IV. DIVINITY AND WORSHIP

As a general rule, *isoteoi timai* appear to have been appropriate whenever an individual had been responsible for upholding the existence of the state, such as by freeing it from foreign domination or defending it against the attacks of an enemy. Above all divine honours will be due to one who founds a state, thus bringing it into existence, and it is notable that those who restore a state's sovereignty are called new founders, the event being often counted as the commencement of a new era. Extraordinary deeds of this order merited extraordinary honours and, in recognition of such, a state will spontaneously decree what the Milesians called "the greatest and fairest honours". So, too, with the institutional cults of the Hellenistic kingdoms. If the founder of a city was worthy of divine honours, *a fortiori* might the ruler of a kingdom lay claim himself to the same form of distinction. Nor need such a step provoke opposition or hostility. Evidence suggests, for instance, that the official cult of Arsinoe, founded after her death by her brother Ptolemy II Philadelphus, was warmly received and practised by the Greek inhabitants of the town of Ptolemais. We have seen that the principal difference between civic and dynastic cults is that the initiative no longer lay with the city-state but with the monarch, who imposed a cult for his own purposes. Yet despite the altered circumstances, the reason why a monarch required divine honours from his subjects was undoubtedly the thought that only *isoteoi timai* were appropriate for one in whose power lay the fate of an entire kingdom.

For lesser services the Greeks were accustomed to award one or more of the secular honours that had long existed in the city-state and continued to be granted in an age when it was possible to pay cult to a living man as a god. Honours at this level included crowns, public eulogies, front seats at theatrical productions (*προεδρία*), exemption from public burdens (*ἀξελεια*), free meals at the Prytaneum, even citizenship. The erection of a statue to a civic benefactor in some public place is of particular interest since we have seen that the statue could sometimes be placed in a temple, where it need have no more significance than if put in the *agora*. The quality of secular honours was proportional to the *εὐγενεσία* and therefore depended upon a subjective decision of the community, the most prestigious *πτερίς* being a statue, which was itself of varying worth according to the material used.
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honours were conferred could include the most diverse services to the state—financial, economic, or diplomatic support, artistic success, outstanding performance as a magistrate, and similar contributions. All of these are lesser accomplishments than those for which divine honours might be appropriate, but whether an individual was worthy of human or divine honours depended in the final reckoning on what a community judged to be appropriate. The full range of possible *timai*, from human to heroic or divine, is well illustrated by the various honours accorded to all who had helped lift the blockade of Rhodes in 304 or had served the Antigonids at Athens between 307 and 302. Obviously a city could go too far and what was deemed worthy of divine honours in one case might merit only human honours in another: the title *euergetes*, for example, can be used equally well in either context (above, p. 27).

The conclusion to be drawn is that divine and human honours differed in degree but not in kind; both belong at different intervals on essentially the same scale. There is therefore no illogicality in listing secular and divine honours side by side in the same decree, as in that of Ilion for Antiochus I (*OGIS* 219). Nor need it cause any surprise if, in defining *timé*, Aristotle feels no incongruity in jumbling sacred and profane honours without distinction:

> τιμή δ' ἐστι μὲν σημεῖον εὐεργετικῆς δόξης, τιμῶντα δὲ δυκαίως μὲν καὶ μάλιστα οἱ εὐεργετηκότες......μέρη δὲ τιμῆς θυσίαι, μνήμαι εἰ στρεύοντο καὶ άνευ μέτρων, γέρα, τεμένη, προσδήμη, τάφοι, εἰκόνες, τροφαὶ δημόσιαι, τὰ βαρβαρικὰ, οἰον προσκυνήσεως καὶ ἐκστάσεως, δῶρα τὰ πάρ᾽ ἐκάστος τίμα.

(*Aristotle, Rhetoric* 1361a, 28-37)

As Nock and others have repeatedly stressed, this indicates an imprecise, flexible distinction on the part of the ancients between what we should term worship on the one hand and homage on the other. It also explains the peculiarity mentioned above (p. 21), that the same word *timé* is used both for human and divine honours.

To a modern mind, accustomed to the Judaeo-Christian concept of God as a single, all-powerful, good and eternal being, the notion of paying cult to a man as though he were a god seems a very strange one indeed. But once the nature of divine honours is properly grasped it becomes much easier to understand that for a man to be given *isotheoi timai* in no way implies any recognition that he was a god in reality—a god in the sense that the in-
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