

D. FISHWICK

VOTIVE OFFERINGS TO THE EMPEROR?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 80 (1990) 121–130

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## VOTIVE OFFERINGS TO THE EMPEROR ?

"It must be emphasized that no one appears to have said his prayers or did sacrifice to the living Augustus or any other living king in the hope of supernatural blessings."

Nock's view that prayers, whether public or private, were at no stage part of the imperial cult was repeated on various occasions through his writings.<sup>1</sup> The doctrine is stated at its most positive in Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. 10, 481:

"The touchstone of piety in antiquity is the votive offering, made in recognition of supposed deliverance in some invisible manner from sickness or other peril. This we do not find directed to rulers dead or living."

In a study published towards the close of his career Nock himself provided a clear exception to this principle, an Egyptian text — it should be noted — from the Ptolemaic period,<sup>2</sup> but his insistence on the basic absence of ex-voto's to the emperor has by and large remained the standard view until now.

In a recent paper S.R.F. Price argues precisely the opposite case.<sup>3</sup> In addition to various literary passages, Price points to a small number of inscriptions which he takes to attest votive offerings to the emperor. If so, these would be crucial to the whole question of prayer in the imperial cult, not that Price views prayers as in any case a fundamental element of religion.

"The aspects of practice which are particularly controversial are prayers by private individuals and the votive offerings made as a result of successful prayers."

The main concern of the present paper is with the analysis of these and similar epigraphical texts, which on closer inspection may not prove as unequivocal or decisive as seems the case at first sight. Nock's verdict could in that case still stand, at least in regard to the living emperor. The discussion in no way undermines the possibility, however, that

<sup>1</sup> A.D. Nock, *Gnomon* 8, 1932, 517; cf. id., *Σύνναος Θεός*, *HSCP* 41, 1930, 14 (= id., *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* [ed. Z. Stewart], Oxford 1972, 212); further *Gnomon* 27, 1955, 245. See in general H.S. Versnel, *Heersercultus in Griekenland*, *Lampas* 7, 1974, 152 with n. 167.

<sup>2</sup> A.D. Nock, *Deification and Julian*, *JRS* 47, 1957, 115 (= *Essays* 834), citing O. Rubensohn, *Neue Inschriften aus Ägypten*, *APF* 5, 1913, 156f.: a dedication to King Ptolemy and Queen Berenice, *theoi soterai*, by three individuals with Greek names, after deliverance, in payment of a vow. See further D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (EPRO 108), Leiden 1987, Vol. I, 1, 38f.

<sup>3</sup> S.R.F. Price, *Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult*, *JHS* 104, 1984, 91-93.

petitionary prayers were directed to deified members of the imperial family, more particularly to good emperors such as Augustus or Marcus Aurelius.<sup>4</sup>

A text from Pednelissus (?) in Pisidia is in Price's view the prime example of a votive offering set up to the emperor as a result of successful prayer; the reading seems safe despite the restoration [ἀνέθη]κεν:<sup>5</sup>

Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι | Τραϊανῶι Ἀδριανῶι | Σεβαστῶι καὶ τῷ  
 δήμῳ | τὴν εὐχὴν || Σάλμων Θ[έ]ονος? | ἱερεὺς Διὸς καὶ προ-  
 θύτης τ[ῶν Σεβ]αστῶν γε|νόμενος [ἀνέθη]κεν | σὺν γυναικί  
 (δηνάρια) σ'.

(SEG 2, 718)

The key point to be made here is that Salmon is both priest of Zeus and sacrificer of the Sebastoi; the genitive is ambiguous but Price takes *prothytes*, correctly one would have thought, to indicate that he sacrificed on behalf of the Sebastoi.<sup>6</sup> Since Salmon is also priest of Zeus, it is perfectly possible that the votive has been set up to Zeus in recognition of his response to prayer. Why is this not explicit in the inscription? For the simple reason that there would have been no need if the votive had been placed at the temple of Zeus in line with the customary practice of depositing an artifact of some kind in a sanctuary as an *anathema*.<sup>7</sup> What object was deposited we do not know, only that it cost 200 denarii, but the place where the votive was set up would itself have made it clear to which deity it was offered.<sup>8</sup> To mention this in the inscription would in that case have been superfluous. In

<sup>4</sup> For discussion see D. Fishwick, *Ovid and Divus Augustus*, forthcoming; id., *Prudentius and the Cult of Divus Augustus*, forthcoming. For texts relevant to the living emperor see id., *Prayer and the Living Emperor*, *Studies in Honour of A.G. McKay*, forthcoming.

<sup>5</sup> For the use of ἀνατίθημι with votive offerings see W.H.D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings*, Cambridge 1902, 323f. The most extensive recent treatment of votives is by F.T. van Straten, *Gifts for the Gods*, in H.S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope & Worship*, Leiden 1981, 65-151, especially 70ff.

<sup>6</sup> S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power, The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge 1984, 211f. with n. 23, refers to a *prothytes* of the emperor; but the plural clearly includes deceased emperors with the living. It might seem odd to offer sacrifice on behalf of deceased emperors, yet the idea also occurs in the well known Gytheum inscription: SEG 11, 1954, 923, lines 28f. See further D. Fishwick, *Liturgy and Ceremonial*, in ICLW (above, note 2) (1990), Vol. II, 1, forthcoming.

<sup>7</sup> Rouse, o.c. 322, 348ff.; W. den Boer, *Heersercultus en ex-voto's in het Romeinse Keizerrijk*, *Meded. der Konink. Nederl. Akad. van Wet., aft. Letterkunde* 36, 4, 1973, 104f.; W. Burkert, *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass. 1985, 93; van Straten (above, note 5) 69, 74ff.

<sup>8</sup> The find spot of the inscription itself is given as 'in area strata': SEG 2, 718 (cf. 717), citing B. Pace, *ASAA* 3, 1916/20, 152, n. 87. For a coin of Pednelissus showing Zeus holding an eagle and sceptre, seated 1. on a throne see *JHS* 34, 1914, 45, no. 144. On Pednelissus see *RE* 19, 1937, 43-45.

practice a wide range of inscriptions, both east and west, frequently omit the name of the deity to whom a vow has been paid, undoubtedly because this was thought unnecessary.<sup>9</sup>

On this interpretation, therefore, the votive will have been to Zeus, who is unnamed, and the priest, having deposited it, is careful to honour the emperor in the dedication formula, as appropriate to the office of *prothytes* of the Sebastoi (to which he had recently been elevated?). The text could then be read: "In honour of the emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Sebastos and the people, Salmon son of Theon, priest of Zeus and having become sacrificer for the Sebastoi, along with his wife, set up the votive at a cost of 200 denarii." Three points tell in favour of this sense. (i) The emperor is called simply *autocrator* and given his standard names; nothing, that is, goes to show he was thought of as a deity. (ii) In the dedication the *demos* appears alongside the emperor. If the votive was to the emperor *ut deo*, was it then also to the *demos* as a god? The people of a city can sometimes be personified as an abstraction but this is clearly not the case here. Apart from the mention of the votive (*euchên*), the inscription does in fact resemble a class of dedications that are made to a god and, say, the emperor and the people or the emperor and a city. Nock has shown that in such cases the emperor and the people or a city are associated with a god *honoris causa*, an idea explicit in the common formula IN H. D.D.<sup>10</sup> What we have in such cases is a combination of the dative of honour with the votive dative of the deity to whom the dedication is made. The Pednelissus inscription looks very much a similar example except that the name of the deity is suppressed. (iii) We are not told what Salmon's original petition had been but the text states that he has become *prothytes*. If the petition was in fact that he might obtain this office, there would have been every reason for Salmon, in fulfilling his vow to Zeus, to dedicate the *euchên* to the emperor.

An explanation along the same lines — that the vow was paid to a deity but the emperor is included in the dedication — looks a possible interpretation of a defaced text on a broken limestone altar from Bozuk Kuyu, near Ladik (Laodicea Combusta) in eastern Phrygia. Here Stephanus, freedman of the procurator, has recorded his dedication in fulfillment of a vow in the year A.D. 184:

... | ... | *Stephanus lib. proc. | ex voto | dedic. d* [... |  
*Marullo et Aeliano cos.* (MAMA 1, 23)

The presumption is that the first two lines of the inscription gave the name of Commodus, which has been erased as commonly elsewhere. With the key part of the text missing this

<sup>9</sup> For Greek examples see Rouse, o.c. 324f.; for Latin see, for instance, CIL 13, 588, 920, 959, 1421. On the Roman practice of fulfilling a vow by dedicating an object see G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*<sup>2</sup>, Munich 1912, 385.

<sup>10</sup> Nock (above, note 1), 1930, 47-52 (= Essays 239-42); id., (above, note 2) 115 (= Essays 833); cf. Rouse, o.c. 332; P. Veyne, *Les honneurs posthumes de Flavia Domitilla et les dédicaces grecques et latines*, *Latomus* 21, 1962, 65-67. Professor Eck adds the valuable point that the *demos* is mentioned perhaps because the people had elected the *prothytes* of the Sebastoi.

inscription hardly serves as a basis for discussion but it is worth observing that, so far as one can tell from the photograph, a sizeable section of the stone has been broken away, perhaps in the process of erasure. It is not entirely certain, then, that the name of a god to whom the altar was dedicated did not originally stand in first place. Alternatively, if space is to be judged too short for that, the name of a god could have been deliberately omitted as superfluous for some reason (above, p. 122f.)<sup>11</sup> In any event there is nothing definite to confirm that Commodus has heard or answered *ut deus* the prayer of the procurator's freedman. One might compare an Argive text dating from the lifetime of Vespasian and recording the formula ὑπὲρ λειτᾶς (= λιτᾶς):

Αὐτοκρ]άτορα Τίτον  
 Καίσ]αρα Σεβαστοῦ  
 Οὐε]σπασιανοῦ υἱὸν  
 .....ης Ἀλεξάνδρου γυμνα-  
 σιαρχ]ήσας, ὑπὲρ λειτᾶς.

(IG 4, 584)

Here again nothing in the titulature of Titus serves to show he was considered a god; despite the votive formula nothing confirms that a vow was paid to the emperor. The fact that the name of Titus is in the accusative should indicate that in fulfilment of his vow (to some deity) the dedicant, having served as gymnasiarch, has honoured the emperor in setting up a statue to him or has erected a statue of the emperor.<sup>12</sup> Quite correctly, therefore, the text is listed by Fraenkel among *tituli honorarii*.

Two Gallic examples that belong in the same category as the above come from Neuilly-le-Réal in the territory of the Bituriges Cubi. The texts are inscribed on the bases of two small bronze busts that purport to be of Augustus and Livia:

*Caesari Augusto | Atespatus Crixii fil. v.s.l.m.*  
*Liviae Augustae | Atespatus Crixii fil. v.s.l.m.*

(CIL 13, 1366)

On the face of it Atespatus has paid a vow to Augustus and to Livia at some point during their lifetimes. Hence Hirschfeld's comment: "Quod Augusto eiusque uxori deorum more votum solvitur, in Gallis, ubi iam a. 742 ara Romae et Augusti condita est, offensionem non habet." Against this it may be noted once again that both the emperor and his wife are given their secular names;<sup>13</sup> nothing, that is, indicates they were considered gods who had responded to prayer. More importantly, in this instance the two accompanying busts, which

<sup>11</sup> Rouse, o.c. 282f., 354.

<sup>12</sup> See the helpful discussion of Veyne, o.c. 68f.

<sup>13</sup> Hirschfeld notes ad loc. that Livia is sometimes called Augusta even before her death and that the name Livia Augusta (rather than Iulia Augusta) is a provincialism.

chance to have survived, clearly depict Augustus and Livia as very human;<sup>14</sup> the mediocre workmanship along with the name Atespatus, son of Crixus, points to a provincial owner of modest means. Once again, then, it seems best to take these dedications as purely honorific, the name of the deity to whom the vow was paid being simply omitted. We have seen that this would be the case if, for example, the busts had been placed in a temple as thank-offerings for answered prayer.<sup>15</sup> In practice, however, the dedications will have served to identify the busts, an obvious need in this case.<sup>16</sup>

In all of the above instances it has been suggested that the vow was paid to a god whose name was omitted, while the dedication is to the emperor, that is in his honour. How such a situation could arise is aptly illustrated by the two texts of a Neronian inscription found near Caecina (Luna):

imp. Neroni Claudio divi Claudi f., Germ. | Caesaris n., Ti.  
Caesaris Aug. pron., divi Aug. abn., | Caesari Aug. Germ., p. m., tr. pot.  
XIII , imp. XI , cos. IIII, | L. Titinius L. f. Gal. Glaucus Lucretianus flam.  
Romae et Aug., Ilvir | IIII, p. c. , sevir eq. R., curio, praef. fabr. cos.  
tr. mi. leg. XXII Primig., praef. pro legato | insular. Baliarum , tr. mil.  
I[e]g. VI Victricis, ex vótó suscepto pro salute imp. | Neronis, quod  
Baliaribus voverat anno A. Licinio Nerva cos. , Ilviris L. Saufe[i]o | Vegeto  
et Q. Aburio Nepote, ub[i] velle[t] poneret, voto compos posit Iovi Iuno[ur] |  
Minervae Felicitati Romae divo Augusto.

divae Poppaeae Augustae | imp. Neronis Caesaris August. | L. Titinius  
L. f. Gal. Glaucus Lucretianus | (*sequuntur eadem quae supra*).

(CIL 11, 1331 = ILS 233)

In this instance L. Titinius Glaucus Lucretianus, who gives us his full *cursus*, had made a vow in A.D. 65 for the *salus* of the emperor Nero, a vow which he now pays to the Capitoline Triad, Felicitas, Roma and Divus Augustus. The right-hand text begins, however,

<sup>14</sup> The busts are reproduced in E.E.A. Desjardins, *Géographie historique et administrative de la Gaule romaine*, Brussels 1885 (1968), Vol. III. 215-217. He takes them to be 'Lares Augustes'.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. two bronze busts, evidently of the young Octavian and Livia, found *in situ* at a native sanctuary at the Iberian town of Azailia, where they had been deposited: L. Curtius, *Zum Bronzekopf von Azailia und zu den Porträts des jugendlichen Augustus*, MDAI (R) 55, 1940, 36-64. For a vow paid, for example, to I.O.M. Dolichenus on behalf of the *salus* and *victoria* of Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Geta and [C. Fulvius Plautianus] see AE, 1951, 228.

<sup>16</sup> For the placing of names on busts see Suet., Aug. 7,1; Price (above, note 6) 179 with refs.; T. Pekáry, *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft (Das römische Herrscherbild; Abt.3, Bd.5)*, Berlin 1985, 38ff.; id., *Tiberius und der Tempel der Concordia in Rom*, MDAI (R) 73/74, 1966/67, 130. For two *protomai* from Rome with the names of a man and a woman in the nominative case see CIL 6, 2170 (= ILS 5010). Often enough a dedicatory inscription on the base (as here) will have served the same purpose; cf. CIL 2, 5264 (= ILS 261); CIL 6, 3756 (= ILS 5160).

with a dedication to Nero, the left-hand with a dedication to Diva Poppaea Augusta. While the latter was a deity, it is clear that the vow was not paid to her; hence both initial dedications are honorific. For a similar instance in which the text begins with a dedication to one deity but the vow is recorded as paid to another one might compare the text on an oolite statue base from Somerdale Keynsham:

*Num. Divor. | Aug. G. Indutius | Felix Silvano | v.s.l.m.*

(RIB 181)

Here Gaius Indutius Felix has paid his vow to Silvanus but the dedication is to the Numina of the Divi Augusti.<sup>17</sup> If the name of the deity to whom the vow is paid had been omitted in any of these examples, we would have had a parallel *mutatis mutandis* to the inscriptions treated above. Why the recipient of the vow is made explicit in CIL 11, 1331 seems reasonably clear, the vow for the emperor's *salus* having been made during Titinius Glaucius' term as *praefectus pro legato* of the Balearic islands (cf. CIL 11, 6955 = ILS 8902) but paid a year or so later *in agro Lunensi*. Presumably it was some particular reason that also impelled Gaius Indutius Felix to be specific in RIB 181, perhaps the need to identify the statue which stood on the base as that of Silvanus.

In other inscriptions the god to whom the vow is paid is mentioned explicitly and the emperor is then associated in the dedication.<sup>18</sup> In a text from out (Synnada) the dedicant states that, having made a vow (εὐξάμενος),<sup>19</sup> he has set up the two columns, the cornice architrave and the *agalmata* which are placed on them. The dedication is to Zeus Pandemos, with whom are associated Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta, addressed in their civil aspects, and the *agalmata* appear to be ornamental statues, certainly not cult idols.<sup>20</sup>

Διὶ Πανδήμῳ καὶ Αὐτοκράτορσι Καίσαρσι Λ. Σεπτιμίῳ Σεουήρῳ καὶ Μ. Αὐρ.  
 Ἀντωνείνῳ καὶ [Π. Σεπτιμίῳ]  
 [Γέτα] Ἀττικιανὸς β' τοῦ Ἀττικοῦ εὐξάμενος τοὺς δύο κείονας καὶ τὸ γεισεπίστυλον  
 καὶ τὰ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐστῶτα ἀγάλματα  
 ἀνέθηκεν.

(MAMA 6, 370)

<sup>17</sup> For what look to be similar examples inscribed on altars see RIB 146 (Bath), 611 (Overborough), 1074 (Lanchester) et passim.

<sup>18</sup> See above, note 10.

<sup>19</sup> Rouse, o.c. 329.

<sup>20</sup> Rouse, o.c. 327f. For the term *agalma* see Price (above note 6) 176-179. The *agalmata* above the architrave in the out inscription are clear examples of the use of the term to denote an ornament.



What we have here, then, is an instance of the votive dative in conjunction with the dative of honour — to the god but for, in honour of the emperors:<sup>21</sup> a combination particularly telling since, if this were a joint votive, it would have been to Zeus in company with three emperors, hardly a likely eventuality. One might compare a similar case at Norroy-sous-Prény (Mediomatrici), a votive paid to Hercules Saxsanus, with whom are associated Vespasian, Titus and Domitian:

*Herculi Saxsano et | imp. Vispasiano (sic) | Aug. et Tito imp. et |  
Domitiano Caesari | M. Vibius Martialis | leg. X Gem. et commili | tones  
vexilli leg. eiusd. | qui sunt sub cura eius | v.s.l.m.*

(CIL 13, 4624 = ILS 3453)

Again at Abusina (Raetia) the prefect T. Flavius Felix associates [Caracalla, Geta] and Julia with the Capitoline Triad and the genius of the *cohors III Britannorum* on an altar set up to these deities on 1st Dec., A.D. 211 in fulfilment of his vow.

*[Dominis nostris M. Aurelio et P. Septimio Getae Augustis et Iuliae] Aug(ustae)  
matri Aug(ustorum) et kast(rorum). I(ovi) o(ptimo) [m(aximo)] | et Iun(oni)  
re(ginae) et Miner(vae) sac(rum). Gen[io] | coh(ortis) III Brit(annorum) aram T.  
Fl(avius) | Felix praef(ectus) ex voto posuit l(ibens) m(erito). | Dedicavit kal. Dec.  
Gentiano et Basso cos.*

(CIL 3, 5935)

In these texts too it seems reasonable to take the inclusion of the imperial personages in the dedications to be honorific:<sup>22</sup> that is, they are not treated as gods who have answered prayer. That the dative of honour could even come in first place followed by the votive dative of the deity is confirmed by a text from Bourges (Avaricum Biturigum):

*[C.] Caesari Germanici [f.] Aug. | p.p. et Etnoso | Anavus Attici lib. | v.s.l.m.*

(CIL 13, 1189 = ILS 4675)

One or two other texts that might be adduced are beside the point since the votive is not to the emperor but to his τύχη or genius, that is his concomitant, independent deity. Thus

<sup>21</sup> Nock (above note 2) 115, n. 4 (= Essays 834, n.4), citing an inscription recording the fulfilment of a vow to Zeus Bronton along with an honorific dedication to a deified father: Δὶ βρογτωνί εὐχὴν | καὶ πατρὶ θεῷ (MAMA 5, pp. xxxviii, 11f. no. 232). Here the position of εὐχὴν surely confirms that the vow is paid to Zeus Bronton, with whom the deified father is associated in the dedication.

<sup>22</sup> So Nock (above, note 2) 115, n. 5 (= Essays 834, n.5). On the stereotype formula *Aug. sacrum* in conjunction with ex-voto's to deities see D. Fishwick, *Augusto ut deo*, ICLW Vol. II, 1 (above, note 6) forthcoming.

IGRR 4, 363 (Pergamum) records an ex-voto to the τύχη ἐκήκοος of Caracalla,<sup>23</sup> while PSI 1261 preserves a statement in a private letter from Egypt (A.D. 212-217) that the emperor's τύχη has saved someone. Similarly the genius of [Gallienus] is the recipient of a votive at Aquincum (CIL 3, 3424 = ILS 545), while at Narbo the vow made in perpetuity on behalf of Augustus, his wife and family, the senate, the Roman people and the inhabitants of Narbo, is made to the Numen Augusti (CIL 12, 4333 = ILS 112). The *numen* of the emperor was immanent rather than concomitant<sup>24</sup> and the distinction between the emperor and his *numen* must in practice have been even finer than that between him and his *genius*. Even so the vow at Narbo is still to a minor deity, a deified concept, not to the living emperor himself.

A very different situation is presented by a votive to the deceased Antinous at Claudiopolis, his place of origin:

[Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι.]  
 Νέωι θεῶ[ι]  
 Ἀντινόωι  
 εὐχὴν  
 Σωσθένη[ς].

F.K. Dörner, Denkschr. Öst. Akad. Wiss.  
 75, 1 (1952), 40, no. 78

Here the vow is paid to Antinous as a "new god", whose effective divinity is widely attested by both the epigraphical and the literary sources. More particularly, he is stated to have heard prayers and prophesied, to have healed the sick by sending them dreams, and to have been worshipped in a mystery cult.<sup>25</sup> Prudentius went out of his way to pillory Antinous, whom he represents listening to prayers in temples.<sup>26</sup> This evidence is also in line with the consistent picture that emerges from the sources of a general belief in the efficacy of the deified deceased, especially good *divi* such as Augustus, Marcus Aurelius and Julian.<sup>27</sup> In

<sup>23</sup> On ἐκήκοος see H.S. Versnel, *Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer*, in id. (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship*, (above, note 5) 34-37 with refs.; cf. van Straten (above, note 5) 71, n. 28.

<sup>24</sup> D. Fishwick, *Augustan Blessings & Virtues*, in ICLW Vol. II, 1 (above, note 6) forthcoming.

<sup>25</sup> See especially Origen, *Contra Celsum* 3, 36. Further evidence in J. Beaujeu, *la Religion romaine à l'Apogée de l'Empire*, Paris 1955, Vol. I, 242-57; Nock (above, note 2) 120 (= *Essays* 842).

<sup>26</sup> *quid loquar Antinoum caelesti in sede locatum,  
 illum delicias nunc divi principis, illum  
 purpureo in gremio spoliatum sorte virili,  
 Hadriani que dei Ganymedem, non cyathos dis  
 porgere sed medio recubantem cum Iove fulcro  
 nectaris ambrosii sacrum potare Lyaeum  
 cumque suo in templis vota exaudire marito?*

*Contra Orat. Symmachi* 1, 271-77

<sup>27</sup> See in particular Livy 1,16,3 (Romulus); Suet., *Iul.* 85 (Caesar); Vergil, *Ecl.* 9, 46-49 (Caesar); Val. Max. 1,6,13 (Caesar); Vergil, *Georg.* 1, 24-42 (Octavian post mortem); *Aen.* 1, 286-90 (Caesar or Augustus post mortem); Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4,9, 127-34; 4,13, 24 (Divus Augustus); cf. *Met.* 15, 869f. (Augustus post

light of this it is all the more surprising that there seems to be no trace of vows paid to Divus Augustus or, indeed, to any other *divus* in isolation — particularly when we hear of mysteries of Divus Augustus, admittedly of uncertain content.<sup>28</sup> What we do have is evidence for vows paid to Divus Augustus in combination with other deities<sup>29</sup> — the inscription from Luna (above, p.125) in a case in point. In the Acta Fratrum Arvalium, for example, vows are paid regularly to Divus Augustus, Diva Augusta and Divus Claudius in combination with Jupiter and other deities at least down to the Flavian period when they seem to have ceased, probably for the mundane reason of financial retrenchment.<sup>30</sup> Presumably this reflects the fact that Augustus and later *divi* were formally enrolled among the state gods.<sup>31</sup> In the Claudiopolis text, on the other hand, we have clear evidence of a vow paid solely to the deceased and deified favorite of Hadrian, undoubtedly in recognition of his supposed answer to prayer.<sup>32</sup>

To round the picture out one or two oddities are worth a brief mention. A *fanum* excavated at Châteauneuf-les-Boissons (Savoie) has produced *inter alia* a number of graffiti incised in a curious hand on tile, notably two dedications to Roma and six to the emperor (*Caesar, Augustus, Imperator, Nero*).<sup>33</sup> The formula *v.s.l.m.* is legible but seems to go with Roma rather than the emperor, though a link with the imperial cult has been supposed (AE 1982, 696). At Tupusuctu a third-century (?) inscribed base attests a votive to Hiempsal: *Iemsali | L. Percenius | L. f. Stel. | Rogatus | v. [s.l.a.]* (CIL 8, 8834, cf. 17159). If this is to the king *ut deo*, it would be consistent with the Mauretanian practice of paying cult to deified rulers,<sup>34</sup> so not directly relevant to the issue of supposed votives to the Roman emperor despite the Romanized form of the inscription with its votive formula. Wilmanns took it to refer to the god from whom the king derived his name. Lastly, attention may be

mortem); Prudentius, *Contra Orat. Symm.* 1, 245-48 (Divus Augustus); SHA, *Marc. Anton.* 18, 3-7 (Marcus Aurelius); Libanius, *Or.* 18, 304; cf. *Or.* 15,36; *Or.* 24,40 (Julian). See further Seneca, *Apoc.* 8,3 (Divus Claudius). For discussion of these passages, emphasizing that even an ordinary mortal was thought open to prayer after death, see Fishwick, *Ovid and Divus Augustus*, above, note 4.

<sup>28</sup> H.W. Pleket, *An Aspect of the Emperor Cult: Imperial Mysteries*, *HThR* 58, 1965, 331-347 at 335, n. 15, noting the view of Pouilloux that the mysteries consisted simply in the showing of sacred representations; cf. Price, *Rituals* (above, note 6) 191.

<sup>29</sup> Similarly one swears by *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus ac Divus Augustus ceterique omnes di immortales* (CIL 2, 172 = ILS 190).

<sup>30</sup> Nock (above, note 2) 115f. (= *Essays* 834), citing Henzen, *AFA* 102f.; D. Fishwick, *ICLW* Vol. II, 1 (above, note 6) forthcoming.

<sup>31</sup> In contrast, an inscription at Allonnes seems to combine an honorific dedication to Divus Augustus with a votive dative: *Marti Mulloni | et Divo Aug. | Severus Nigri | fil. | v.s.l.m.* (ILTG 345, cf. 343f.).

<sup>32</sup> For the distinction between the apotheosis of Antinous and that of members of the imperial house see Beaujeu (above, note 25) 245f.

<sup>33</sup> J. Lasfargues, *Informations archéologiques*, *Gallia* 40, 1982, 424f.; id., *Archéologie en Rhone-Alpes. Protohistoire et Monde Gallo-Romain. Dix ans de Recherches*, Lyon 1984, 160f.

<sup>34</sup> Ph. Leveau, *Caesarea de Maurétanie*, *ANRW* 2,10,2, 1982, 683-738 at 729; D. Fishwick, *ICLW* Vol. I,1 (above, note 2) 92, n. 59 with refs.

drawn to IGRR 4, 1273,<sup>35</sup> a text from Thyatira which alludes to a statue (lines 30f.) in honour of G. Sallustius [Ap?]pianus and mentions among other accomplishments that he had bountifully and magnificently rendered in full all the prayers and sacrifices to the local god Tyrimnas (cf. lines 6f.) and to the lord emperors: ...πάσας τὰς εἰς τὸν θεὸ[ν] | [καὶ] εἰς τοὺς κυρίους αὐτοκρά[τορας] εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας ... (lines 10-12). Given that one can sacrifice to benefactors<sup>36</sup> and that sacrifices to rulers seem to fall largely in the category of honorary offerings as classified by Porphyry (De abstinentia 2,24),<sup>37</sup> it seems likely enough that the εὐχὰς to the emperors will have taken the form of honorific formulae which come within the definition of 'hymns of praise'. At all events there is nothing to show these were petitions which the emperors were supposed to hear and answer *ut dei*.<sup>38</sup>

On the analysis developed above no evidence has so far accrued that can stand as unequivocal documentation of a votive offering to the emperor. What this would seem to imply, so far as epigraphical testimony is concerned, is that the living emperor was not seen as a personal god of saving or healing to whom one turned at times of crisis or affliction. The deified emperor was another matter, as the literary texts confirm,<sup>39</sup> though here it seems to have been the practice to pay vows to him only in association with other deities of the Roman state. Evidently even after death, Divus Augustus or Divus Marcus were never fully on level terms with the Olympians.

Edmonton

D. Fishwick

---

<sup>35</sup> Cited by Pleket (above, note 28) 334, n. 14. The text of IGRR 4, 93 (= IG 12, 2,278: Mytilene) is too uncertain to form a basis for discussion; conceivably Theos Sebastos refers to (Divus ?) Augustus along with Zeus and all the immortals in a prayer on a funerary monument.

<sup>36</sup> Nock, (above, note 1) 53, n.3 with refs. (= Essays 244, n.235).

<sup>37</sup> Porphyry's source is Theophrastus, Peri euseb. fr. 12, lines 42-44 (Pötscher). For discussion see van Straten (above, note 5) 66ff., noting that sacrifice and prayer go together; further Price, Rituals (above, note 6) 219f.

<sup>38</sup> Pleket, l.c. would not exclude this possibility. The emperor (Elagabalus?) appears as a new edition of Dionysus in an inscription on Aegina, where he is given the epithet *epekoos*. Nock (above, note 2) 121 (= Essays 843).- For the term see above, note 19.

<sup>39</sup> Above, note 27.