I. Introduction

When writing the imperial cults, two mayor proposals can be observed about this matter, which have been divulged for almost a century. The first one is a negative appreciation. This considers those manifestations as a manipulation from the central power and superficially religious manifestations.1 If this is true, then how and where do we begin to consider the literature of the period and epigraphical evidences? The other appreciation considers the imperial cults as part of the religious system in the Roman World, and the epigraphical records as diverse ways of manifestation to the emperors and the imperial family.2

II. Some Epigraphical Statements

It is known by the epigraphical records that some emperors refused to be considered as godlike in life or manipulate the imperial cults, trying to avoid a direct link with the honors presented. This illustrates that the imperial cults did not always depend of the princeps. Some examples are: Tiberius refusing divine honors in a letter to the ephors and the city of Gytheum, rejecting any connection with Augustus or the gods and stating ‘[…] I myself am content with more moderate honors, as befitt men’.3 This example enlightens that the religious change was not always in the hands of the princeps, but there were others involved in the process, like local elites, politicians in the provinces, and even the underprivileged.4 Cassius Dio reminds in his words when Tiberius says in one occasion: ‘I am master of the slaves, imperator of the soldiers, and chief of the rest’ and Suetonius explained that the new emperor refused some titles like Imperator, Pater Patriae and Augustus.5 S. Mazzarino explains the reason of this rejection: “dalla costante ripugnanza del nuovo imperatore ad ereditare alcune forme decisamente monarchiche dell’ideologia augustea”.6
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Claudius tried to keep the traditions by taking two determinations: a) accepting political dedications without direct insinuation of divine attributes, like the statues from the Dionysus’ performers in AD 43,7 and one inscription exemplifies the municipal tendencies in the establishment of the cult without any divine insinuation: Τιβερίωι Κλαυδίωι Καίσαρι Γερμανικῶι Σεβαστῶι Αὐτοκράτορι τὸν ναὸν ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἰσθμιωτᾶν καθεδρώσες;8 b) the rejection of public divinity like his decision against the construction of temples to his person by the people of Alexandria in AD 41: [...] But a priest for me and erection of temples I reject [...] and judging that temples and such things to the gods alone should be reserved and granted by every age,9 against the temple from the people of Thasos in AD 42: [...] but I decline the temple because I consider that to be the privilege of the gods alone.10 Nero also refused the divine attributes at the beginning of his reign in AD 55: [...] [ - - - - ] of the remaining two honors your temple I decline because to gods alone is this honor to be granted rightly by men, and the gold crown I released to be sent back to you, not wishing at the beginning of my principate to burden you;11 a dying Vespasian exclaimed against the divine condition: Vae, inquit, puto deus fio.12 Some members of the imperial family such as Germanicus also reject divine honors: your goodwill [...], I accept, but odious to me are your shouts [...]. They are fitting for the true savior only and the benefactor of the entire race of men, my father and his mother (who is) my grandmother.13

Many of the erected inscriptions were unauthorized records, hence the notion must be removed from common sense that the emperor or the imperial family had direct responsibility on those, because the imperatores only tried to put a limit over the private and collective initiatives, but not always achieving that goal.14 A considered number of individuals put inscriptions across the cities of the Roman World, and even when the emperors did not consent about the erection, there were limited for what they could do. Hadrian on his second visit to the Ephesians was acclaimed as Ζεὺς Ὀλύμπιος,15 knowing that he never accepted a direct link between himself and the gods (officially). Vespasian suffered the same destiny: the people from the cities openly created religious manifestations to the princeps, dedicating statue bases with the category of sacred on his honor.16 But the cities and the people who honor the emperors and the imperial house go further than that: Caligula was openly declared a big and eminent god by the Cyzicans: μέγιστος καὶ ἐπιφενέσθες θεὸς [[Γάϊος ]] Καίσαρ.17 Maybe this last inscription finds the correct connection with the words of Philo of Alexandria, who wrote that the emperor represented
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himself superior even to the roman gods. However, was it the mistake of Caligula or the provincials? Clearly the provinces fed the ego of the emperor.

It is important to recall that the formulas used on the imperial cults do not differ much from honors paid to the gods, and there were two models for this: one is without cult or divinization and the other attached the divine potentia of the princeps with the gods. J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz recognized the imperial cult as secular, but also considers that men believed in the survival of the empire “[…] from being sincerely and emotionally involved in it”. This emotion can only be understood if we realize that politics and religion were deeply connected in the ancient world. They cannot be understood as separate processes. To think that the imperial cults were only political reduces all the academic interpretations and even the religiosity of the ancient world. Satruninus was very clear in a discussion about the genius of the princeps and the imperial cults when he said: *Et nos religiosi sumus, et simplex est religio nostra, et iuramus per genium domini nostrir imperatoris, et pro salute eius supplicamus, quod et vos quoque facere debetis*. It is obvious that Saturninus was defending the religious expressions of the Romans, and the public rejection of the Christians was a problem for the continuity and safety of the empire. The ancients could not understand the politics separate from the religious manifestations. Even A. D. Nock could not reject the idea of religion-imperial cults (= emotions-actions) when he wrote: “There were no doubt moments of intense emotion”. A response letter from Caligula expresses the link between politics and religion, considering both as important and emphasizing the religious character of the Greek fashion in direct actions towards the emperor: “I have read the decree given to me […] and have noted that you have spared no extravagance in your zeal and piety towards me, in that you have each personally offered sacrifice for my welfare and have joined in a common festival and have decreed the greatest honors you could […].” This was a moment of intense emotion.

Undoubtedly, the founder of this tradition was Julius Caesar, and Augustus exploited the formulas. Just after the battle of Pharsalus in 48 BC, Caesar was called a living god by the Demetrians, just as Γάϊος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ αὐτοκράτωρ θεός, but some scholars believed that the inscriptions were set up after that date. He was also called savior and benefactor of the mankind by the Cart-heians also considered as godlike: Ὁ δήμος ὁ Καπθαιέων τὸν θεόν καὶ αὐτοκράτορα καὶ σωτήρα
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τῆς οἰκουμένης Γάιον Ἰούλιον Καίσαρα. This inscription and the plausible date of 48 BC are quite curious because at the same time there was another one from Ephesus and the community of Asia, calling him god manifested and savior of all mankind: Γάιον Ἰούλιον [...] Καίσαρα [...] τὸν ἀπὸ Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀφροδείτης θεὸν ἐπιφανῆ καὶ κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου σωτῆρα. Considering this epigraphical record, it provides information about Caesar’s benefactions because the usage of εὐεργέτα is so significant, not only for the conceptualization but also for the hermeneutical meaning of the dedicators and the readers. Pergamum expressed their gratitude upon Caesar recording Ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμεσε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ σωτῆρα καὶ εὐεργέτην Γάιον Ἰούλιον [...] Καίσαρα; Athens did the same and recognized the saving and benefactor character of Caesar: [Γ]άιον Ἰούλιον Καίσαρα [...] σωτῆρα καὶ εὐεργέτην. The Latin part of the empire was quite moderate, and for this key aspect there are two inscriptions: the first one was settled by legal permission (now is preserved on the Vatican Museums) and they did not call him a god in the Greek style, but divine: Divo Iulio iussu populi Romani statutum est lege Rufrena. The other inscription talked about the genius of Caesar that was accepted by the Senate and People of Rome and now is held among the Roman gods: Genio deivi Iuli parentis patriae quem senatus populusque Romanus in deorum numerum rettulit.

Julius Caesar’s son-in-law was also called god, but his divine relation was officially considered by his birthday and the beginning of good things for the world, just as the Priene inscription records: [...] ἤρξεν δὲ τῶι κόσμωι τῶι δι’ αὐτὸν εὐανεργίαν [...], which translates to: Augustus was called god, son of god and god of god. These three titles are very important for the statement of this research, because they enclose a significant part of the discussion about the divinity of the Roman emperors. There is no need to believe that these titles were only official because several inscriptions were found of spontaneous initiative. Someone can be divine yet not necessarily a god in the strict sense of the word, and this is a problem that still arises when the studies of ancient pagan religion try to explore and explain the subject, since the line between man and god on ancient epigraphs is blurry. A useful tool for this problem is the language-game, a world of constructing meanings. Clearer is the sentence of the academic J. Smith: “what we study when we study religion is one mode of constructing worlds of meaning, world within which men find themselves and in which they choose to dwell”. 
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In the imperial cults it must be considered that every action, whether it be a political or social expression, had an inherent religious transmission.42 W. S. Ferguson thought that the Hellenistic ruler cult was similar to the Roman ruler cult, and A. Momigliano observed an obvious line for this dilemma: from heroes-cult to Hellenistic rulers, then to the roman magistrates and finally to the roman emperor.43 S. Price has denied this theory, considering there was no continuation in the reification of ruler cults.44 The alleged relationship is known as ἰσόθεοι τιμαί. This concept can be translated as "honneurs pareils à ceux des dieux",45 "honours equivalent to those given to the gods",46 or "honours equal to those bestowed upon the gods".47 Despite of the subtle difference on the translations, there is no need to believe that the emperors were similar to the gods.48 D. Fishwick said that the monuments rendered to the rulers were not τεμένη - for the gods but σηκοί - for humans,49 and Cassius Dio conveys that in the year 29 BC when the people of Pergamum made the arrangement for a temple for Augustus and Rome, but Dio used the word τέμενος, considering the goddess and not Augustus as the principal deity.50 This example evidences the importance of words, the translations and the interpretations. Caesar’s death closes a way to understand the honors to politicians and generals, the so called ἰσόθεοι τιμαί.

Commonly the title θεός was conferred after the death of the individual51 but at some point, in history it was bestowed upon the living (see Julius Caesar). Records of this religious title could be tracked back to the decree in honor of Ptolemy V, an ever-living king and θεός ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ θεᾶς καθάπερ Ὁρος ὁ τῆς Ἴσιος καὶ Ὀσίριος υἱός.52 Official or unofficially, the emperors were addressed as living gods and as having the power of gods, perhaps for eulogy, recognition, religiosity or just politics like Gordianus - Θεὸς Γορδ.,53 and the title invictus that was understood as an unofficial title years ago, and now the interpretations of official contents in four documents might indicate that it indeed had official status.54 Aurelian was related with the Sol Invictus, keeping the religious sentiment of the period, and some inhabitants believed that, just as the papyrological record in P30 3.96.1.14 and the POxy 7.1036 who calls the emperor as ἀνίκητος. For this point, J. De Jong declared “it may be that the appearance of ἀνίκητος in imperial titulature in third-century papyrus texts does reflect the perception of Aurelian’s imperial representation by at least some
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inhabitants of Egypt. And similar it must be for Domitian with the plausible inscription of him, which calls the princeps as unconquered god - Αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα Σεβαστὸν Γερμανικὸν ἀνίκητον Θεόν.

For instances of eulogy and thanksgiving, there are inscriptions like that of the people of Larisa to Claudius for the buildings and attention of the princeps: θεὸν Κλαύδιον ὁ δήμος ὁ Δαρεισαίων. In 30-29 BC, four lamplighters of two temples in Egypt made an oath to Octavian, calling him Καίσαρος θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ. Here, a potential word was found: god of god. If a lamplighter’s oath is curious, then an oath made by some sheep farmers would be even more curious and significantly less common after reparations and re-erection of the surrounding walls of the temple: They have made an oath for the safety of the emperor, writing again the formula ὑπὲρ Καίσαρος Αὐτοκράτορος θεοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ. The people from Cyzicus without any complication or doubt recognized the emperor Caligula as the biggest and most eminent god: μέγιστος καὶ [ἐ]πιφενέστατος θεὸς [[Γάϊος] Καῖσαρ]. On the other hand, Claudius was celebrated as god for this birthday at the official festivals and banquets of Pergamum - Σεβαστοῦ Τιβέριου Καίσαρος θεοῦ γενεθλίῳ. The epigraphical records go even further and by the Coan decree. It was declared Augustus as a god and even superior to the Olympian Gods, but not by power, but by his benefactions to all men: Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ θεὸν νίκων, θεὸς [Σεβαστός, ταῖς εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ευεργεσίαις ὑπερτερετικός καὶ τοὺς Ὀλυμπίους θεούς]. A similarly enthusiastic epigraph comes from Mytilene, when the people of the polis decreed that Augustus had a heavenly reputation and possessed the power and authority of the gods, and the city would do anything to deify him. In Pergamum it was declared that Augustus was a god and son of god of every land and sea, and even the overseer ([Αὐτοκράτ]ορ[α Κ]αίσαρα [θ]εοῦ νίκον Σεβαστόν [ν] [πάσης] γῆς καὶ [θ][αλάσσης ἐποπτῆν]). After a century, the name of Augustus will be associated as a title, and sometime later from the time of Marcus Aurelius, someone named Tiberius Claudius Milatos as ὑμνῳδοῦ θεοῦ Αὐγούστου (‘singer of hymns of the God Augustus’) and her daughter was priestess of the Goddess Faustina - ἱερείας θεᾶς Φαυστείνης.

In official titulature, the ruling emperor was associated in some cases with the divinity of the dead emperors, as is the case of Tiberius and others. He was officially saluted as [Τ]ιβέριος Καίσαρ θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ νίκων θεοῦ Ιουλίου νιωνός Σεβαστός], linking his person with official gods Αὐ
gustus and Caesar; Titus and Domitian were saluted as sons of the god Vespasian (θεοῦ Οὐεσ-
πασιανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱῶ[ν]); Heliogabalus as div[i] Antonioni Magn[i fill(io), divi Se
ver(i) n[ep(ot-
ti)];66 Hadrian in the statue base erected by the linen workers as θ[εοῦ] Τραϊανοῦ Παρθικοῦ υἱ[ῶ
ν]69 or in the thanksgiving for distributed food among children: [Imp(eratori) Caesari] divi Trai
ani [Parthici] fil(io) [divi Nerv]ae [nepoti] [Traiano Hadriano [Aug(usto)[…] [pueri et puellae [alim-
entariae];67 Marcus Aurelius was saluted in Samos and linked as heir and grandson of gods: αὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρος Μᾶρκον Αὐρήλιον Ἀντωνεῖον Σεβαστόν, θεοῦ Ἁδριανοῦ υἱωνόν, 有用的神, θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ ἕκγο
νος, θεοῦ Νέρουα ἀπόγονον;71 Antoninus Pius is even remembered in a judicial verdict of the titles and divinity of his predecessors: θ[εοῦ] Αὐτοκράτωρ Σεβαστὸς Καίσαρ, θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἔκγο
νος θεοῦ Ἁδριανοῦ υἱωνός, θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ ἔκγονος, θεοῦ Νέρουα ἀπόγονον;71 Caligula, despite knowing
that Tiberius was not considered a god by the Roman estate, tried to associate his principate with
another imperial divinity, and for this, he found the utilization of the formula Αὐτοκράτωρ Σε-
βαστὸς Καίσαρ, θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἔκγονος, Τιβερίου Καίσαρος υἱωνός as the solution for the correct
transmission of power.73

The title of θεός was not the only one bestowed upon the emperors, and there are two peculiar
variations of this divine word in the imperial cults. They were also addressed as θειόστατος. Some
emperors were known for their military capability, such as Septimius Severus who was addressed
by a scribe as most divine: θειόστατος Καίσαρ Λουκίου Σεπτιμίου Σεουήρου,74 and with Caracalla who were called in a formal petition as τοῖς μεγίστοις καὶ θειόστατοι κυρίοις ἡμῶν Σεουήρῳ καὶ Ἀντωνίνῳ. 75 In the third century, several emperors were acclaimed
with titles such as Maximinus and Maximus as ὁ μέγιστος καὶ θειόστατος.76 In Moesia Inferior,
Gordianus was saluted with the same formula77 and even as a god.78 Phillipus the Senior was ac-
claimed as ὁ θειόστατος Σεβ.,79 ὁ μέγιστος καὶ θειόστατος,80 ὁ θειόστατος Αὐτ. Κάισ. Μ. Ἰουλ. Φιλ.,81 and using the name of Augustus as a title with the formula of the most divine: θειόστατος
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The same official formula was repeated with Decius in Achaea and Thrace. The same official formula was repeated with Decius in Achaea and Thrace. In Achaea, Gallus was known as the lord of us, the biggest and most divine, embodying the word κύριος as a royal title adding now a divine aura: ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ μέγιστος καὶ θεόστατος Αὐτ. Καῖσ. Γαλ. Valerian, Gallienus and the young Valerian were acclaimed in the form of most divine, a word given to them to state their beyond human status: τοῖς θεοτάτοις Αὐτοκράτορι Π(οπλίοις) Λικιννίοις Οὐαλεριανῷ καὶ Γαλληνῷ καὶ Οὐαλεριανῷ. The other variation is the title θεοφιλέστατος which singularity is important, because it can be translated as ‘dearest to the gods’ and ‘most god-loving’. It is common to find this title after the collapse of the Severan dynasty and it seems that the concept tried to calm the stormy years of anarchy. Gaius Julius Vero, better known as Maximus (AD 235-238), was called on Latin inscription as nobilissimus Caesar, but in the Greek inscriptions is called θεοφιλέστατος Καῖσαρ, Hostilianus was addressed as ὁ θεοφιλέστατος Γ. Οὐαλ. Ὅστ. In the reconstruction of the Nicaea Council, it is said that Constantine was the most God-loving emperor - Θεοφιλεστάτου Βασιλέως.

The first princeps open a new form of official and unofficial dedications. Augustus was celebrated in 29 BC by the Senate and the People of Rome as a savior and protector: Imperator Caesari divi [...] re publica conservata. Twenty years after that acclamation, Augustus was given a supplication in the Fasti Cumae: Imperio Caesaris Augusti custodis. Certainly, these two inscriptions do not expose any divine attribute in the Latin West, but in the Greek East the story was quite different. The word for this difference is σωτήρ. The soteria is understood as a power of safety, protection and many others. In the Greek world, it was understood as a language to express gratitude to the gods or individuals with divine potential “tying the dedicator to the divine in a personal relationship”. The application of this word is not just from the Principate alone. Some utilization of this concept can be established even before the Principate (like when Antiochos - the founder of the Seleucid dynasty - died, it was obviously deified, and also honored as savior: Ἀντίοχος Ἀπόλλων Σωτήρος). It seems like some poleis repeated the same formula when speaking of Julius Caesar since he was also called soter in his lifetime, but not by any official dedications approved by the imperator; for example: in Mytilene IGR 4.57, in Megara IG 7.62, in Athens IG 22.1222 and ὁ δῆμος [Γ]αίου ᾿Ιούλιου Καίσαρα ἀρχιερεᾶ καὶ δικτά[τορα τόν ἐ]αυτοῦ σωτήρα καὶ εὐεργέτην. However, this presents a predicament, given that not only emperors were acclaimed as soter. For example, two politicians were saluted as savors: Publius Servilius Isauricus
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in ca 47 BC and Gaius Julius Xenophon in the first century AD.93 So the question is: Were Gaius Julius Xenon and Publius Servilius Isauricus divine ones? Not really. And this is because of the nature of the two inscriptions as political dedications. So, A. Harnack was wrong on his interpretation that “a Saviour (σωτήρ) could only be represented somehow as a Divine being” and I. Ezeani was right when he considered the particularity of soter as a sign of gratitude and used as an official form of recognition.94

Hadrian was acclaimed as soter and also as ktistes (a founder), which can be supported by a list of thirty-three inscriptions on altars evidencing this relation between the communities and the emperor.95 Even through the historical process known as anarchy, the titulature kept some formulas to the princeps. Gordianus was acclaimed in Egypt as κτίστης καὶ σωτήρ τῆς πόλεως.96 Claudius is one of the best examples for this. The attention of the emperor with the empire is even recorded by his own words in the imperial edict of Tegea, trying to relieve of economic problems of not only Italy, but of the provinces as well: cum et colonias et municipia non solum Italicæ verum etiam provinciarum item, civitatem cuiusque provinciae lebare oneribus vehiculorum praebendorum saepè temptatissem et cum satis multa remedia invenisse mihi viderer potuit tamen nequitiae hominum non satis per ea occurrit.97 In Sidyma (Lycia), Quintus Veranius, legatus propretorian of Claudius, erected an inscription to the Θεοῖς σωτῆρσι Σεβαστοῖς,98 bringing special attention to the Gods Augusti; in Athens Claudius was addressed as savior of the world - σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου.99

If soter means safety, it is quite obvious to relate it with another title: ἐπιφανέστατος. The presence of the emperor across the empire was not physical at all, but through images, temples, altars, dedications, and any form of cultic devotion. That is why it is not strange to find epigraphical records with this usage: Caligula was addressed as the biggest and the most manifested of the gods by a decree from Cyzicus - μεγίστῳ καὶ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ Θεῷ Γαίῳ Καίσαρι.100 Trajan, keeping the tradition, was acclaimed as savior and benefactor of the world - [Νέρου]αν Τραϊανον Καίσαρα Γερμάνικον Σέβαστον τὸν εὐεργέταν καὶ σαώτηρα τῶν οἰκημένων μὲ τῆς ἁρμονίας.101

Some emperors were associated with specific gods: Tiberius was acclaimed as Τιβερίωι Καίσαρι Σεβαστοῦ ψεὶ Σεβαστῳ Δι[κ]απτουρίῳ Αλεξανδροῦ, with the healing function just as M. de Rossi recalled;102 Claudius was assimilated with Poseidon and Asclepios in a Coan round altar as Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Ποσιδώνος Ασφαλείου;103 Augustus was recognized as Apollo
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Eleutheros in Alabanda, Zeus Boulaios, as Zeuς Ἐλευθέριος and in Mytilene too, and Zeus Caesar Olympios, Hadrian was recognized as Ζεὺς Ἐλευθέριος and in his second visit to Ephesus as Zeuς Ὀλύμπιος; Nero by official decree from Acraephia was potentially addressed as lord of the entire world and new Helios κόσμου κύριος Νέρων [...] νέος Ἥλιος.

To conclude, a change has to be made. There is information after the battle of the Milvian Bridge in AD 312 which shows that in the city of Cirta in Africa, the priesthood for the gens of Flavia was settled as an attempt to again establish a link the emperor and his family with the tradition of the imperial cults, but Constantine took away all his portraiture from the temples. When Constantine died, he was divinized. The Senate of Rome begged for the body but it was all in vain. Now, a new city has the privilege: Constantinople, and with this city comes a new form of funeral. No more apotheosis, the norm now is a Christian burial, and in a Christian church.

III. Final Considerations

Artemidorus said that the ruler was not a god; the ruler had the power of a god - τὸ κρατοῦν γὰρ δύναμιν ἔχει θεοῦ. Th. Witulski avoids some interpretations from the ancient world, and he believed that in the Greek context, the subjects worshipped the sovereigns who ruled over them as gods. Elias Bickerman clearly manifested on a conference that “we should not confuse the divinity and the association with the divine. The monarch by the grace of God, by definition is no deity himself.”

Even if the inscription considers the emperor and the imperial as gods, the rulers were not gods in the very sense of the word. The epigraphical records must be seen under a hermeneutical analysis and not literally. Obviously, the rulers and their families were considered special for their position, but to speak openly that they were gods is a misinterpretation. Just as S. Price said: the emperors were something else, and the function of the gods must be understood as power and not as a personification.
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When Augustus died, the imperial cults were widely spread all over the Mediterranean. Considering that, it is important to recall how the divine and divinizing words were produced for the princeps and the imperial family, and, if these words can be seen as a sincere expression of divinity (even in life) or just as a form of adulation. Through the interpretation of a few selected Greek and Latin inscriptions, the following study seeks to establish various contrasting elements and to put forward new suggestions to the concept of imperial cults, since this religious manifestation was not the only form of cult with continuations and additions. In fact, evidence has shown a number of differences when compared to other ruler-cult forms. The importance of words is unique: they are able to literally and figuratively show the expression of a person or several individuals. It is important to note that inscriptions can exaggerate the individuals’ rhetoric and that “the language-game” cannot be forgotten, as L. Wittgenstein pointed out.

Furthermore, the geographical locations and the cultural manifestations are important to consider as the imperial cult words may vary because of it. By using the religious and political epigraphical monuments and the literature of the period, some ideas can be tracked about the titulature of the imperial cult and the problems that still arise.

Keywords: Imperial Cults, Divinity of Roman Emperors, Greek Inscriptions, Latin Inscriptions.