V. AUGUSTO UT DEO

A number of inscriptions from the provinces of the Latin West attest the association of the living emperor with some local or Roman divinity in a dedication or the payment of a vow. The familiar combination of Roma and Augustus (certainly in the dative case) appears on coins portraying the great altar at the sanctuary of the Three Gauls by Lugdunum (Vol. I, I, Pls. I, XIII-XVII). Whether this corresponds to an actual dedication formula in bronze letters, clamped onto the altar itself, must remain uncertain, but it is likely enough that the altars at Ara Ubiorum and Arae Flaviae were similarly dedicated, perhaps also the altar before the temple at Camulodunum. In a few instances the emperor is linked with a deity other than Roma such as Mercurius or some local godling, with Augustus standing now in first place, now in second—in some cases one even finds Augustus replaced with a roster of personal names and secular titles. But by far the largest group is made up of inscriptions beginning Aug(usto) sacr(um) followed by the dative of a deity. Most examples of the latter that happen to survive are in the form of "ex-voto's"; the rest are dedications on statue-bases or from temples or other structures. Apart from their number, inscriptions of this type are remarkable for the fact that the great majority originate in the same general area of Gallia Lugdunensis.

How such evidence is to be interpreted raises a number of questions of central interest to the cult of the Roman emperor. Toutain took the view that an official Imperial divinity (Augustus) is here associated with another deity: in other words the emperor is in all cases paid cult ut deus. If so, the vast majority of these inscriptions would be in conflict with the rule laid down by Augustus that he might be worshipped only in company with Dea Roma (Suet. Aug. 52)—not that such a development would be so very surprising in itself. Both communities and individuals were free to worship the ruler as they saw fit (even without Roma) and to link the emperor with a variety of gods in dedications would be no more irregular per se than to set up a statue assimilating him to a particular deity. But is Toutain's analysis, followed in large part by others, wholly acceptable? Does the emperor invariably appear
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in what Taeger calls his "göttliche Wesenheit"? If not, what is one to make of the various categories of inscriptions distinguished above?

Wherever it is clear that an altar or a statue serves the cult of the emperor, a dedication Augusto must naturally be understood as the dative appropriate to dedications to a god. It will be convenient to use the regular term "votive dative" in this context, though in practice the emperor seems not to have been the recipient of gifts dedicated ex voto. The way the votive dative had evolved needs no elaboration. Greek statues are known to have been originally in the nature of ἀνθρωπος with an inscription on their bases to the effect (usually) that A has dedicated (the statue of) B to the god C. But when statues came to be erected elsewhere than in the sanctuary the name of a particular deity gave way to a loose notice of the gods in general (θεοῖς), which itself was eventually dropped, leaving an honorific formula in the accusative: A has set up (a statue of) B or honoured B (with a statue). On the other hand with true dedicatory inscriptions—dedications to a god, that is—the dative of the deity was retained as the natural way of signifying that A has dedicated X to be god B. The usage was subsequently copied by Latin inscriptions to show that the object dedicated—a vase, tablet, metal plate, statue, altar, temple—has been given over to the deity. In both Greek and Latin inscriptions the genitive can also be used to signify that the deity is now the owner.

The force of Augusto in the double dedication formula at Lugdunum is therefore not in question: the altar is plainly dedicated to the emperor ut deus alongside the goddess Roma, with whom he shares the services of a priest. The same combination, originally in bronze lettering, occurs on the architrave of the municipal temple at Pola, where Augustus is also styled Caesar, divi filius, and pater patriae: Romae et Augusto Caesari divi f[ilio] patri patriae (CIL 5, 18 = ILS 110; Pl. LXXXI a, b, c). Similarly a private dedication from Tarracina, now lost, reads: Romae et Augusto Caesari divi [f[ilio]] | A.
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