavations”, “from the urban area”, etc). Out of these, 13 have been found in *agorai*, to which probably could be added the three Pergamene dedications found below or southwest of the Great Altar and presumably come from the Upper Agora, as well as another four that have been found in secondary contexts in marketplaces and are unlikely to have been moved very far.²⁴ Among other notable known

find contexts, one dedication comes from a fountain house, and another from a bath house²⁵ and a dedication from an *agoranomos*, presented after his term in office, was carved on a column in the temple of Zeus Osogo.²⁶

Statue bases dominate among the gifted objects. However, as usual, the objects mounted on the bases are often lost and we do not know what kind of sculpture they once carried. The identifiable statues are mainly herms or other statues of Hermes, once specified as Hermes Agoraios.²⁷ To the statues can be added other objects, such as a discus and “eagles”.²⁸ One stele dedicated to Herakles and Zeus Soter carried a relief picturing Herakles, and one base possibly held a portrait of the donor whereas a base from Samos held a *horologium*.²⁹ Three altars are moreover among the gifts, and five inscriptions regard dedications of objects connected to the tasks of the *agoranomoi*: measuring tables and measures.³⁰ An inscription from Salamis of Cyprus has been interpreted as the dedication of a public building, as has a text inscribed on a column from Apollonia Salbake.³¹ Those buildings were perhaps *zygostasia*; in the 1st century AD and onwards, it became common for the *agoranomos* to pay for the construction of this building, which held the official scales.³²

With a few exceptions, the dedicatory inscriptions examined specify recipient deities.³³ Hermes is without competition the most popular god in this material, represented 25 times.

2nd century BC, Delos). *Salviat* 1958, 319 no 1; *IG XII suppl.* 402; Pouilloux 1954, 405 no 153 (4th century BC, 1st century BC, 1st century BC–1st century AD, Thasos); *La Carie* II, no. 161 (1st century AD, Apollonia Salbake). It should be noted that this inscription in fact identifies the agora, thus the evidence for the findspot is somewhat circular). *IPriene* 179 (= *NIPriene* 186, 4th century BC, Priene). *IEphesos* 7.1 3004 (1st century BC, Ephesos, found at the entrance to the agora). *IG XII.6* 2:972 (2nd century BC, Samos). *SEG* 11 334 (no date, Argos). *SEG* 37 761 (1st century BC, Halaisa, Sicily). Secondary context, probably from an agora: Pouilloux 1954, 397–398, no. 151 (4th/3rd century BC, Thasos). *IG XI.4* 1143; *ID* 1835 (3rd century BC, 1st century BC, Delos). *IPriene* 182 (3rd century BC, Priene).

²⁵ *Table 1*, nos 17, 19.

²⁶ *Table 1*, no 29.

²⁷ Eight statues, *Table 1*, nos 5, 14, 16, 27, 43, 44, 48, 50.

²⁸ Discus: *Table 1*, no 17. Eagles: *Table 1*, no 25. The editors note that these are Zeus’ birds.

²⁹ Herakles stele, *eucharisterion* for grain and fruit, *Table 1*, no 47; statue of donor: *Table 1*, no 5; Van Bremen 1996, 178, n. 129; *Horologium*, *Table 1*, no 38.

³⁰ Altars: *Table 1*, nos 2, 21, 24. Measures etc.: *Table 1*, nos 18, 27, 30, 42, 55. For possible *agoranomos* altars, not dated and carrying the inscription *agoranomikos*, and sometimes with the depiction of a bell (whose sound opened the market), see Robert 1937, 288–291; *SEG* 35 1323.

³¹ *Table 1*, nos 41, 52.

³² Steinhauer 1994, 58–59.

³³ *Table 1*, nos 24, 50, 52 and 56 do not give a recipient deity. *Table 1*, nos 51, 53, and 55 are fragmentary and may once have included a recipient. It is to be noted that three other *agoranomos* dedications from Erythrai mention Demos as recipient deity, once together with Zeus Soter: *Table 1*, nos 25, 26 and 27.

¹⁸ Graf 1985, 264, n. 43; Hasenohr 2002, 72; Wallensten 2003, 81.

¹⁹ Capdetrey & Hasenohr 2012a.

²⁰ Bresson 2020; Pouilloux 1954, 406.

²¹ Bresson 2016, 234–250; Capdetrey & Hasenohr 2012b; Migeotte 2005, 287–301. Occasionally they also filled the function of public notary, *LSJ*, s.v. Ἀγορανόμος.

²² Oliver 2012; Robinson 1933, 603; Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 51.1–3: According to some sources, they also fixed the fees of the *hetairai*, cf. Robinson 1933; Buxton 1982, 32. For cheating in the Agora as a topos, see Bresson 2016, 234–235.

²³ I have aimed at including all known *agoranomoi* dedications from this time-span. For later *agoranomoi* dedications (and some included in the present article), see also Robert 1969, 254–261. For the identification of *ID* 1832, see Wallensten 2003, 200–201, CI 59. (Other possible *agoranomoi* dedications, not included here since the title is not mentioned or the text is too fragmentary, are Pouilloux 1954, no 151, and *IG XII suppl* 403, see Wallensten 2003, 200–201, CI 60, 61.)

²⁴ *IPergamon* 183, 243, 244 (no date, Hellenistic, 3rd–2nd century BC respectively, Pergamon). *GIMB* IV, 1 901 (4th century BC, Halikarnassos). *IG XI.4* 1144, 1145; *ID* 1832 (3rd century BC, 2nd century BC,

Table 1. Agoranomoi dedications. ND = no date, NM = not mentioned.

No.	Dedicators	Recipient deity	Find context	Provenance	Dedicated object	Date	Reference
1	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	APHRODITE	Agora	Halikarnassos	Block	4th century BC	<i>GIBMIV</i> 1, 901
2	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	APHRODITE Timouchos	Unknown	Delos	Altar	3rd/2nd century BC	<i>IG XI,4</i> 1146
3	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	HERMES, APHRODITE	North of Artemision	Delos	Statue base	mid 2nd century BC	<i>ID</i> 1833
4	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	APHRODITE	Unknown	Thermai Himerai	Base	2nd/1st century BC or later	Brugnone 1974, 219 no. 1; <i>IG XIV</i> 313
5	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES, APHRODITE	Western Agora, Tetragone	Delos	Statue base herm	3rd century BC	<i>IG XI, 4</i> 1144
6	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES, APHRODITE	Western Agora, Tetragone	Delos	Base	2nd century BC	<i>IG XI,4</i> 1145
7	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	APHRODITE	Urban area	Akrai	Base	3rd century BC?	<i>IAkrai</i> 7
8	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	APHRODITE	Urban area	Akrai	Base	2nd century BC	<i>IAkrai</i> 6
9	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	APHRODITE	Urban area	Akrai	Base	3rd–2nd century BC	<i>IAkrai</i> 8
10	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES, APHRODITE	Secondary	Priene	Base	4th century BC	<i>IPriene</i> 183; <i>NIPriene</i> 189
11	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	HESTIA, APHRO- DITE, HERMES	Agora	Thasos	Base	4th century BC	Salviat 1958, 319 no. 1; <i>SEG</i> 17 422
12	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	HESTIA, HERMES, APHRODITE	Agora	Thasos	Base	1st century BC	<i>SEG</i> 17 425; <i>IG XII</i> suppl. 402
13	<i>Agoranomoi?</i>	HESTIA, APHRO- DITE, HERMES	Secondary, Prytaneion	Thasos	Statue base	4th/3rd century BC	Pouilloux 1954, 397–398, no. 151
14	<i>Agoranomoi?</i>	HERMES, APHRODITE	Portico of Western Agora	Delos	Base for herm	2nd century BC	<i>ID</i> 1832
15	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	HERMES Agoraios	Secondary, Agora	Delos	Statue base	3rd century BC	<i>IG XI,4</i> 1143
16	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	Western part of Agora	Priene	Base for two herms	4th century BC	<i>IPriene</i> 179; <i>NIPriene</i> 186
17	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	Fountain house	Priene	Discus	1st century BC or later	<i>IPriene</i> 180; <i>NIPriene</i> 188
18	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	Secondary, probably from agora	Priene	Table	3rd century BC	<i>IPriene</i> 182; <i>NIPriene</i> 187
19	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	EIRENE	Grandi Terme	Kos	Statue base, one statue	2nd century BC	<i>ICos</i> EV 227; <i>IG XII</i> 4.2 580
20	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	THEOI, DEMOS	Secondary	Kos	Statue base	2nd century BC	<i>ICos</i> EV 212; <i>IG XII</i> 4.2 581
21	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	“vicinity of tombs”	Sikinos	Altar	2nd century BC	<i>IG XII,5</i> 26
22	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES Agoraios	Unknown	Istria	Statue base, small	2nd century BC	<i>ISM I</i> 175
23	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES Agoraios	Unknown	Istria	Statue base	2nd century BC	<i>ISM I</i> 176
24	<i>Agoranomos</i>	NM	Secondary	Erythrai	Altar	2nd century BC	<i>IErythrai</i> 101
25	<i>Agoranomos</i>	ZEUS Soter, DEMOS	Secondary?	Erythrai	Eagles	2nd/1st century BC	<i>IErythrai</i> 102
26	<i>Agoranomos</i>	DEMOS	Unknown	Erythrai	Architrave, small (building?)	1st century BC	<i>IErythrai</i> 103
27	<i>Agoranomos</i>	DEMOS	Unknown	Erythrai	Statue base, mention of dedicated objects, a herm, scales and <i>stathmia</i>	Late Hellenistic	<i>IErythrai</i> 104
28	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES Agoraios	Unknown	Velventos	Statue base	2nd/1st century BC	<i>SEG</i> 47 1002
29	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	ZEUS Osogo	Column in temple of Zeus Osogo	Mylasa	Column(s)	1st BC–1st AD	<i>IMylasa</i> 326
30	<i>Agoranomos</i>	POLIS	Agora	Argos?	Measures	ND	<i>SEG</i> 11 334
31	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	HERMES, POLIS	Secondary	Larisa Chremaste	?	ND	<i>IG IX,2</i> 94
32	<i>Agoranomoi</i>	HERMES	Secondary	Beroia	Statue base	2nd century BC	<i>IBeroia</i> 24

Table 1 continued.

No.	Dedicators	Recipient deity	Find context	Provenance	Dedicated object	Date	Reference
33	<i>Agoranomos</i>	ARTEMIS, DEMOS	Western Agora entrance	Ephesos	<i>Stroma, parastas</i>	1st century BC	<i>IEphesos</i> VII,1 3004
34	<i>Agoranomos</i>	Roman DEMOS & Theos Sebastos Kaisar & Opuntian DEMOS	Secondary?	Opuntian Lokris	Fountain, <i>agalmata</i> , tub	1st century BC–1st century AD	<i>IG IX</i> ,1 282
35	<i>Agoranomos</i>	EUETERIA	Secondary?	Gortyn	?	1st century BC	<i>IC IV</i> 250
36	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	APHRODITE	Unknown	Thasos	Base	3rd century BC	<i>IG XII</i> , suppl. 390
37	<i>Agoranomos</i>	ZEUS Agoraios, THEMIS, HERMES	Secondary	Lindos	Base	?2nd century BC	<i>N.Suppl.Epig.Rodio</i> 170, 21
38	<i>Agoranomos</i>	DEMOS	Agora	Samos	<i>Horologium</i>	2nd century BC	Paton 1899, 79; <i>IG XII</i> ,6 2 972
39	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	PEITHO	Secondary	Olynthos	Base	2nd–1st century BC	Robinson 1933, 602–604
40	<i>Agoranomos</i>	APOLLO, HERMES	Secondary, Agora	Delos	Block	1st century BC	<i>ID</i> 1835
41	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	POLIS, DEMOS of the Salaminians	Ancient Salamis	Salamis, Cyprus	Official building	1st century BC	<i>SdC</i> 36
42	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES, POLIS	Agora region	Thasos	Measuring table	1st century BC–1st century AD	Pouilloux 1954, 405, no. 153
43	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	Below the Great Altar	Pergamon	Base for herm	Hellenistic	<i>IPergamon</i> 8.1 243
44	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	Below the Great Altar, Theatre street	Pergamon	Base for herm	3rd–2nd century BC	<i>IPergamon</i> 8.1 244
45	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES Agoraios	Secondary	Alabanda	?	3rd century BC	Cousin & Diehl 1886, 308, no. 3
46	<i>Agoranomos</i>	HERMES	Secondary	Pergamon?	Fence and paving	2nd century BC	Conze & Schuchhardt 1899, 168, no. 6
47	<i>Agoranomos</i>	ZEUS Soter, HERAKLES	Secondary	Omarkoi	Stele with Herakles	ND	Wiegand 1904, 301
48	<i>Agoranomos</i>	NYMPHAI	Southwest of the Great Altar	Pergamon	Base for Hermes statue	ND	<i>IPergamon</i> 8.1 183
49	<i>Agoranomos</i>	THEOI PANTES	Agora, area of the west portico	Halaisa	Rectangular slab	1st century BC	<i>SEG</i> 37 761
50	<i>Agoranomos</i>	NM	Unknown	Thrace	Statue base of Hermes Agoraios	2nd century BC	<i>SEG</i> 42 662
51	<i>Agoranomos</i>	?	Unknown	Larisa	?	ND	<i>IG IX</i> ,2 600
52	<i>Agoranomos</i>	NM	Agora?	Apollonia Salbake	Column(s)	1st century AD	<i>La Carie</i> II, no. 161
53	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	?	Acropolis, now lost	Athens	Base	344/343 BC	<i>IG II</i> ? 2823
54	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	THEOI	Secondary	Mobolla	Shield (round marble plaque), honorary inscription	188–167? BC	<i>IRbodPer</i> 781
55	<i>Agoranomos</i>	?	Secondary	Pireus	Stele, dedication of <i>mensa ponderaria</i> , lists	1st century BC?	<i>SEG</i> 47 196; Steinhauer 1994, 51
56	<i>Agoranomos</i>	NM	<i>In arce</i>	Amorgos	Base	1st century BC	<i>IG XII</i> ,7 261
57	<i>Agoranomos</i>	ZEUS Soter & DEMOS	Secondary	Astypalea	On architectural fragment	ND	<i>IG XII</i> ,3 194
58	<i>Agoranomoï</i> , with other magistrates	BOULE, DEMOS, THEOI	Secondary, close to one of the city gates	Rhodos	Circular base	1st century BC	<i>NSER</i> 20
59	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	THEOI Agoraioi	Unknown	Anthemous	Semi-circular base	106/105 BC	<i>SEG</i> 42, 561
60	<i>Agoranomos</i>	Dionysos and the <i>Thiasos</i>	North of the Theatre	Dion	Base	1st century BC–1st century AD	<i>SEG</i> 66 525
61	<i>Agoranomoï</i>	Theoi, <i>Polis</i>	Secondary	Assiros	Pylon, on column	Early 1st century AD	Dimitsas 1896, 678

He is followed by Aphrodite, 14 times,³⁴ and Demos, 10 times.³⁵ The collective Theoi are recipient deities six times, once specified as Theoi Agoraioi;³⁶ Zeus appears in five inscriptions, as does the *Polis*, and Hestia in three. Several gods and personifications appear once: Themis, Eirene, Artemis, Eueteria, Peitho and the Nymphs.³⁷ Most dedications were made after the term in office: at least 32 of the examined dedications (as made clear by the aorist participle formula).³⁸ Six offerings were presented during the time in office (the dedicatory text include a present participle). Often, however, the *agoranomoi* present themselves by their official title, and in those cases, we cannot know whether this was during the term in office or at their leaving or taking up of duties.³⁹

Judging from this material, *agoranomoi* were frequent dedicators and their inscribed gifts provide an interesting material for analysis of their dedicatory habits.⁴⁰ The brief texts themselves do not make this group of gifts immediately stand out within the general corpus of dedicatory inscriptions. The *agoranomoi* chose the same standard dedicatory formulae as worshippers all over the Greek world, magistrates or not. However, we can note that they tend to place their title before the mention of the recipient deity, indicating a certain highlighting of the dedicating *agoranomoi*. Likewise, epithets are not often given to the recipient gods. But when the deities are presented with a byname, it is mainly in order to tie them to the agora and thus the sphere of the *agoranomoi*: out of eleven included epithets, seven are *Agoraios*.⁴¹ Furthermore, when we move

³⁴ Robert & Robert 1959, 325, suggests that a dedication to Peitho, *Table 1, no 39*, was made to a “*parèdre ou à une hypostase d’Aphrodite*”.

³⁵ Demos is sometimes topographically specified (“Demos of the Salaminians”, *Table 1, no 41*), but more often not.

³⁶ Theoi Agoraioi: *Table 1, no 59*.

³⁷ Themis: *Table 1, no 37*. Eirene: *Table 1, no 19*. Artemis: *Table 1, no 33*. Eueteria: *Table 1, no 35*. See also *ICr 4 252* for a possible second dedication to this deity). Peitho: *Table 1, no 39* (= Hatzopoulos 1996, 69, 200–166 BC, Olynthos). Nymphs: *Table 1, no 48*.

³⁸ It is noteworthy that the title of the *agoranomoi* proceeds the name of the recipient god(s) in a majority of the studied inscriptions. For word-order as important in dedicatory language, see for example Ma 2013, 25–26.

³⁹ In my opinion, the fact that they present themselves by their title indicates that the gift was presented while in office. Two examples use the formula *hyper agoranomias* (*Table 1, nos 49, 52*), and this has been interpreted as evidence of a *summa honoraria*: payment for taking on the *agoranomos* office. A later example is to be found in *IosPE I² 440*. See also Quass 1993, 328–334; Chaniotis 2018.

⁴⁰ Wallensten 2003 examines dedications from officials to Aphrodite and compares dedicatory patters from several magistratures noting the frequency of *agoranomoi* dedicators.

⁴¹ Hermes is called *Agoraios* five times: *Table 1, nos 15, 22, 23, 28, 45*. Zeus and the Theoi also receive this epithet: *Table 1, nos 37, 59*. Aphrodite is *Timouchos*, probably “Of (a college of) the *Timouchoi*” (*Table 1, no 2*). Interestingly Zeus always gets an epithet when he appears in this dossier, but not the same. Apart from *Agoraios*, he is also *Soter* (*Table 1, no 25*) and *Osogo* (*Table 1, no 29*). Moreover, in regards to the few epithets included in the *agoranomoi* dedications, one could suggest that it

beyond the text and study the gifts as material objects, once placed and kept in a deliberately chosen setting, the preferred location of these offerings is striking. When presenting a gift as an *agoranomos*, it appears that the dedicator often decided against placing the gifted object in a sanctuary proper. In fact, only one case of the examined dedications stems from a clear-cut sanctuary context, the dedicatory text inscribed on a column of the temple of Zeus Osogo in Mylasa.⁴² Instead, the *agoranomoi* rather placed their gift in their own workspace, somewhere in the Agora. It could perhaps be argued that the deities most often gifted by the *agoranomoi*, Hermes and Aphrodite, were gods not frequently endowed with magnificent temples and sanctuaries anyway, obliging the *agoranomoi* to honour them in other locations. However, *temene* of especially Aphrodite were not as rare as to cause a specific need to place dedications outside of a space sacred to the goddess.

The result of this dedicatory habit is that the spatial context is dominated by the dedicators rather than by the gods:⁴³ the initiative is with the *agoranomoi* who brought the gods to the agora to receive their offerings. When they could have brought their gifts to precincts of their divine recipients, they chose not to, in favour of a location closely tied to the dedicators themselves. It is perhaps not a coincidence that altars are very rare among these dedications? Arguably an altar, especially if an “active” altar made for sacrifices rather than a more “passive” votive one, would have created a sacred space of the recipient god around it, especially if and when in use, thereby bringing back the main attention to the deities worshiped.⁴⁴

Furthermore, the character of the dedicated objects is also entangled with the identity and presence of the agora overseers. The monuments of the *agoranomoi* were not the most magnificent ones standing in the marketplace. The surviving bases show that the *agoranomoi* usually offered small statuettes rather than large-scale sculpture.⁴⁵ This in turn means that the inscribed letters were small and the writing not always easily accessible; neither were they necessarily placed in the most visible spot of an agora.⁴⁶ But, importantly, if we can

was deemed unnecessary to add bynames to Hermes and Aphrodite in this particular context. These gods were strongly connected to magistrates all over the Greek world, especially when worshiped together.

⁴² *Table 1, no 29*. Perhaps a dedication to Dionysos, found north of the theatre in Dion, should also count as from a sanctuary context (Kotzias 1951, *Chron.*, 36, no. 4, cf. Robert & Robert 1953, no. 105), made by an *agoranomos* assigned in a festival context (Nigdelis 2016, 675–677. The very interesting inscription mentioning a female *agoranomos* treated in the same article chronologically falls outside this study).

⁴³ In the latter respect it is certainly significant that two of the three altars included in this case study (*Table 1, nos 2, 21, 24*), were vowed to Hermes and Aphrodite respectively.

⁴⁴ Wallensten 2009.

⁴⁵ See for example *Table 1, nos 7, 22, 23, 39, 50*.

⁴⁶ For the most visible spot, the *epiphanestatos topos*, see for example Ma 2013, 67–70.

judge by the few dedications found *in situ*, the statues were often placed outside in open air, as noted in the agora itself, and there for example in open porticos and by the entrance to the marketplace.⁴⁷ Thus, the gifts were potentially visible to all visitors, and not only to those entering an *agoranomion* building. Certainly, the few holders of the office would be in demand in every corner of the agora and not able to be present everywhere at once. But their gifts could have a regular presence in the marketplace, as if discreetly reminding the crowds of the presence of the magistrates themselves. Likewise, the dedicated measuring tables identified in the dossier were perhaps not luxurious eye-catching gifts, but neither were they miniature ones, nor old and broken. Furthermore, they were not always objects exclusive to the gods or made just for them on a specific occasion, but could be real working tools, to be used by the magistrates, outside or inside their official building. They were meant to be seen by and used in front of customers and visitors to the agora and the *agoranomion*. They were things that sent a message of control of correct transactions, the main duty of the *agoranomoi*. Taken together, these dedications thus make manifest the dedicators, their office and duties, rather than the glory of the recipient gods. Standing outside a sanctuary context, these gifts did not only, possibly not even mainly, celebrate the gods, but gave passers-by a message from the *agoranomoi*, one of active control and duties well-performed. They were objects that pointed to the presence of the *agoranomos* office, and its authority. In a sense they even become an extension of the presence of the *agoranomoi*, sanctioned and supported by their divine protectors.

These dedications, placed outside of a sanctuary context, seem to have sought another primary audience than the recipient gods themselves.⁴⁸ And, could it possibly be argued that these dedications were less inviolable, less sacred, than the ones placed in a sanctuary? Outside of sacred ground, without the looming presence of the recipient deity as owner of that space, it is plausible that that the character of offering was less stable, going from a dedication mainly *to* (a god), to a dedication mainly *from* (a mortal). Without the sanctuary context as a constant reminder of an object as a gift to the god, the dedication develops, becoming less of an offering to the gods and more of a proof to the surrounding mortal community, of active professional engagement and/or a duty well-executed.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Table 1, nos 14, 33.

⁴⁸ For the double message of dedications, see for example Wallensten 2003, 14–18.

⁴⁹ One could perhaps compare with the choregic monuments in the Street of the Tripods, clearly dedications in the original agonistic festival context, but, as time went on, taking on the character of a victory monuments, see above note 9.

I believe that this was the case with the offerings of our *agoranomos* group. But it would of course be too easy a solution to generalize and argue that all dedications placed in a non-sanctuary space only turned outwards, to a larger general audience, and that their religious intensity, or value, was less than in the case of a gift placed in a *hieron*.

The *nomophylakes* and the *Nomophylakeion* of Cyrene

Magistrates called *nomophylakes* are known from widely scattered locations all over the Greek world, from Abdera in Thrace to Cyrene in North Africa.⁵⁰ In several cities they seem to have been magistrates of an important status, such as in Demetrias and Pergamon. The office could be filled either by a single magistrate or a college of officials.⁵¹ As the title suggests, in various ways the *nomophylakes* were guardians of the law. Generally, they watched over the safekeeping and observance of laws and decisions.⁵² Among the tasks of the *nomophylakes* in Athens were the supervision of other officials and the scrutiny of proposed resolutions in the *boule* and the *ekklesia*. The *nomophylakes* decided whether these were against the law or in any other way harmful to the city.⁵³ *Nomophylakes* of some Macedonian *poleis* likewise examined the legality of law proposals, and in Cyrene they were responsible for the city archives.⁵⁴ *Nomophylakes* sometimes had tasks concerning the publication and announcement of official decisions; they were sometimes an archive authority set to watch over commercial transactions⁵⁵ and could also prepare and close judicial proceedings.⁵⁶

As regards the *nomophylakes* of Cyrene, we know that they formed a board of nine members after 321 BC, but that

⁵⁰ Cyrene, see below. Abdera, see for example *IAegThr* 9, 175–150 BC; Avezou & Picard 1913, 122–137.

⁵¹ *New Pauly, Antiquity VIII* (2000), 981–982 s.v. *Nomophylakes* (W. Ameling).

⁵² Busolt 1920, 490.

⁵³ Habicht 1997, 55. In Athens, they have also been connected to the reforms of the role of the Areopagos instigated by Ephialtes but it has been deemed more likely that the Athenian board of seven *nomophylakes* was created shortly before 323 BC (Rhodes 1981, 315 with references). It has also been suggested that the office was either created or reinforced by Demetrios of Phaleron and perhaps also abolished as he left Athens in 307 BC (Habicht 1997, 55, with n. 50). The *nomophylakes* are not mentioned in Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*].

⁵⁴ Gauthier & Hatzopoulos 1993, 42.

⁵⁵ Abdera: Gottlieb 1967, 26–27; Avezou & Picard 1913, 135–137.

⁵⁶ Alexandria: Wolff 1970, 37. The functions of the *nomophylakes* of Alexandria are compared with those of the *eisagogeis* by Ameling, and to that of the *mnemones* (of Paros and Thasos) by Lambrinudakis & Wörrle 1983, 333 (referring to L. Robert 1969, 269–272).

their number changed with time. The detailed functions of this board are not well-known, but it is certain that they were in charge of the city archives. These archives comprised both public and private documents and were housed in the *Nomophylakeion*.⁵⁷ This building was identified in 1925, in the agora of Cyrene. It consisted of a large rectangular room, entered by a portico and was, at least in its last phase, adjacent to a temple of Zeus (later, perhaps from the time of Hadrian, of Jupiter Capitolinus).⁵⁸ In this room, along each of the longside walls, the *nomophylakes* had set up five small pillars, relatively high and slender, with equal distance between them, decorated with corniches and resting on bases *c.* 40 cm high. These pillars supported statuettes, and carried inscriptions either carved on attached panels, or on the pillars themselves.⁵⁹ Four inscriptions date from the 1st century BC, one from the 1st century AD, and they all regard dedications of statues. We thereby know that in their office, the *nomophylakes* had set up statues of Agathe Tyche, Apollo Nomios, Homonoia and of Aphrodite, once specified as Aphrodite Nomophylakis.⁶⁰

Let us take a closer look at these inscriptions. Four introduce the title of the *nomophylakes* themselves on the first line, followed by a the dating by a priest and list of the names of the magistrates; then the name of the god in the accusative and the dedicatory word *anethekan* close the texts.⁶¹ The fifth one differs slightly by beginning by a dating formula by two priests, of Apollo and Augustus. This is the dedication of the statue of Aprodite Nomophylakis. The dedicating *nomophylakes* title is however singled out on a line of their own to catch the eye, as is their patron goddess.⁶² The five inscriptions are thus clearly

⁵⁷ Maddoli 1965, 46; Goodchild 1971, 92–93; Laronde 1987, 432. The *Nomophylakeion* has been dated to the 3rd century BC. Both public and private documents were kept here at least in the Imperial period.

⁵⁸ Bonacasa & Ensoli 2000, 64, 66, 85, 87. They suggest that the building was built in an area previously dedicated to *divinità nomie*, protectors of the laws. In this area and thus front of the entrance of the *Nomophylakeion* was a sacred well, which was taken into consideration when the adjoining temple of Zeus was constructed, in fact included and accessible within it.

⁵⁹ Three inscriptions were carved on plaques fixed on the pillars and one was carved on the pillar itself.

⁶⁰ Agathe Tyche: *SEG* 9 131 = *IRCyr2020* C. 94; Apollo Nomios: *SEG* 9 132 = *IRCyr2020* C. 93; Homonoia: *SEG* 9 135 = *IRCyr2020* C. 96; Aphrodite: *SEG* 9 134 = *IRCyr2020* C. 97; Aphrodite Nomophylakis: *SEG* 9 133 = *IRCyr2020* C. 95.

⁶¹ The introduction is missing from *IRCyr2020* C. 97.

⁶² *IRCyr2020* C 95:

(ἔτους) ιε´ (vac. 2) ἐπὶ ἱερῆ(vac. 1)ωσ
Φιλίσκω Εὐφάνεω
Αὐτοκράτορος δὲ Καίσα-
ρος Θεῶι υἱῶ Σεβαστῶ
Βαρκαίω τῶ Θεοχρήστῳ
Νομοφύλακ<ε>ς
Ἀπολλώνιος Εὐίππω
Θεόδωρος Ἀρίστωνος
Ἀπολλώνιος Εὐδαίμωνος

dedications, which again stress the dedicators by opening the dedicatory text with their title. However, in spite of the use of the dedicatory verb *anethekan*, which clearly marks the statuettes as offerings, no recipient deity is mentioned. The gods are indeed present, but only as the dedicated objects.

As in the case of the *agoranomoi* dedications placed in a non-sanctuary context, this presence of several offerings in an office building raises questions of how the gifts, together with the act of gift-giving, affected their setting. We can wonder what went on in this archival area, with its five gods looking inwards and surrounding the visitor. Did this cluster of offerings somehow cause the space to become sacred? Did these objects in themselves become foci of worship, e.g., cult statues?⁶³ Or were the sculptured gods only decorative?

Certainly, we are not dealing with an in-house permanent sanctuary or temple. The priests mentioned in the votive inscriptions are there only as a means of dating and not in relation to cultic duties in the *Nomophylakeion*. There is no other trace of emperor worship in this space contemporary with the inscriptions and their statues, and Apollo was a main god of Cyrene and was mentioned here in that function.⁶⁴ In spite of the inclusion of the dedicatory verb *anethekan*, no recipient deities are mentioned. Moreover, the arrangement of the statues does not place one, or, for that matter, several, statues in focus, in the manner of a cult statue(s). Rather, they appear as decorative, small objects placed on similar bases along the walls at regular intervals, present, but not imposing.

However, the gathering of votive gifts does affect the *Nomophylakeion* in more ways than making it pleasing to the eye. First of all, there is a cumulative effect, suggesting that this is the preferred area for votives of the *nomophylakes*, and that divine attention is sought in this locale. In fact, it appears that the *nomophylakes* had materialized their proper pantheon in their work space. Going in to this room, a visitor would have been surrounded by a very specific divine company, all connected to the *nomophylakes* and/or their tasks. Two gods stand out as specific protectors of the officials in question. Aphrodite Nomophylakis, naturally, and I believe, like the editors

Ἀρτεμίδωρος Ἀγεμάχω
Ἀμμόνιος Σωφάνου
Μένανδρος Ἀντιπάτρω
Σεραπίων Π<ο>λυμνάτω
“Υρατθῆς Διονυσίω
Ἀλέξανδρος (Ἀλεξάνδρω) τῶ Ἀλεξάνδρω
Ἀφρ<ο>δείταν
Νομοφυλακίδα
(vac. 2) ἀνέθηκαν (vac. 2)

⁶³ For a recent discussion of this contested term, see Mylonopoulos 2010.

⁶⁴ A dedication to Domitian was carved on the architrave belonging to the porticus leading to the entrance of the archival room, but the dedications discussed predate his reign. The hall with the archives and the inscriptions/statues burnt down in AD 115: Goodchild 1971, 92.

of *IRCyr2020* C95, that Apollo Nomios should, in this case, also be understood as such a guardian. The epithet Nomios is normally translated as “of shepherds”, or “of the flocks”.⁶⁵ However, in this particular context we cannot ignore the sound of the word *Nomios*: inside the *Nomophylakeion*, the epithet is associated to law, Nomos; perhaps there is even a *double entendre*, where Apollo is a shepherd of the law in a metaphorical sense, just like the *nomophylakes* themselves.⁶⁶ The worship of Homonoia is frequent and understandable in a magistrates’ context: concord being sought for the community as a whole and within the college of officials. In this particular case, Gaétan Thériault has suggested that the dedication is a reference to concord among the *nomophylakes*, whereas others understand the personification as homonoia among the Cyrenaean, possible even in the specific context of peace after a period of civic strife, *stasis*.⁶⁷ Louis Robert in fact interprets the general devotion paid Aphrodite by magistrates as related to the concept of Homonoia, arguing that Aphrodite is a goddess of concord and *bonne entente*.⁶⁸ Finally Tyche Agathe, as a deity of good fortune, would profit anyone!

Furthermore, a decorative aspect does not preclude that the portrayed gods had the potential to become recipients of worship. Caitlín Barrett’s discussion of the multiple affordances of figurines found in domestic contexts is of relevance here: statuettes like those dedicated by the *nomophylakes* could fill both cult and aesthetic purposes,⁶⁹ like, for that matter, many of the magnificent cult statues of the ancient world. The fact that the statuettes in question were small, and not impressive life-size sculptures, does not affect this; not only images created as cult statues can be approached as such.⁷⁰ It is the behaviour towards a statue that makes it an object of worship rather than an inherent quality. It is not a far-fetched thought that the *nomophylakes* directed their prayers to these particular deities in the setting of their office. Any one of the divine images could become a momentaneous cult statue,

with attention fixed towards this one particular object such as at the time of dedication.

A peculiarity of the five *nomophylakes* dedications makes them stand out somewhat in the large corpus of inscribed offerings from the Greek world. To the quick glance in fact, the inscriptions look as if they belonged to honorary statues: the formula with dedicator, no recipient deity and a statue in the accusative, in combination with the placing of the object in a non-sanctuary context, is typical for that genre (recently brilliantly explored by John Ma).⁷¹ There is even a clear visual stress on the dedicators; the title of the *nomophylakes* stand out in the layout of the carved letters as the first word in probably four out of five cases; the fifth also allows a full line to the title, only preceded by a dating formula. However, as mentioned above, these five inscriptions also include the dedicatory verb: *anethekan*. The texts are thus marked as dedications, and there is no honorary verb, such as *etimesan*, to be implicitly understood. Furthermore, the statues presented are of course images of gods, not of human honorands. But perhaps we should understand them in somewhat similar terms? Ma’s study has underlined how honorific statues do not simply present a likeness of an honoured benefactor, but how they also illustrate the transaction of benefactions between the honorand and the honoring person or political body. I suggest that we see a version of this transaction inside the Cyrene *Nomophylakeion*. The statues are not merely decorative objects: the Aphroditai and the Apollo were not simply pretty figurines, but gave body to the presence of Aphrodite Nomophylakis, and Apollo of the Law, benefactors of the *nomophylakes*.⁷² At the same time, through the accusative, the gods become objects more than the divine subjects in the shape of recipient deities that the dative would have allowed. Just as these small-scale gods can be handled physically, perhaps their inscribed presences as dedicated objects made them more controllable than the wilful recipient gods of standard dedicatory exchange? Furthermore, the choice of not inscribing the name of the recipient god in the dative cannot, for once, be explained by an evident context such as the setting up of the gift in the sanctuary of a certain god. Several gods are present in the room and the overall context does not allow an obvious identification of a specific recipient god. For example, Aphrodite was sometimes associated with the divine personification Homonoia, and sometimes carried the term as an epithet: the two could be

⁶⁵ *LSJ*, s.v. Νόμιος; Call. *Hymn* 3, 47. Jaillard 2007, 106 n. 35, 182 n. 134.

⁶⁶ Cicero does in fact mention an Arcadian cult of Nomius, called this way because he was thought to have brought the laws, Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.57. Yet another dedication of a statue of Apollo Nomios from the *nomophylakes* has been found in the agora of Cyrene (*SEG* 20 736 = *GV*Cyr026), and it has been suggested that it originally came from the *Nomophylakeion*. It is a panel, dated to Augustan times or the 1st century AD and meant to be inserted or attached to something, much like the other objects described here (*GV*Cyr026). However, the dedicators are not mentioned in the beginning of the inscriptions, as in the other cases, but in two metric lines carved under the list of names and the dedication of the statue.

⁶⁷ Thériault 1996, 54–55; *IRCyr2020* 96. Other magistrates’ dedications to Homonoia, see for example: *SEG* 55 920 (1st century BC, Kos); *IG* XII,4 2:601 = *ICos* EV 2 (3rd century BC, Kos); *Ilasos* 621 (Bargyilia).

⁶⁸ Robert & Robert 1959, 325.

⁶⁹ See Barrett, *Chapter 9* in this volume.

⁷⁰ See Mylonopoulos 2010.

⁷¹ Ma 2013.

⁷² The blurred lines between (cult) statue and god are well-known. Famously, Theano places the gift of the Trojan women in Athena’s lap, i.e., in the cult statue’s lap (*Hom. Il.* 6.302–311), and the women of Herodas’. Fourth mime place their votive tablet next to Hygieia, i.e., next to her statue (*Herod.* 4.19). The theme treated in an enormous bibliography, see for example the classic article Gordon 1979, and the brilliant monograph Platt 2011 and Bremmer 2013 with further references.

difficult to tell apart. Moreover, a dedicated statue of Apollo cannot by default be interpreted as dedicated to Apollo.⁷³

As in the previous case study regarding the *agoranomoi*, the non-sanctuary context makes it possible to place the initiative and agenda wholly with the *nomophylakes*. Since the offerings are not placed in a shrine, the god's wishes about behaviour in the sacred area and possible preferences for what type of objects to be dedicated matter less and have no precedent. Hence the choice of not presenting inscribed dedications to these gods but of their statues becomes highly significant. Through this manoeuvre, the *nomophylakes* are less subject to the uncertain outcome of a gift exchange with the gods. Simultaneously, however, these deities, that should normally have been the recipients of the dedications, are forced to a constant presence in the *Nomophylakeion*, in the material shape (of statues) of divine benefactors, literally surrounding the *nomophylax* who entered the room and creating a protective wall around him. Present and manifest in the *Nomophylakeion* is an active transaction: the living relationship of the *nomophylakes* with their honoured protecting powers, where initiative and focus lie with the honouring magistrates themselves.⁷⁴

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have drawn attention to the choice of placing gifts to the gods in spaces other than sanctuaries of the divine recipients. I hope to have shown that we should not be tempted to generalize in relation to dedications placed outside a formal sacred space, since their interpretations are individually context dependent, nor to argue that the choice of a non-sanctuary, civic context for a dedication necessarily made it “less sacred” and that its message was meant for the mortal community rather than the divine. Looking at such offerings not only as abstract symbols for exchange humans-gods, but also as objects, with physical presence, a form to be handled and placed in meaningful locations allows for a deeper understanding of the experience they once created. The two case studies showed, that whereas the *agoranomoi* dedications were turned outwards, placed outside and visible to the public, the *nomophylakes* dedications were turned inwards, placed inside and meant for the limited few, namely for the *nomophylakes* in office and their protector gods. Whereas the outside dedi-

cations of the *agoranomoi* created and showed a presence of the *agoranomia* office, perhaps in the absence of the magistrate himself, the inside dedications of the *nomophylakes* let the abstract relationship god-human, the transaction of honour and worship for protection, take material shape. Each separate decision concerning where to set up a dedication carried important implications for its interpretation.

JENNY WALLENSTEN
Swedish Institute at Athens

Abbreviations

Agora XV = B.D. Meritt & J.S. Traill 1974. *The Athenian Agora. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens XV. Inscriptions: The Athenian councillors*, Princeton, New Jersey. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3601983>

Agora XIX = G.V. Lalonde, M.K. Langdon & M.B. Walbank 1991. *The Athenian Agora. Results of excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens XIX. Inscriptions: Horoi, poletai records, and leases of public lands*, Princeton, New Jersey. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3601987>

GIMB IV = G. Hirschfeldt 1893–1916. *The collection of Greek inscriptions in the British Museum (4); Knidos, Halikarnassos and Branchida*, Oxford.

GVCyr = C. Dobias-Lalou 2017. *Inscriptions of Greek Cyrenaica*, Bologna. <http://doi.org/10.6092/UNIBO/IGCYRGVCYR>

IaegIthr = L.D. Loukopoulou, M.G. Parissaki, S. Psoma & A. Zournatzi 2005. *Επιγραφές της Θράκης του Αιγαίου: μεταξύ των ποταμών Νέστου και Έβρου (Νομοί Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης και Έβρου)*, Athens.

IAkrai = G. Pugliese Carratelli 1956. ‘Silloge delle epigrafi Acrensi’, in *Akrai*, ed. L. Bernabò Brea, Catania, 151–181.

IBeroia = L. Gounaropoulou & M.B. Hatzopoulos 1998. *Επιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας (μεταξύ του Βερμίου όρους και του Αξιού ποταμού). Τεύχος Α΄. Επιγραφές Βέροιας*, Athens.

ICos = M. Segre 1993. *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente, 6), Rome.

⁷³ In *IStratonikeia* 103, a statue of Hermes is dedicated to Zeus and Hera, for example. Aphrodite Homonoia: *IG X,2 1 61* (Thessaloniki, 3rd century AD).

⁷⁴ Ma 2013, 49: “The grammar itself casts the honorand in the role of the ‘acted-upon’ rather than the Great-man actor of the nominative inscriptions; the honorand is literally the object of transaction.” An interesting topic for further study would be to examine whether there are different patterns in the formula for sanctuary/civic space dedications?

- IEphesos VII.1* = R. Meriç, R. Merkelbach, J. Nollé & S. Şahin 1981. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 11:1–17:4), Bonn.
- IErythrai* = H. Engelmann & R. Merkelbach 1972–1973. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 1–2), Bonn.
- Iiasos* = W. Blümel 1985. *Die Inschriften von Iasos* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 28 1-2), Bonn.
- IMylasa* = W. Blümel 1987–1988. *Die Inschriften von Mylasa* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 34–35), Bonn.
- IosPE I²* = B. Latyshev 1916. *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae*, vol. 1², *Inscriptiones Tyriae, Olbiae, Chersonesi Tauricae*, St Petersburg.
- IPriene* = F. Hiller von Gaertringen 1906. *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin.
- IRCyr2020* = J. Reynolds, C.M. Roueché & G. Bodard, *Inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica*. <https://ircyr2020.inslib.kcl.ac.uk>
- IRhodPer* = W. Blümel 1991. *Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 38), Bonn.
- ISM* = D.M. Pippidi 1983. *Inscriptiones Daciae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae* vol. 1. *Inscriptiones Histriae et vicinia*, Bucharest.
- IStratonikeia* = Ç. Şahin 1981. *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia* vol. I, *Panamara* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 21), Bonn.
- La Carie II* = J. Robert & L. Robert 1954. *La Carie* vol. II. *Le Plateau de Tabai et ses environs*, Paris.
- Lindos II* = C. Blinkenberg 1941. *Lindos. Fouilles et recherches, 1902–1914* vol. II, *Inscriptions*, Copenhagen & Berlin.
- NIPriene* = W. Blümel & R. Merklebach 2014. *Die Inschriften von Priene* (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, 69), Bonn.
- NP* = P.J. Rhodes, W. Ameling & F. Tinnefeld 2006. ‘Nomophylakes’, in *Brill’s New Pauly, Antiquity*, eds. C.F. Salazar, Leiden. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e824370
- NSER* = A. Maiuri 1925. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*, Florence.
- N.Suppl.Epig.Rodio* = G. Pugliese Carratelli 1955–1956. ‘Nuovo supplemento epigrafico rodio’, *ASAtene* 33–34, N.S. 17–18, 157–181.
- SdC* = J. Pouilloux, P. Roesch & J. Marcillet-Jaubert 1987, *Salamine de Chypre* vol. XIII. *Testimonia Salamina 2. Corpus épigraphique*, Paris.
- SIG³* = W. Dittenberger, F. Hiller von Gaertringen, J. Kirchner, H.R. Pomtow & E. Ziebarth 1915–1924. *Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum*, Leipzig.

Bibliography

- Agelidis, S. 2009. *Choregische Weihgeschenke in Griechenland*, Bonn.
- Avezou, C. & C. Picard 1913. ‘Inscriptions de Macédoine et de Thrace’, *BCH* 37, 84–154. <https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1913.3132>
- Bonacasa N. & S. Ensoli, eds. 2000. *Cirene*, Milano.
- Bremmer, J.N. 2013. ‘The agency of Greek and Roman Statues. From Homer to Constantine’, *OpAthRom* 6, 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.30549/opathrom-06-02>
- Bresson, A. 2016. *The making of the ancient Greek economy*, Princeton & Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.23943/princeton/9780691183411.001.0001>
- Bresson, A. 2020. ‘agoranomoi, Greek’, in *OCD⁴*, eds. T. Whitmarsh & S. Goldberg, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.206>
- Brugnone, A. 1974. ‘Iscrizioni greche del museo Civico di Thermini Imerese’, *Kokalos* 20, 218–264.
- Busolt, G. 1920³. *Griechische Staatskunde* vol. 1 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 4:1:1:1), Munich, 604–617.
- Buxton, R. 1982. *Persuasion in Greek tragedy*, Cambridge.
- Capdetrey, L. & C. Hasenohr, eds. 2012a. *Agoranomes et édiles. Institutions des marchés antiques* (Scripta Antiqua, 44), Bordeaux.
- Capdetrey, L. & C. Hasenohr 2012b. ‘Surveiller, organiser, financer. Fonctionnement de l’agoranomia et statut des agoranomes dans le monde égéen’, in *Agoranomes*

- et édiles. Institutions des marchés antiques* (Scripta Antiqua, 44), eds. L. Capdetrey & C. Hasenohr, Bordeaux, 13–34.
- Chaniotis, A. 2018. *Age of conquest. The Greek world from Alexander to Hadrian (336 BC–AD 138)* (History of the Ancient World, 2), London.
<https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674982406>
- Choremi-Spetsieri, A. 1994. 'Η οδός των τριπόδων και τα χορηγικά μνημεία στην αρχαία Αθήνα' in *The archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, eds. W.D.E. Coulson & O. Palagia, Oxford, 31–42.
- Conze, A. & C. Schuchhardt 1899. 'Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1886–1898', *AM* 24, 97–240.
- Cousin, G. & C. Diehl 1886. 'Inscriptions d'Alabanda en Carie', *BCH* 10, 299–314.
<https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1886.4028>
- Csapo, E. 2016. 'Choregic dedications and what they tell us about comic performance in the fourth century BC', *Logeion* 6, 252–284.
- Currie, B. 2011. 'Epinician choregia. Funding a Pindaric chorus' in *Archaic and Classical choral song. Performance, politics and dissemination*, eds. L. Athanassaki & E.L. Bowie, Berlin & Boston, 269–310.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110254020.269>
- Detienne, M. 2003. *The writings Orpheus. Greek mythology in cultural context*, Baltimore.
- Dimitis, M. 1896. *Η Μακεδονία εν λίθους φθεγγομένοις και μνημείοις σωσομένοις, ήτοι, πνευματική και αρχαιολογική παράστασις της Μακεδονίας εν συλλογή 1409 ελληνικών και λατινικών επιγραφών, και εν απεικονίσει των σπουδαιοτέρων καλλιτεχνικών μνημείων*, Athens.
- Gauthier, P. & M.B. Hatzopoulos 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* (Meletemata, 16), Athens.
- Goodchild, R.G. 1971. *Kyrene und Apollonia*, Zurich.
- Gordon, R. 1979. 'The real and the imaginary. Production and religion in the Graeco-Roman world', *Art History* 2:1, 5–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8365.1979.tb00031.x>
- Gottlieb, G. 1967. *Timuchen. Ein Beitrag zum griechischen Staatsrecht*, Heidelberg.
- Graf, F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte. Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia* (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, 21), Rome.
- Habicht, C. 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Hasenohr, C. 2002. 'Les collèges de magistri et la communauté italienne de Délos', in *Les italiens dans le monde grec IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.* (BCH Suppl., 41), eds. C. Hasenohr & C. Muller, Paris, 67–76.
- Hatzopoulos, M. 1996. *Macedonian institutions under the Kings* vol. 2. *Epigraphic index* (Meletemata, 22), Athens.
- Hodder, I. 2012. *Entangled. An archaeology of the relationships between humans and things*, Chichester.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118241912>
- Jaillard, D. 2007. *Configuration d'Hermès. Une théogonie hermaïque* (Kernos Suppl., 17), Liège.
<https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pulg210>
- Jameson, M.H. 2002. 'Sacrifice before battle', in *Hoplites. The Classical Greek battle experience*, ed. V.D. Hansen, London, 197–227.
https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203423639_chapter_8
- Kotzias, N. 1951. 'Λείβηθρα, Πίμπλεια, Πιερίς, ή πατρίς του Όρφέως', *ArchEph* 1948–1949, 25–40.
- Kousser, R. 2005. 'Creating the past: The Vénus de Milo and the Hellenistic reception of Classical Greece', *AJA* 109:2, 227–250.
<https://doi.org/10.3764/aja.109.2.227>
- Lambrinudakis, W. & M. Wörrle 1983. 'Ein hellenistisches Reformgesetz über das öffentliche Urkundenwesen von Paros', *Chiron* 13, 283–368.
<https://doi.org/10.34780/uyoz-41a9>
- Laronde, E. 1987. *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique*, Paris.
- Ma, J. 2013. *Statues and cities. Honorific portraits and civic identity in the Hellenistic world*, Oxford.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199668915.001.0001>
- Maddoli, G. 1965. 'Le cretule del nomophylakion di Cirene', *ASAtene* 41–42, 39–145.
- Martini, W. 2004. 'Bemerkungen zur Statuenausstattung hellenistischer Gymnasien', in *Das hellenistische Gymnasium* (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel, 8), eds. D. Kah & P. Scholz, Berlin, 407–411.
<https://doi.org/10.1524/9783050047249.407>
- Migeotte, L. 2005. 'Les pouvoirs des agoranomes dans les cités grecques' in *Symposion 2001. Vorträge zur grie-*

- chischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, eds. R. Wallace & M. Gagarin, Vienna, 287–301.
- Mikalson, J. 2016. *New aspects of religion in ancient Athens. Honors, authorities, esthetics, and society*, Leiden. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004319196>
- Mili, M. 2012. 'Hestia' in *Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, eds. R.S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C.B. Champion, A. Erskine & S.R. Huebner, Hoboken, New Jersey. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444338386.wbeah17198>
- Mylonopoulos, J. 2010. 'Divine images versus cult images. An endless story about theories, methods, and terminologies, in *Divine images and human imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 170), ed. J. Mylonopoulos, Leiden, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789047441656_002
- Nigelidis, P. 2016. 'The Nonae Capratinae in Dion and religious associations and public festivals in Roman Macedonia', *GRBS* 56, 663–678.
- Oliver, G. 2012. 'Agoranomoi at Athens', in *Agoranomes et édiles. Institutions des marchés antiques* (Scripta Antiqua, 44), eds. L. Capdetrey & C. Hasenohr, Bordeaux, 81–100.
- Parker, R.C.T. 1983. *Miasma. Pollution and purification in early Greek religion*, Oxford.
- Parker, R.C.T. 2005. *Polytheism and society at Athens*, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199216116.001.0001>
- Paton, W.R. 1899. 'An inscription from Samos', *CR* 13, 79.
- Platt, V. 2011. *Facing the gods. Epiphany and representation in Graeco-Roman art, literature and religion*, Cambridge.
- Pouilloux, J. 1954. *Recherches sur l'histoire et cultes de Thasos* (Études Thasiennes, 3), Paris.
- Quass, F. 1993. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1981. *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198149422.book.1>
- Ridgway, B.S. 1997. *Fourth-century styles in Greek sculpture*, Madison.
- Robert, L. 1937. *Études Anatoliennes. Recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris.
- Robert, L. 1969. 'Inscriptions' in *Laodicée du Lycos. Le Nymphée*, ed. J. des Gagniers, Québec & Paris.
- Robert, J. & L. Robert 1953. 'Bulletin épigraphique', *RÉG* 66, 113–212. <https://doi.org/10.3406/reg.1953.3311>
- Robert, J. & L. Robert 1959. 'Bulletin épigraphique', *RÉG* 72, 149–283. <https://doi.org/10.3406/reg.1959.3579>
- Robinson, D.M. 1933. 'A new Greek inscription from Macedonia', *AJA* 37:4, 602–604. <https://doi.org/10.2307/498125>
- Salviat, F. 1958. 'Dédicaces de magistrats à Thasos', *BCH* 82, 319–328. <https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1958.2343>
- Steinhauer, G. 1994. 'Inscription agoranomique du Pirée', *BCH* 118:1, 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.3406/bch.1994.1659>
- Thériault, G. 1996. *Le culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques*, Lyon-Québec.
- Van Bremen, R. 1996. *The limits of participation. Women and civic life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman periods*, Amsterdam.
- Veyne, P. 1976. *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.14375/np.9782020045070>
- Von den Hoff, R. 2004. 'Ornamenta γυμνασιῶδῆ? Delos und Pergamon als Beispeilfälle der Skulpturenausstattung hellenistischen Gymnasien', in *Die hellenistische Gymnasion* (Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel, 8), eds. D. Kah & P. Scholz, Berlin, 407–413. <https://doi.org/10.1524/9783050047249.373>
- Wallensten, J. 2003. ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗΙ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΑΡΖΑΣ. *A study of dedications to Aphrodite from Greek magistrates*, Ph.D. thesis, Lund University.
- Wallensten, J. 2009. 'Demand and supply? The character of Aphrodite in the light of inscribed votive gifts', in *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse. Systèmes votifs dans les sanctuaires de déesses dans le monde grec* (Kernos Suppl., 23), ed. C. Prêtre, Liège, 169–179. <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pulg.612>
- Wiegand, T. 1904. 'Reisen in Mysien', *AM* 29, 254–339.
- Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian institution of the Khoregia. The chorus, the city and the stage*, Cambridge.
- Wolff, H.J. 1970. *Das Justizwesend der Ptolemäer*, Munich.