

NUMINA AUGUSTORUM

SHORTLY before the death of Augustus, Tiberius dedicated the celebrated *ara numinis Augusti*, thus formally enshrining the *numen* of Augustus within the Imperial Cult.¹ The step was a radical one, fundamental to the whole development of the emperor's 'divinity'. Whereas the official cult of the emperor's *genius* had continued a traditional Republican practice, if with significant differences,² to ascribe *numen* to the *princeps* was to establish Augustus as a *θεός ἀνὴρ*, through whom divinity could function as an intermediary.³ For to pay cult to the *numen Augusti* was to ascribe to the human emperor the quintessential property of a god.⁴ The cult of the *numen* seems, however, to have been slow in establishing itself as a popular form of worship and to have been restricted in the areas where it took hold.⁵ In the north-east and the east it occurs rarely, apart from the late formula *devotus numini maiestatique eius/eorum*,⁶ and is attested only to a very limited extent in Africa, where *numini Augustorum* gives way in the third century to *D N M Q E*.⁷ Spain has produced scores of examples of the *devotus* formula, yet extremely few direct dedications.⁸ But in Narbonensis and more especially in the Celtic provinces of the north-west evidence for the worship of the Imperial *numen* is very great indeed. In no other quarter of the Roman world, in fact, does the Imperial *numen* appear so frequently in dedications of the widest variety.

The present paper is mainly concerned with the form the cult took and with what exactly this implies. In the vast majority of cases dedications are made to the *numina Augustorum*, either written in full or in a variety of abbreviations.⁹ When the plural *Augustorum* is abbreviated to *Augg./Auggg.*, there is usually no

¹ L. R. Taylor, 'Tiberius' *Ovatio* and the *Ara Numinis Augusti*', *AJPhil* lviii (1937), 185-93.

² As instituted in c. 14-12 B.C., the official cult of the imperial *genius* included the sacrifice, probably of a bull, the same type of animal victim as was offered to Jupiter and most gods; in the traditional cult of the *genius* the offering had been simply pure wine, incense, and flowers; cf. L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, 1931), 192; A. D. Nock, *Gnomon*, viii (1932), 516. On the cult of the *genius* see in general W. F. Otto, *RE* vii, 1 (1910), 1155-70; L. Cesano, *Diz. Epig.* iii (1922) (1962), 449-81; R. Étienne, *Le Culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (*Bibl. des écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome*, 191; Paris, 1958), 307-9.

³ Though possessing *numen*, the emperor was not, however, himself a god like Apollo or Asklepios, to whom one turned in the hour of need; cf. Nock, loc. cit., 518; *HTHR* xlv (1952), 237 ff.; *JRS* xlvii (1957), 115. For the significance of the step from *genius* to *numen* see my article 'Genius and Numen', *HTHR* lxii (1969), 356-67.

⁴ On the nature of *numen* see F. Pfister, *RE* xvii, 2 (1937), 1273-91; H. J. Rose, *HTHR* xxviii (1935), 237-57; xlv (1951), 109-20; also in general H. Wagenvoort, *Roman Dynamism: Studies in ancient thought, language, and custom* (Oxford, 1947).

⁵ Two of the earliest examples are from Narbo, *CIL* xii. 4333 = *ILS* 112: A.D. 11, and from Forum Clodii, *CIL* xi. 3303 = *ILS* 154: A.D. 18.

⁶ *D.N.M.Q.E.* and variants first appear in the early third century; cf. H. G. Gundel, *Epigraphica*, xv (1953), 128-50.

⁷ Africa is unique in that the commonest form of dedication is *numini* (never *numinibus*) *Augustorum*: elsewhere this form is rare; cf. below, p. 197 n. 1.

⁸ Étienne, op. cit., 309-13.

⁹ On the expansion of the various abbreviations and the general nature of the cult in Britain see Fishwick, 'The Imperial Numen in Roman Britain', *JRS* lix (1969), 76-91. For abbreviated forms in the Germanies and the Gauls see J. Deininger, 'Numinibus Augustorum', *Germania*, xlv (1966), 138-42.

doubt that the *numina* of two or more reigning *Augusti* are intended.¹ Examples of this type occur frequently in Britain, which is unique in attesting an early-third-century cult of the *numen/numina* of the living emperor or emperors. But what exactly is implied by *numinibus Augustorum/Augustor./Aug.; num(inibus) Aug(ustorum)*? The fact that the double or treble G is expressly used to denote reigning emperors certainly seems to imply that some other sense is intended when an abbreviation has only the single G. Must one then assume that if the reduplicated G denotes living emperors to the exclusion of the dead, therefore the single G denotes dead emperors to the exclusion of the living? The question is prompted by the opinion of *RIB* on the subject, stated in the editorial note *ad RIB* 152 (p. 49): '... In an abbreviated form, however, the sole means of distinguishing between the *numina* of two or more reigning *Augusti* and those of deceased emperors treated collectively [my italics] would be to use for the former the normal AUGG. or AUGGG., and for the latter AUG. with the plural NUMINA ...' The question is an important one since it is basic to the whole cult of the Imperial *numen*. To whom is the cult actually addressed in its most frequent manifestation, that is, in dedications to the *numina Augustorum*?

First, let us consider the problem in the context of the ruler cult as a whole within the general area of the Celtic World. It is important to observe that in the Gauls, the Germanies, and Britain emperor-worship was something different from what it was in the Romanized provinces of the West. In Narbonensis, Baetica, and Proconsularis, for example, a great deal was originally left to local initiative and the establishment of an official provincial cult deferred until the time of Vespasian.² But in newly pacified territories the cult performed the important role of focusing loyalty on the person of the emperor and helped to further the process of Romanization.³ Hence it was installed at a very early stage in the development of a new territory.⁴ This is certainly true of the cult centre at Lyon, where from 12 B.C. the famous altar at the confluence of the Rhône and the Saône served the cult of *Roma* and the living emperor, in direct line with Augustus' regulation that he might be worshipped in the provinces by non-Roman provincials provided *dea Roma* shared in the cult.⁵ It is also true of the centre at Camulodunum, where—whatever the technical status of the temple may have been—the emphasis was certainly on the living Claudius; here there is no trace of *Roma*.⁶ One would presume that it also held true for the abortive foundation at *Ara Ubiorum* in the Rhineland, though there is nothing definite to prove a cult of *Roma* and Augustus.⁷

By the turn of the century the situation had altered at Lyon to the extent

¹ This is true at least of the period after A.D. 161. Before then *Augg.* can certainly include past emperors on occasion: see below, p. 196. *Augg.* [sic] refers to Postumus on a milestone from Margam, Glamorgan: *JRS* xxvii (1937), 249.

² For Narbonensis see J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit (Vestigia: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, Band 6; München, 1965)*, 30; for Proconsularis see Fishwick, *Hermes*, xcii (1964), 342–63; T. Kotula, *Eos*, lii (1962), 155 ff.; for Baetica see J. Deininger, *Madriider Mitteilungen*, v (1964), 167–79; Fishwick, 'The Equestrian Cursus in *CIL* 2, 3271', *Historia*, xix (1970), 96–112.

³ E. Kornemann, *RE* iv, 1 (1900), 803 f., s.v. *concilium*.

⁴ M. Krascheninnikoff, 'Ueber die Einführung des provinziellen Kaiserkultus im röm. Westen', *Philologus*, liii (1894), 169, 175, 184.

⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 4. 37; Suet. *Aug.* 52; cf. Dio 51. 20. 6–7. On the cult at Lugdunum, see now Deininger, *Provinziallandtage*, 21–4, 99–107.

⁶ See Fishwick, *Phoenix*, xv (1961), 161–4, and the cogent discussion by S. S. Frere, *Britannia* (London, 1967), 323 f.

⁷ A cult of *Roma* and the living ruler is nevertheless very probable; cf. Deininger, *Provinziallandtage*, 24, with note 4.

that a temple had been added and past emperors were now included in the worship, apparently both at the altar and at the temple. Towards the close of the second century, however, it would appear that the altar was once again reserved for the living emperor(s), whereas both past and present rulers shared in the temple cult.¹ This is the period when dedications to the *numina Augustorum* become plentiful on the continent, though occasional inscriptions may be earlier. In Britain, on the other hand, the cult of the *numina Augustorum* begins in the surviving evidence in A.D. 133–7 (*RIB* 824 f.). Since at least six and perhaps twice as many inscriptions of this type are dated before A.D. 161—that is, before the first reign of double emperors—it is clear that divinized emperors must certainly be included in the cult. Yet Britain remained what it was, a distant outpost of dubious loyalty, and it is significant that in the second century as in the third such abstractions as Imperial *Virtus*, *Victoria*, *Fortuna*, and *Disciplina*, which can only refer to the living ruler or rulers, occur relatively frequently in military dedications.² By the early third century the pendulum had swung the other way once again and the emphasis was now on the *numen/numina* of the living emperor(s) to the exclusion of the past. A somewhat similar development is observable at this time on the north-west frontier. In Belgica and the Germanies the cult of the *numina Augustorum* is less frequently attested than in Aquitania and Lugdunensis, and again mainly in the late second and early third centuries, when there are several dedications to the *numina* of multiple reigning emperors; cf. *CIL* xiii. 4131 f. Significantly, there are no dedications in this area set up to the *numina* by soldiers, though the *devotus* formula was popular enough in military cult. The score or so examples of this formula that have come to light are, however, third-century and, of course, relate specifically to the *numen* of the living emperor or his house. What appears to have replaced the *numina* as the main facet of the Imperial cult in this region is the *domus divina*, that is the cult of all living members of the reigning dynasty.³ These occur in very great numbers—all told close to 100 by soldiers and more than 250 by civilians, with far more in Belgica and the Germanies than in Aquitania and Lugdunensis. Once again the bulk of dedications *in h.d.d.* date from the first half of the third century, relatively few coming from the second.

The picture that emerges from the inscriptions, then, is that in the first century and the third the main emphasis of the ruler cult in the Celtic world was emphatically on the living emperor. In the second century and to some extent in the third the *divi* certainly had their place in the cult, but at no stage and in no province of the north-west is there any possibility that divinized emperors would have been paid cult to the exclusion of the living. Even in older provinces such as Tarraconensis and Lusitania the living emperor and *Roma* had been added to the earlier cult of the *divi* under Vespasian,⁴ and when this was the trend in the Romanized west it is difficult to think that the *divi* would ever have eclipsed the living emperor in Britain, Gaul, or the Germanies. As

¹ See further below, p. 194.

² Étienne, *op. cit.*, 333 f. with refs. For Imperial virtues in Britain see, e.g., *RIB* 152, 1466, 2200 (*Virtus*); 1073, 1778 (*Fortuna*); 842–4, 1138, 1337, 1731, 1995, 2100 (*Victoria*); 990, 1127 f., 1978, 2092, *JRS* xlix (1959), 136, no. 6 (*Disciplina*). These virtues relate to the living emperor whether the abbreviation *Aug.* is to be

expanded to *Aug(usta)* (cf. *RIB* 845: *virtus Augusta* [sic]) or, as is perhaps likelier in military examples, *Aug(usti)*.

³ On the *domus divina* see Neumann in *RE* v (1905), 1527; Calza in *Diz. Epig.* ii, 3 (1910), 2062–7.

⁴ I have argued this in detail in *HSCP* lxxiv (1970), forthcoming.

a result, while there is every reason to group the *divi* with the reigning emperor(s) whenever the plural *numina Augustorum* does not apply to multiple reigning emperors, the general development of the ruler cult makes it *a priori* most unlikely that *Augustorum* could ever have denoted past emperors exclusively. Not only would this have made no sense politically, and the Imperial cult was essentially a political device, but to exclude the *numen* of the living ruler would have almost amounted to a rejection of his legitimacy. Such a situation is inconceivable at times when dynasties tended to be short-lived.

So much for general probability. A second, possibly decisive, argument can be based upon the technical uses of *Augustorum*, again within the framework of the ruler cult as a whole. Just as Σεβαστῶν denotes all rulers, past and present inclusively, in ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν,¹ the commonest title of eastern provincial priests, so too in the west *Augustorum* seems to denote both past and present *Augusti* in the various titles of the provincial *flamen* or *sacerdos*. In Hither Spain, for example, the titles *flamen Aug(ustorum)*, *flamen Romae et Aug(ustorum)*, *flamen divorum Augustorum*, and *flamen divorum et Augustorum* all occur within the Flavian period² and must therefore be considered simply as variants, all of which denote a provincial priest charged with one and the same form of cult. Since *Roma* is normally associated with the living Augustus, it would appear that from the time of Vespasian onwards the provincial cult at Tarraco included *Roma* and the living emperor along with divinized past emperors. Hence *Augustorum* in the priest's title must embrace both past and present *Augusti*: for at this period *Augusti* cannot denote multiple emperors reigning jointly and successive rulers are ruled out by the fact that a provincial priest served only one year. Similarly at Lyon, when a temple was added to the cult altar,³ the inscriptions show that the priest's title now changed from *sacerdos Romae et Augusti ad aram* . . . to *sacerdos ad templum/aram Romae et Augustorum*. This makes it clear that the cult of *Roma* and the living ruler had been widened to include divinized emperors.⁴ For since some at least of these inscriptions are prior to A.D. 161, it is impossible to take *Augusti* in the sense of two living rulers, and successive rulers can be excluded for the same reason as at Tarraco. Finally, in the late second and third centuries a further change is reflected in the title *sacerdos ad aram Caesaris nostri/Caesarum nostrorum apud templum Romae et Augustorum*. As Kornemann saw, this can only mean that the altar was reserved for the living ruler or rulers whereas the temple was dedicated to *Roma* and the *Augusti*. But by the *Augusti* is surely meant, as in the second century, the *divi* with the inclusion of the living emperor(s), since to limit *Augusti* to the *divi* now that the altar catered solely for the living ruler(s) is surely to impose a different interpretation on *templum Romae et Augustorum* in the third century from the one it bore in the second.⁵ And I can see no contradiction in holding that,

¹ Cf. W. Dittenberger, *Hermes*, xiii (1878), 72; C. G. Brandis, *RE* ii (1895), 480 f.; E. Kornemann, 'Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte', *Klio*, i (1901), 105-8.

² Cf. *CIL* ii. 4226, 4225, 4239, 4217, with my discussion (above, p. 193 n. 4).

³ Kornemann, loc. cit. 108 f., dates the erection of the temple to about the turn of the first century. New inscriptions may yet modify the picture here.

⁴ The priest's title in the second century is

either *sacerdos ad aram Romae et Augustorum* or *sacerdos ad templum Romae et Augustorum*. On Kornemann's very probable interpretation this means that both temple and altar served equally well the cult of *Roma* and the *Augusti*.

⁵ *Contra* Kornemann, loc. cit. 109: '... der Altar der Verehrung des oder der jeweils regierenden Kaiser . . . geweiht worden ist, während der Tempel dem Kult der Roma und der Augusti, d.h. der gewesenen Kaiser gewidmet blieb.' Yet in

whereas the *divi* were excluded from the altar, the living emperor(s) was included in the formula *templum Romae et Augustorum*. Here again, therefore, *Augustorum* denotes living as well as divinized rulers.

Thirdly, can one demonstrate from individual inscriptions that *numina Augustorum* includes the *numina* of both past and present rulers? One negative point in favour of this view is that *numini Aug./numinibus Augg.* (or a variant) never occur in conjunction with *numinibus Aug.* While this does not necessarily prove that the *numen/numina* of the living emperor(s) is included in the *numina Aug.*, it would certainly prove that *numinibus Aug.* is restricted to divinized rulers, if the two ever appeared together in the same dedication. Furthermore, *CIL* viii. 5177 is one text at least that lends support to the general thesis by explicitly linking the *numen* of the living emperor with the *numina* of divinized emperors in a common dedication: *numini divor. Augustorum sacr. et imp. Caes. divi Traiani Parthic. f. divi Ner. nep. Traiani Hadrian. Aug.* (Zattara, A.D. 121). In the great majority of dedications, however, one is confronted with the simple formula *numinibus Augustorum* (or an abbreviation), with the result that any conclusions can be based only on the general content of the inscription. An occasional text offers reasonable possibilities: for example, *CIL* xiii. 1752 (= *ILS* 4132): *||||| numinib. Aug. totiusque domus divinae et situ [sic] c. C.C. Aug. Lugud. taurobolium [sic] fecerunt dendrophori Luguduni consistentes . . .* (Lyon, A.D. 190). Since this is a *taurobolium*, it almost certainly began with the *pro salute* formula: the editors supply *pro salute Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Commodi Antonini Aug.* Now with the *pro salute* formula one commonly finds *et domus divinae/totiusque domus divinae* immediately following the emperor's name; that is, the dedication is made for the *salus* of the emperor and all the divine house.¹ Here the emphasis is wholly on the living: there would be no point in praying for the welfare of the dead.² Sometimes, too, *pro salute* is coupled with *devotus numini eius*; that is, the *numen* of the living emperor; cf. *CIL* xiii. 6549: *[pro] sa[l]u[t(e)] im[p(eratoris) Sev]eri colle[giu]m iuvent[ut]i[s] devotiss[im]i numini eiu[s] sacrant . . .* But in *CIL* xiii. 1752 we have *numinib(us) Aug(ustorum)* sandwiched between *pro salute* and the genitive of the divine house. When the inscription (almost certainly) begins 'For the welfare of the (living) emperor . . .', it is difficult to think that this would be followed by a dedication to the *numina* of past emperors. But it is well-nigh impossible to believe that *Augustorum* excludes the present emperor when it is immediately followed by *totiusque domus divinae*. The formula 'and of all the divine house' surely implies a prior mention of some specific member or members of the divine house;³ hence the common expansion of the formula to *totiusque domus divinae eius/eorum*; cf. *RIB* 897, 919, 2066 *et passim*. Therefore, since *-que* must be taken to link all the divine house directly with *Augustorum* rather than with the (restored) name of Commodus, it follows that the living Augustus is included with past *Augusti* under *numinibus Augustorum*. (The date again precludes the possibility of joint emperors.) Thus the altar commemorating the *taurobolium* performed by the *dendrophori* who had their locale at Lugdunum

the second century Kornemann takes *Augusti* to denote both past and present rulers in the formula *templum Romae et Augustorum*: *ibid.* 109, n. 4 with refs.

¹ Cf. *CIL* xii. 1782, 1753 f.; xiv. 41; viii. 8203 (= *ILS* 4130, 4133-6).

² For *pro salute domus divinae* [sic] see *RIB*

91; *CIL* xiii. 5042. That *domus divina* denotes living members of the ruling house is even clearer in the rare formula *pro salute et incolumitate d.d.* (cf. *CIL* xiii. 520).

³ See Calza's lists, *Diz. Epig.* (above, p. 193 n. 3), 2063.

would appear to have been dedicated: '[For the welfare of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus,] to the divinities of the *Augusti* (the *divi* and Commodus) and of all the divine house, and for the [prosperity]¹ of the colony Copia Claudia Augusta at Lugdunum . . .' Inscriptions of this type, in which the *numina Augustorum* are coupled with *totiusque domus divinae*, must surely always imply that the *Augusti* include the living emperor(s); so, too, one would have thought, *numinibus Aug(ustorum) et dom(us) div(inae)* (cf. *CIL* xii. 2596). The same argument applies to *in h.d.d. numinibus Aug.*, where it would be very difficult to accept the interpretation 'in honour of the (living) divine house, to the divinities of the (dead) *Augusti*'.²

There remain one or two hard cases which might seem to jeopardize the conclusions reached above. A dedication from Nescania in Baetica, for example, reads: *numini divorum Augg. C. Publicius Fortunatus liber[t]us m(unicipii) F(lavii) Nesca[niensis] aram solo pub(lico) s(ua) p(ecunia) d.d.* (*CIL* ii. 2009). At first sight it might appear that this was a dedication to the *numina* of divinized emperors and that here was one text where the living emperor's *numen* was certainly not included. Two considerations strongly suggest that this inference would be false. In the first place C. Publicius Fortunatus was a freedman of the Flavian municipality of Nescania. Whatever the precise date of the inscription may have been, then, it was certainly Flavian or post-Flavian. Now under Vespasian a provincial cult for Baetica was established at Corduba, the object of which was almost certainly the living emperor and *Roma* in conjunction with the *divi*, who had already been paid municipal cult under the Julio-Claudians.³ The interesting point is that, in six out of the eleven cases we have, the title of the provincial priest of Baetica is given as *flamen divorum Aug.* or a variant. As I have argued elsewhere, this title is synonymous with *flamen divorum et Augustorum* and, first appearances to the contrary, does not imply a cult of the *divi* to the exclusion of the living emperor.⁴ Equally striking is that *CIL* ii. 2344 (Trajan) and *AE* (1966), no. 181 (A.D. 191) both attest the formula *flamen divorum Augg.*, which in neither case can denote joint ruling emperors. While there is nothing to show that the double G is deliberately intended to signal the inclusion of the living emperor, it is clear that *divorum Augg.* in the titles of provincial priests certainly does not denote past emperors exclusively. I suggest therefore that the formula *divorum Augg.* in the Nescania text may echo or even be consciously modelled on the formula commonly employed at the provincial centre. If so, in this case too *divorum Augg.* must include the living emperor with the *divi*.

An objection to this might be that in the Zattara inscription (above, p. 195) *numini divorum Augustorum* certainly denotes divinized emperors exclusively since the *numen* of Trajan is explicitly mentioned in addition; yet the two texts are hardly comparable. For one thing the most common form of dedication in

¹ Reading *statu for situ*; cf. Dessau ad loc., n. 2.

² A good example is *CIL* xiii. 7317 (= *ILS* 7095): [*i*]n *h.d.d.* n[*u*]min. *Aug. hastiferii sive pastor(es) consistentes Castello Mattiacorum [d]e suo posue[r]unt VIII Kal. Apriles [I]uliano et Crispino co[s]*. If the erection of this altar on 24 March A.D. 224, reflects the *vota* commonly offered on this day by the *archigallus* for the emperor's welfare then *numin(ibus) Aug(ustorum)* must surely

include the living emperor Alexander Severus with past emperors; see further *JRS* lvii (1967), 151. For the expansion of *numin. Aug.* see *RIB* 146 and my discussion in *JRS* lix (1969), 76–91.

³ Étienne, op. cit., 200–4.

⁴ See above, p. 193 n. 4. Similarly ἀρχιερεὺς θεῶν Σεβαστῶν by no means implies a cult of the *divi* exclusively; cf. Brandis (above, p. 194, n. 1), 481.

Africa is *numini Augustorum* and there are no African examples of dedications *numini divorum Augustorum tout court*;¹ for another, in contrast to Baetica or Tarraconensis, the titles of the provincial priests of Africa (*flamen/sacerdos p. A* . . .) do not attest any currency for the formula *divorum Aug.* Indeed, taken as a whole, the Zattara text rather supports the thesis that in the cult of the *numen* dedications are made to the *numen/numina* either of the present emperor or emperors or of both past and present emperors, never of past emperors alone. Nevertheless it does not follow that *numina divorum Augustorum* must in every context be taken to include the living emperor. An inscription from Egypt, for example, reads: *iuravitque per I(ovem) O(ptimum) M(aximum) et numina divorum Augustorum geniumque Imp. Caesaris Traiani Hadriani Augusti* . . . (AE [1937], no. 112: A.D. 127). With this may be compared the formula in the well-known municipal laws of Malaca and Salpensa: *iusiurandum* . . . *per Iovem et divom Augustum et divom Claudium et divom Vespasianum Aug. et divom Titum Aug. et Genium imp. Caesaris Domitiani Aug.* . . . (CIL ii. 1964 [LIX] = ILS 6089; cf. CIL ii. 1963 [xxvi] = ILS 6088). The similarity makes it well-nigh certain that *numina divorum Augustorum* in the Egyptian text above denotes past emperors exclusively. But these are oaths—not dedications to the Imperial *numina*, which is what the present discussion is about.

Finally, there is the problem of RIB 181 (Keynsham): *num(inibus) divor(um) Aug(ustorum) G. Indutius Felix Silvano v.s.l.m. cos. Vic. Ga.* (A.D. 155). This seems to be the only example of its kind in Britain or indeed the entire north-west where the *Augusti* are qualified *divi*; elsewhere in the area *n(umini) Aug(usti)* or *num(inibus) Aug(ustorum)* with variants is the form. If, then, one considers that this formula is unique in the Celtic world, that the evidence overwhelmingly favours the view that the *numen* of the living emperor is included in the *numina Augustorum*, and that in Baetica and Tarraconensis *divorum Aug.* includes the living emperor in any case, it is difficult to think that the Keynsham stone is an isolated example of a dedication to the *numina* of past emperors exclusively. Where this formula came from (had G. Indutius Felix encountered it in Spain, for example?) it would be idle to speculate, but all analogy suggests that here, too, the *divi Augusti* include the living emperor, Antoninus Pius. Certainly it would be illegitimate to conclude either from this text or from the Nescania inscription that cult was normally paid to the divinities of past emperors exclusively. The verdict stands that, wherever one encounters dedications to the *numina Augustorum*, the *Augusti* must be understood to include the living emperor along with the *divi*.

St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia

DUNCAN FISHWICK

¹ Cf. CIL viii. 958, 8808, 14395, ILS 1. 3991; ILTun 1501 reads: *num(ini) deor(um) Aug(ustorum) sac(rum)*. This can certainly

include the living emperor; cf. ILS 9495: *Augusto deo cives Romani qui Thinissut negotiantur* . . . (Bir-bu-Rekba).