UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

https://helda.helsinki.fi

Naming Gods : An Onomastic Study of Divine Epithets Derived from Roman Anthroponyms

Kajava, Mika

2022

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/352341

Kajava, M 2022, Naming Gods : An Onomastic Study of Divine Epithets Derived from Roman Anthroponyms. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, vol. 144, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki.

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository. https://helda.helsinki.fi
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.
Please cite the original version.

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
144 2022

Naming Gods

An Onomastic Study of Divine Epithets Derived from Roman Anthroponyms

Mika Kajava

Societas Scientiarum Fennica
The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

NAMING GODS

An Onomastic Study of Divine Epithets Derived from Roman Anthroponyms

Societas Scientiarum Fennica

The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

Address:
Pohjoinen Makasiinikatu 7 A 6, FI – 00130 Helsinki
In Swedish:
Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten, Norra Magasinsgatan 7 A 6, FI – 00130 Helsingfors
In Finnish:
Suomen Tiedeseura, Pohjoinen Makasiinikatu 7 A 6, FI – 00130 Helsinki

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum

The series, founded in 1923, publishes monographs or other studies on antiquity and its tradition.

Editor:
Prof. Mika Kajava
Address: Department of Languages, P. O. Box 24, FI – 00014 University of Helsinki.

Requests for Exchange:
Exchange Centre for Scientific Literature, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki, or at the Secretary of the Society.

Distribution and Sale:
Tiedekirja, Snellmaninkatu 13, FI – 00170 Helsinki; tiedekirja@tsv.fi, www.tsv.fi.

Other series published by the Society:
Commentationes Physico-Mathematicae
Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium
Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk
The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828-1918
Årsbok – Vuosikirja (Yearbook), serie A sarja
Sphinx (Årsbok – Vuosikirja, serie B sarja)

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
144 2022

NAMING GODS

An Onomastic Study of Divine Epithets Derived from Roman Anthroponyms

Mika Kajava

Societas Scientiarum Fennica

The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
is part of the publishing cooperation between
the Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters and
the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters

This book has received a subsidy granted by the Ministry of Education and Culture
distributed by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies

ISSN 0069-6587 (print)
ISSN 2736-9374 (online)
ISBN 978-951-653-490-2 (print)
ISBN 978-951-653-491-9 (online)
DOI https://doi.org/10.54572/ssc.235

Layout by Vesa Vahtikari

Copyright © 2022 by
Societas Scientiarum Fennica

Printed by Grano Oy, Vaasa 2022

Contents

Preface 1

1. Introduction 3
   1.1. Subject, material and sources, methodology 3
   1.2. Epithet types, dedicatory contexts, literary vs. epigraphic sources 7

2. Theonym + nomen 17
   2.1. Rome 19
   2.2. Italy 23
   2.3. Africa 25
   2.4. Germania Inferior 28

3. Theonym + nomen-*ianus*/-*a* 31
   3.1. Rome 33
   3.2. Italy 45
   3.3. Africa 61

4. Theonym + nomen-*ian-ensis* 65
   4.1. Rome 65
   4.2. Italy 67

5. Theonym + cognomen (or signum)-*ianus*/-*a* (or -*anus*) 71
   5.1. Rome 71
   5.2. Italy 78
   5.3. Africa 81

6. Theonym + cognomen-*illa* 83
   6.1. Rome 83
   6.2. Germania Superior 85

7. Theonym + cognomen-*ius*/-*ia* 87
   7.1. Rome 87

8. Theonym + nomen/cognomen in the genitive — Adjective ~ genitive 91

9. Derivation ~ association 97

10. Conclusions 103

Bibliography 109

Indices 137

Preface

This work originated from the end of autumn 2020 when I was invited to come and speak on the same topic at a Workshop entitled "My Name is Your Name: Anthroponyms as Divine Attributes in the Greco-Roman World", which was supposed to be organized in Madrid at the beginning of June in 2021. The colloquium did take place, although due to external reasons it was turned into a remote meeting.

I was glad to participate because the general subject, epithets of gods derived from human names, seemed not only interesting but also quite promising for future research. In addition, the topic was already familiar to me because during the previous years I had made some notes regarding the relevant material, especially in the context of my research on ancient sacred dedications.

Originally, this contribution was meant to be a concise survey article, but since it became clear at an early stage that a single paper dealing with the epithets would become far too extensive and because, on the other hand, a book format would allow for a more thorough treatment, it appeared that the subject would be best researched and presented in the form of a monograph.

The same topic was partly covered in the Workshop by Piergiuseppe Di Michele (Rome). However, as his material was limited to Rome and Italy, and to avoid overlaps, it was agreed that he would draw up a catalogue of the material from these areas, while I would prepare a brief summary discussion of the entire evidence. Both these contributions are intended to appear later in the colloquium proceedings by the Princeton University Press.

My thanks are due to the participants of the Workshop for their comments. For further remarks and observations, or various other help, I am grateful to Laurent Bricault, Christer Bruun, Maria Letizia Caldelli, Piergiuseppe Di Michele, Ivan Di Stefano Manzella, Valentino Gasparini, Cesare Letta, Alberto Manco, Tuomo Nuorluoto, Gianfranco Paci, Gil Renberg, Olli Salomies, John Scheid, Heikki Solin, Eva Margareta Steinby and Cristiana Zaccagnino.

Helsinki, November 2022

1. Introduction

1.1. Subject, material and sources, methodology

The present study intends to be an onomastic and typological survey of the divine denominations composed of a theonym and an epithet that were derived, usually with the suffix *-ianus*, from a Roman anthroponym, either a nomen gentilicium or an individual cognomen (e.g., *Apollo Sos-ianus* in Rome, *Silvanus Lus-ianus* in Beneventum, or *Fortuna Taur-ian-ensis* and *Hercules Hermogen-ianus* in Ostia). The phenomenon was recognized in scholarship long ago but has not been studied systematically so far.[1]

Sometimes, rarely, the adjectival epithets of deities were derived from the names of other deities, but these cases usually represent a different onomastic category in terms of the typology of the suffixes.[2] Since the approach is mainly typological, the purpose of the study being to identify onomastic patterns in the naming of gods, there are relatively few references to strictly linguistic matters or etymologies, the latter being a field in which I would not be able to offer much anyway. However, when necessary, I will also refer to this sort of evidence as well as anything that helps understand the naming of gods through human names. As far as possible, I always try to contextualize the occurrences of the divine epithets.

Unsurprisingly, the relevant epithets are mainly found in sacred dedications, and therefore the observations made are based on preponderantly epigraphic material. However, as will be seen, just as the interpretation of the epithets occurring in the literary sources may present various problems, those found in inscriptions need to be viewed with due caution. Sometimes we may even be dealing with fictitious inventions.[3]

---

[1] E.g., Borghesi 1872, 251 (in a letter of 1850, cf. *BullInstArch* 1850, 141); Becker 1856, 144 n. 56; Preller 1858, 349; Marquardt 1878, 126 n. 1; R. Peter, in: Roscher 1884–1890, 2957; De Marchi 1896, 265; Carter 1898, 35; Schulze 1904, 123; Wissowa 1912[2], 214; Reid 1916, 183; Nock 1925, 91; Autran 1926, 97 n. 5; Latte 1960, 333–34; Fishwick 1978, 377; Fears 1981, 886; Pollini 1990, 355; Fishwick 1991, 447; Versnel 2011, 137. See also the Preface above for the recent work of Piergiuseppe Di Michele (Rome) on the evidence from Rome and Italy in the proceedings of the 2021 Madrid Workshop and my introductory observations in the same volume.

[2] *Apollinaris*, *Cereria*, *Cypria*, *Isiaca*, *Martialis*, etc. See below p. 52 nn. 83–84.

[3] Cf. already Orelli 1828, 270, No. 1255: "Cuius generis tamen pleraque fecundo Ligorii ingenio debentur", with reference to cases such as "Ceres Orciliana", "Diana Rhesiana", "Hercules Paternianus", "Iuno Rubria" and "Pluto Nervianus" (similar cases also in Fabretti 1683, 247–48).

In general, it should be noted that when occurring in different types of sources, the epithets or similar designations of gods that were derived from anthroponyms can have quite different meanings. On the one hand, there are divine titles that had a cultic significance insofar as they are found in dedications to gods or appear in other religious contexts, while others are better considered as literary-antiquarian mentions of, for example, builders of temples or dedicators of statues. Sometimes, a monument given to a deity may have been recorded by an epithet coined from an artist's name (e.g., *Isis Athenodoria*, if this form is the correct one; see pp. 87–88).

Another point to consider is that gods were sometimes characterized by descriptive adjectives that were also commonly used by humans as personal names (*Aesculapius Repentinus*, *Hercules Salutaris*, *Venus Felix/Placida*, etc.[4]). However, these are names that the gods share independently with humans, and thus they are not epithets derived from anthroponyms and do not belong here. The same concerns the divine epithets coinciding with appellatives that were used as personal names (e.g., *Hercules/Iuppiter Victor* ~ PN *Victor*).[5] If the African Aesculapius was named after a man with the name *Repentinus*, his epithet would have been *Repentinianus*, just as a basilica built by a Repentinus would have been called either *basilica Repentiniana* or *basilica Repentini*, but in no case would it have become "*basilica Repentina*".

A further non-related category is the cases where the deceased, mostly a female, is, in some sense and on some level, commemorated and honoured along with a deity (like Bona Dea, Diana, Fortuna, Iuno, Venus), this phenomenon often being labelled "*consecratio in formam deorum*" after a Roman second-century AD inscription commemorating a woman called Claudia Semne, in

---

Note, however, that Orelli's No. 1255 is authentic (*CIL* VI 424, a dedication to *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Purpurio*, discussed below in Ch. 9, No. **98**).

[4] *Deus Aesculapius Repentinus*: *AE* 2010, 1804 (Belalis Maior, Africa Proconsularis; 2nd/early 3rd cent. AD). The adjective probably describes the rapidity of the god's actions and appearances (e.g., during incubation or in a dream, cf. Benseddik 2001, 3714; Hangartner 2018, 120. According to van der Ploeg [2018, 234], *Repentinus* could have been "the name of a deity, making this a case of *interpretatio romana* or syncretism", which though not impossible is not very likely. Instead, Gasparini, forthcoming, thinks that the epithet goes back to a man called *Repentinus* whose name was "honoured by being lent to the god"). *Venus Placida*: *CIL* VI 783 (= *ILS* 3167; lost). *Venus Felix* is more common, as is *Hercules Salutaris* (this epithet was also borne by Iuppiter). Similarly, *Zeus Philios* ~ PN *Philios*, *Aphrodite Glykeia* ~ PN *Glykeia*, etc.

[5] Sometimes, interestingly, a personal cognomen seems to have been obtained from a divine epithet, as in the case of the centurion called *Gradivus* (*CIL* VI 9, cf. p. 4090; *CIL* VI 2506; 2nd cent. AD) whose cognomen suggests *Mars Gradivus*, this term being known only as an epithet of Mars; cf. Kajanto 1965, 57.

which the expression *simulacra…in formam deorum* is found (*CIL* VI 15593 = *ILS* 8063c). In such cases, however, we are not dealing with deities bearing anthroponymic epithets, but with a goddess and a mortal woman juxtaposed, or somehow associated, with each other.[6]

Among all Latin dedications, the type "*Silvanus Lusianus*" was, of course, by no means the prevailing one. The most common method was always to dedicate to deities without giving them epithets derived from human personal names. However, despite their quantitative marginality, anthroponymic epithets are an interesting phenomenon not only linguistically but also because such names can, at least, illuminate the ancient people's perception and experience of the deities they worshipped. Like all inscribed epithets given to gods, those derived from human names are likely to tell what was relevant for the dedicator.

I will start with a brief overview of the epithet types with an eye to some linguistic and onomastic aspects of the theonyms discussed, accompanied by remarks on the probable contexts from which most of these denominations derived. The relevant evidence (c. 100 cases) is organized for convenience in a typological list according to the morphology and structure of the epithets (Chs. 2–7), paying particular attention to the types of the personal names from which they were derived as well as the typology of the suffixes used in each case.[7] The instances are strongly concentrated in Rome or elsewhere in central Italy, but in

---

[6] In general, see Wrede 1981, 187–92; Cesari 1998; Laubry 2015. Cf. the well-known inscription *CIL* XIV 279 (= *ILS* 5449) from Gabii, recording a dedication by A. Plutius Epaphroditus to Venus Felix Gabina, with whom his deceased daughter, Plutia Vera, is very closely associated: *Veneri Felici Verae Gabinae*, etc. In inscriptions, the name of both the goddess and the deceased woman is often in the dative, the latter being also sometimes preceded by *memoriae* / *in memoriam* / *in honorem et memoriam*, e.g., *CIL* VI 15594 (= *ILS* 8063b): *Fortunae, / Spei, Veneri / et / memoriae / Claud(iae) Semnes / sacrum* (in this specific case, as John Scheid suggests to me, the "*Memoria Claudiae Semnes*" could perhaps be read as corresponding to the woman's personal Juno: in the same way, the emperor Nero gives the Juno of his mother the name of Concordia, cf. *CFA* No. 27, 16 [AD 58]: *Concordiae ipsius vaccam*; 31: *Concordiae honoris Agrippinae Aug.*). Occasionally, instead of mentioning a specific goddess, the title *dea* is used (Wrede 1981, 117, and cf. below No. **93** for *Livilla dea*, and *ibid.* n. 8 for the *Dea Domina Rufia [M]aterna* of *CIL* XIII 8706). However, it should be noted that a funerary context may not always be confirmed for inscriptions of this type (cf. M. Kajava: in Solin – Kajava 1992, 345).

[7] I have not distinguished between the onomastic suffixes *-ianus* and *-anus*. The suffix variant *-ianus*, originating from *-anus*, emerged relatively early through (false) analogy with cognomina derived from nomina in *-ius* (cf. Kajanto 1965, 107; Leumann 1977, 325). The reason for this would have been a desire to make the names and words appear more like the dominant series of derivatives in *-i-anus*. In our material, the only cognomen coined with *-anus* is *Sullanus* (see No. **76**: *Hercules Sullanus* and No. **83**: *Victoria Sullana*). Of course, **Sullianus* would not have been an option here (cf. the nomen *Sullius* with the cognomen *Sullinus*).

addition there are a few cases from the African provinces (Sections 2.3, 3.3, 5.3), some of which are dubious, and two very uncertain ones from the Celto-Germanic regions (Sections 2.4, 6.2). Some of the epicleseis discussed are of Greek origin, but they represent Roman onomastic culture (e.g., *Fortuna Zmaragdiana*, *Hercules Invictus Esychianus*, *Victoria Glaucopiana*, etc.). Non-Roman indigenous names found in the provinces have not been considered (unless they have sometimes been taken as Roman names, cf. Nos. **10** and **93**), nor have epithets derived from the names of wider human groups, which are often connected with toponyms, such as urban populations, tribes, or peoples.

As will be seen, several of the epithets are uncertain for various reasons, but I have listed all the instances I found where the title in question is generally, or sometimes more rarely, considered an epithet of a god.[8] The reason for noting even the dubious cases is that the interpretation of many of them is so well established that the reader may be likely to look for them in the Catalogue.

Although the Catalogue does not claim to be complete, it hopefully affords an account that allows drawing some reliable conclusions. The entries contain both general comments on the individual patterns and more detailed discussions of the epithets themselves while also pointing out that the interpretation of many of them is debatable. Several corrections, new readings, and hypotheses, including some bold ones, are proposed.

Sometimes, the divine adjectival epithet either does not seem to be derived from a human name at all, or its derivation remains uncertain for various reasons, or its entire existence is hypothetical. In other cases, the form, type or meaning of the epithet needs revision or reconsideration. The following sigla have been used of the epithets:

(††) epithet non-existent
(††?) existence of epithet doubtful, uncertain, or hypothetical
(†) epithet not derived from anthroponym
(†?) epithet's derivation from anthroponym doubtful or uncertain

---

[8] Instead, early misinterpretations that never became established were omitted (such as the "*Diana Inventiana*" of *CIL* VI 14005, to be read *D. M.* / *Caesiae Daf*ħ*ni/dianae Inventianae*, etc., but I note that the misreading still [November 2022] figures at *EDR*-161434). Some desperately uncertain cases were simply ignored: *CIL* VI 825 (= 30836 = Santolini Giordani 1989, 161, No. 129): *QVIE IANAE / B(?) D* (cf. Henzen, *CIL*, comm., "Fortasse intellegendum *B(onae) d(eae) Quietanae*, ut cognomen trahatur a domo Quieti cuiusdam"). Villaret (2019, 76 n. 147) mentions a "*Diana Gratidiana*", but although the epithet would be perfectly plausible (< nomen *Gratidius*), I cannot find a deity so named anywhere in the ancient sources; perhaps the goddess meant is *Diana Cariciana* (No. **66**), to whom the author refers on p. 45 n. 169?

(*) epithet derived from anthroponym, but to be corrected, read, or, possibly, explained in a new way

For the sake of clarity, the material is presented in the Catalogue geographically (Rome, Italy, Africa, etc.) under individual typologies so that the deities are in alphabetical order according to both their names and the relevant epithets (that is why, for example, *Hercules Victor Certencinus* [†?] is listed by the elements *Hercules* and *Certencinus*. Note also that *dea Satriana* and *(deus) Visidianus* are alphabetized according to the respective onomastic items). To facilitate cross- and other references, all entries in the Catalogue are also numbered consecutively.

1.2. Epithet types, dedicatory contexts, literary vs. epigraphic sources

While the existence of theophoric names in the Greek world is widely attested, citizens in mainland Greece and the islands do not seem to have used divine names unadjusted before the Roman Imperial period,[9] and there are only a handful of instances of a god being accompanied by an adjectival form of a human's name.[10] The general tendency seems to have been not to superimpose the designations of human beings and those of divine entities in the same formal structure. Thus, traditionally, it would have been atypical for a theonym to coincide linguistically and structurally with an anthroponym (cf., however, DN *Hera-kles* ~ PN *Dio-kles, Peri-kles,* etc., perhaps not surprisingly, as Heracles was originally a hero. In any case, *Herakles* is very rarely found as a personal name before the Principate[11]).

In the Roman world, on the other hand, in addition to theonyms as such being commonly found as personal names,[12] the onomastic system was more complex. Regarding the present topic, i.e., divine epithets derived from anthroponyms, the linguistic map of Italy provides various evidence for the use of

---

[9] For some possible, though oddly isolated, late Hellenistic (?) attestations of *Dionysos* as a personal name, see Parker 2019, 17 n. 62.

[10] Parker 2017, 4, 201–204 (App. G: juxtaposition of divine and human names), e.g., *Herakles Diamedonteios* whose private cult on Kos was founded by one Diamedon (c. 200 BC). Concerning the theonyms *Herakles Mantiklos* (Paus. 4,23,10) and *Asklepios Demainetos* (Paus. 6,21,4), rather than the personal name of a human cult founder as claimed by Pausanias (cf. also Marcos Macedo 2017, 570), the second element in each case is likely to be an ordinary epithet of unexplained origin (Parker 2017, 10 n. 38).

[11] See Poccetti 2009, 222–23.

[12] For the Latin theophoric cognomina, see Kajanto 1965, 211–17.

structurally identical double names for both divine entities and mortals. Theonyms composed of a name and a determiner (name + adjective / name + genitive) are especially often formally comparable to binomial anthroponymic formulas (like praenomen + nomen / name + patronymic). Both these syntagmatic types were attested since early times in Latin and the Italic languages as well as Etruscan.[13] As for the Latin-speaking context in the longer term, the homologies, structural or functional, or both, between divine designations and human personal names do not just concern the types discussed in this study, i.e., those in which the anthroponymic epithet functions as an adjectival determiner of the theonym (*Diana Planciana*, *Hercules Nerianus*; cf. *Paulla Cornelia*, *Publius Cornelius*). Also comparable to a human's name is a theonym like *Numisius Martius* (*CIL* I^2 32–33 [Rome], cf. I^2 2435–36 [ager Faliscus], with Bakkum 2009, II, Nos. 377, 421), where the relationship between god and man works in the reverse order, that is, the adjectival form *Martius* (< Mars) determines the name *Numisius* (which coincides with the nomen). The fact that *Martius* is morphologically formed like a gentile name makes the theonym *Numisius Martius* structurally analogous to human names like *Trebis Arronties* (*Imag. It.* 1431–32: Potentia 44) or *Publius Cornelius*. In fact, the formal similarity between double theonyms and double anthroponyms could make it difficult to distinguish the name of a divine entity (like *Numisius Martius*, or *Mamurius Veturius*) from a human personal name, unless extralinguistic information is available.

Ancient evidence suggests that the divine epithets we are dealing with were frequently associated with sacred areas and their architecture (temples, altars, statues, dedications, etc.). Therefore, we must begin by briefly paying attention to the sacred buildings on the one hand, and various other buildings and monuments on the other, as the different ways these objects were named are relevant to our subject.

In the Roman world, buildings could be named after their builders using either the constructor's or sponsor's plain nomen (or praenomen) as an adjective, or the genitive of that name or of the cognomen (*via Appia* / *Flaminia*, *pons Aemilius* — *porticus Octaviae*, *theatrum Balbi*).[14] Suffixed forms derived from

[13] Poccetti 2009 is seminal for this discussion.

[14] A quite specific case is that of the *arae Luciae* at Alba Fucens (*collegium ararum Luciarum*) that may have been so named after the adjectivally used praenomen of Lucius Caesar after his death in AD 2 (*CIL* IX 7994 = *AE* 2012, 430: *Pyrallidi M. / Ocrati Fronto/nis anc(illae) colle/gium ararum / Luciarum / p(osuit)*; latter half of the 1st to early 2nd cent. AD; see, in detail, Letta 2012; Eckhardt 2021, 75).

both nomina and cognomina were also widely used (*horrea Ummidiana* and *horti Torquatiani* in Rome, *basilica Sulpiciana* in Caere, *porticus Placidiana* in Portus, etc.). Many buildings were known by more than one name, either simply because of variation or depending on the type of source and its date (e.g., *horti Silii/Siliani*, *theatrum Pompeii/Pompeianum, theatrum Marcelli/Marcellianum* [see below No. **13**, n. 16]). As for the chronology, since the nomen, not its derivative, originally served as an adjective, the type "*via Flaminia*" is relatively earlier than the names formed with suffixes. It was only towards the later Republic, as a result of the nomen gradually becoming conceptualized as a noun and no longer as an adjective, that adjectival forms in *-ianus* began to emerge. This does not, of course, mean that the old style disappeared, for in the Principate numerous places and buildings were still referred to with names using the adjectival form of the nomen gentilicium.[15]

The naming procedure was somewhat different in the case of sanctuaries that had been built or restored by someone, especially because the type "theonym + nomen" (like the undocumented "*Apollo Sosius*") was not a feasible option. It is true that this could have implied a family cult with general reference to the worship of a deity within the *gens*. However, in the case of a building sacred to Apollo, it would have been very odd to call it "*Apollo Sosius*", as this denomination would not refer unambiguously to a specific sacred area, but generally to the god being in some relationship with the Sosian family, the nature of this relationship, however, remaining opaque without further information. It is unlikely to be a coincidence that, as we will see, compared to "theonym + (cog)nomen-*ianus*", evidence for the type "theonym + nomen-adj." is contradictory and extremely limited, perhaps even non-existent.

From the first century BC, temples were often referred to with a double name composed of a theonym and an epithet derived from the founder's or builder's nomen with the suffix *-ianus/a* (*Apollo Sosianus*, *Diana Cornificiana*, etc.), though the genitive was also possible, especially in the literary sources. The epithet in *-ianus* would have preserved the *nominis aeterna memoria*,[16] but it must have often served as a topographic modifier as well. Naturally, one could make a dedication to a deity like *Diana Cornificiana*, in which case the dedication would be strictly connected with the area sacred to this goddess. That the theonym *Diana Cornificiana* indicates the sanctuary of Diana on the Aventine named after L. Cornificius (cos. 35 BC), its restorer, is also shown by the title of *aeditus*

[15] Salomies 1998, 205–207.

[16] Cf. Wiseman 1987, 396.

Dianae Cornif(icianae) (*CIL* VI 4305; see No. **12**). Similarly, the temple of Apollo Medicus began to be known as *Apollo Sosianus* following its reconstruction by C. Sosius (cos. 32 BC) in the early Augustan age (see No. **11**).

These are typical cases of metonymy accompanied by a transfer of the adjective of belonging from the generic name (*aedes*, etc.) to the deity: *aedes Apollinis Sosiana* > *Apollo Sosianus*.[17] Once this expression is a unit, it can either be accompanied by the generic name or can function without it. Thus, Plin. *nat*. 36,28 has *in templo Apollinis Sosiani*, while the ancient cedar-wood Apollo brought by C. Sosius from Seleucia to Rome, the "*signum Apollinis Sosianum*", appears as *cedrinus Apollo Sosianus* in *nat*. 13,53. Instead of advancing by steps, the metonymic process would have resulted in the style *Apollo Sosianus* at once with the result that the temple could have been named this way right after its restoration was completed.

Another question is how commonly such a designation came to be attached to the building. Be that as it may, even though *Apollo Sosianus* is known only from the literary sources, it would not be at all surprising if one day this designation is also found in an inscription; comparable evidence is provided by the epigraphically attested goddesses *Diana Planciana* and *Diana Cornificiana*, both of whom originate from roughly the same period and from a similar dedicatory culture.

Just as the Roman *Apollo Sosianus* denotes a temple, my strong impression is that the type "*Silvanus Lusianus*", which represents the most common dedicatory pattern in our material by far, is frequently connected with a physical setting. In fact, it is highly probable that a dedication to a protecting god like *Silvanus Lusianus* was usually related to a sacred area situated on the lands of the *gens Lusia*, or, in any case, a representative of the family had sponsored the cult materially by erecting an aedicula, altar, or a similar monument. On the other hand, as the type "theonym + nomen-*ianus*" was clearly the standard one in the Latin sources,[18] it was probably also employed to refer to the relationship between a deity and a *gens* in a more generic way. Over time, this practice presumably became more diffused, so that the divine epithet could be perceived as denoting a family and its members without an association with a specific shrine, and correspondingly the cognomen-derived epithets in *-ianus*, which became more common from the

[17] For this and similar syntagms, see Spevak 2016.

[18] Possibly also found in Oscan documents, cf. dat. *mamertiuí pettiannuí* (< *Pettiano-*, cf. *Pettiis*, *Pettius*; *ST* Cm 7 = *Imag. It.* 592: Acerrae 1, perhaps mistakenly spelled with <*uí*> instead of <*ú*>: Zair 2016, 56), if the first component may be taken to function as a theonym (as if standing for *mamertei*); cf. Poccetti 2009, 228. Alternatively, this may be a combination of a praenomen (~ Lat. **Mamertius*) and a nomen (Salomies 2012, 159 n. 55, 167).

second century AD, could emphasize the relationship of an individual and his or her family to a deity. This is quite in line with the original and principal function of the suffix *-ianus*, that is, to indicate the belonging to something or someone. In general, the meanings of the anthroponymic epithets should not be overclassified; rather, in many cases, they could probably give rise to several associations at the same time.

Suffixes other than *-ianus* are harder to find. In some rare cases from the Imperial era, the epithet *-ianus* was extended with *-ensis*, a suffix peculiar to ethnics (e.g., *Silvanus Valerianensis* < *Valerianus*; see Ch. 4). As for other types of suffixed derivations, only those in *-illa* and *-ius/-a* have usually been reported in scholarship, each represented by two cases in the Catalogue (see Chs. 6-7). Of these, however, only one (*Isis Athenodoria*) may be taken as relatively certain, the others being probably non-existent (for example, the goddess *Bona Dea Galbilla*, who has always been considered to bear an epithet, may not have one at all; see No. **92**).

While a sacred building could be named after the deity to whom it was dedicated,[19] it was very rare for a shrine to be denoted by a combined term formed from both the theonym and the builder. The unique denomination of the *Iseum Metellinum* in Rome (HA *trig. tyr*. 25; cf. M. de Vos, *LTUR* III [1996], 110–12), a temple perhaps founded by Metellus Pius (cos. 80 BC), might have appeared as "*aedes/templum Isidis Metellina/um*" in some other later source. However, the title *Metellinum* itself is hardly anything but an antiquarian note.[20] Generally, and understandably, there is considerable variation in the denominations of sanctuaries when recorded in the literary sources. For example, while a Roman temple of Hercules is recorded in the fasti of Amiternum as *Hercules Invictus ad Circum Maxim(um)* (*Inscr.It*. XII 2, 25), Vitruvius duly calls it *Hercules Pompeianus* after its restoration by Pompey (Vitr. 3,3,5), but it becomes *aedes Pompei Magni* in Pliny the Elder (*nat*. 34,57). This style, directly underlining Pompey's contribution to the building project, is formed by analogy with a denomination like *theatrum Pompeii*. Similarly, the temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei, or Temple B, in the Largo Argentina in Rome, dedicated by Q. Catulus c. 100 BC, is *aedes Catuli* in Varro (*rust*. 3,5,12), and the shrine of Neptunus housing a series of famous statues that was built or restored in the Caesarian age

[19] Cf. the term *Dianium* in *CIL* VI 10006 and *CIL* VI 33922 (= *ILS* 7570; first cent. AD), the first related to an *unguentaria ab D[ianio?]*, the second to a *vestiarius de Dianio*. The identification of these temples is uncertain; see Coarelli 2014, 192–93 (a *Dianium* also appears in Liv. 1,48,6).

[20] Lipka (2009, 18) claimed that "the very characterization of the Iseum as *Metellinum* suggests a political reason, i.e., the (self-)promotion of the family of the Metelli, for its erection."

by a Cn. Ahenobarbus (probably the consul of 32 BC) appears as *delubrum Cn. Domitii* in Pliny (*nat*. 36,26).[21] There are several other examples.

What is noteworthy about literary mentions of this type is that the deity of the temple could be left unnamed, although it is usually clear from the context, or the reader can be expected to recognize which god's sanctuary is being referred to. In any case, much uncertainty is associated with epithets found in the literary sources. Whereas an epithet inscribed on a dedication indicates that it had been in actual use at a given moment and in a certain cultic context, the details of which, of course, otherwise usually remain obscure, the same cannot be said with certainty about the titles reported by the ancient authors.

Any references to temples in sources dating later than the time the temples were built or reconstructed may reflect subsequent naming conventions and are likely to follow the style of the genre in which they were recorded. This is especially true of the literary sources, and one must be careful not to draw too hasty conclusions about earlier naming practices on their basis. So, it should not be inferred from a late style like the above-mentioned *Iseum Metellinum* that "*Metellina*" appeared as an epithet of Isis, let alone that it was used as a cult title of this goddess in sacred dedications (nonetheless, the goddess is sometimes referred to as "*Isis Metellina*" in scholarship). In fact, there may be no reliable evidence that divine epithets were ever coined from anthroponyms with the suffix *-inus/a*, which, of course, partly reflects the fact that this ending was in general rare as a suffix of cognomina derived from nomina from which most of the divine epithets originate. More importantly, however, in contrast to the names in *-ianus/a* (*Aemilianus*, etc.), those formed from other names with *-inus/a* are rarely found as adjectives.[22] Just as theophoric personal names like *Martinus*, *Saturninus*, etc., are not found in adjectival use, it would be hard to imagine that the goddess Fortuna and her above-mentioned temple in the Largo Argentina in Rome could ever have been called "*Fortuna Catulina*". Instead, a late Republican statue dedicated by a Lutatius Catulus was called "*Minerva Catuliana*" (see No. **79**).[23]

---

[21] A. Viscogliosi, *LTUR* III (1996), 342–43.

[22] Kajanto 1965, 55.

[23] There are, however, divine epithets in *-inus/a* which have sometimes been taken as derived from a Roman personal name; e.g., *Hercules Musinus* (*CIL* XI 3778; AD 148, from Monte Musino in the ager Veientanus), to whom the Veientan *arae Muciae* mentioned by Pliny (*nat*. 2,211) have sometimes been related, but this is probably some sort of epiclesis of local origin (cf. Panciera 1969, 363 n. 14; Calapà 2022, 46–47). Note, however, that I have listed two epithets of this type in the Catalogue (*Bona Dea Sevina*, *Hercules Victor Certencinus*) because in both cases the possibility exists that the epithet should in fact be emended to one in *-ianus/a* (see Nos. **28** and **32**).

In the following Catalogue, as a rule, I have left out those very few cases occurring in later literary or other sources where the adjectival epithet derived from a human name is not syntactically associated with the theonym and thus does not determine a deity but defines a temple or statue by referring to a builder or an artist in an antiquarian or registering sense (three such cases are listed here in brackets in the form they appear in the *LTUR*).[24]

(*Hercules, aedes Aemiliana*), often attributed to Scipio Aemilianus (censor 142 BC). Fest. 282 L: *Pudicitiae signum in foro Bovario est, ubi Aemiliana aedis est Herculis* (if one accepts Scaliger's emendation of ms. †*familiana aedisset*†, for which he proposed instead, *Aemiliana aedis est*).[25] If the designation *Aemiliana* is correct, it is hardly earlier than the late Republic. However, the problem with "*aedes Aemiliana*" being connected with Scipio Aemilianus is that, instead of going back to the adoptive name *Aemilianus*, the epithet must be derived from the nomen *Aemilius,* which in the case of the censor would be difficult because he became a Cornelius Scipio at a very young age. In fact, the correction *Aemiliana* would be suitable only if the founder was an Aemilius[26] (unless it is assumed that Festus or his source used that form uniquely and contrary to common convention).

(*Honos et Virtus, aedes Mariana*): Vitr. 7, praef. 17 has *aedis Honoris et Virtutis Marianae*; cf. Vitr. 3,2,5: *ad Mariana Honoris et Virtutis*, with "*ad Mariana*"

[24] It also happens that although no ancient source uses a human-derived epithet even of a temple, designations of the type "*Venus Sallustiana*" nonetheless occur in scholarship. The location of this goddess's cult is defined in inscriptions as either *hortorum Sallustianorum* or *ex hortis Sallustianis* (see F. Coarelli, *LTUR* V [1999], 116–17; Hartswick 2004, 73). Similarly, the *delubrum Minervae* dedicated by Pompey in 61 BC (Plin. *nat.* 7,97; D. Palombi, *LTUR* III [1996], 253–54) is sometimes called "*Minerva Pompeiana*"; nor is it quite uncommon for the "*Hercules, aedes Aemiliana*" to be labelled the "Temple of Hercules Aemilianus".

[25] Pietilä-Castrén 1987, 136–37; F. Coarelli, *LTUR* III (1996), 11–12; Luci 2019, 125, with bibliography.

[26] As correctly pointed out also by Palmer 1990, 237 (he suggested *Flaminini aedis est Herculis* with reference to Quinctius Flamininus); cf. also Siwicki 2021, 497. Wissowa (1904, 261–62) and some others thought of L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 182 BC), but he is not known to have founded temples (cf. Ziolkowski 1988, 313 n. 16). Other emendations of Festus's passage are reported in Oakley 2005, 247. For the question of the location and appearance of the temple in the Forum Boarium, cf. now Zaccagnino 2019, showing, interestingly, that the architectural elements attributed to the "*aedes Aemiliana*" by Pirro Ligorio in his 16th-century drawings in fact belong to the Basilica Aemilia in the Forum Romanum.

variously interpreted and sometimes emended to "*aedes Mariana*".[27] Note that Val. Max. 1,7,5 (*in aede Iovis Mariana*) conflates two temples into one, i.e., the Marian one of Honos and Virtus and the temple of Jupiter. No ancient source uses the epithet *Marianus* of these deities.

(*Iuppiter, aedes Metellina*, i.e., *Iuppiter Stator, aedes ad Circum*): the form "*aedes Iovis Metellina*" is printed in the standard repertories,[28] but Fest. 496 L actually reads: *in aede Iovis Metellinae*, where the adjective may agree with a noun understood from the context: *in aede Iovis Metellinae (porticus)*, i.e., "in the temple of Jupiter of the Metellan portico".[29]

On the other hand, the literary cases where the epithet does directly determine a theonym are recorded in the Catalogue, even if most of them are likely to be antiquarian mentions, and the transmitted epithets may never have served in actual cult contexts (except, perhaps, *Victoria Sullana* which is recorded in Augustan inscribed calendars): *Hercules Pompeianus*, *Hercules Sullanus*, *Isis Athenodoria*, *Minerva Catuliana*, *Victoria Mariana*, *Victoria Sullana*. It is worth noting that in each case the epithet either seems to have been introduced or is first documented decades or centuries after the lifetime of the persons in question. This may support the conclusion that, at least in Rome, the divine epithets derived from anthroponyms with the suffix *-ianus* did not begin to appear before the latest Republic, i.e., the period from which we have other trustworthy evidence for the phenomenon (*Diana Planciana*, *Diana Cornificiana*, *Apollo Sosianus*).

Protective companions and spirits such as the Lares have been considered systematically only insofar as their epithets are derived from personal names with suffixes. The Lares were very frequently associated with emperors and their titles, their names being mostly followed by an adjective (*Laribus Augustis*, etc.).[30] Such evidence has been omitted here; nor have I otherwise considered the names of the emperors except when used adjectivally as divine epithets (e.g., *Silvanus Aurelianus*

[27] D. Palombi, *LTUR* III (1996), 33–35; E. Papi, *LTUR* V (1999), 274 (add.).

[28] Platner – Ashby 1929, 304 (*s.v.* Iuppiter Stator, aedes); A. Viscogliosi, *LTUR* III (1996), 157–59 (*s.v.* Iuppiter Stator, aedes ad Circum); Mackay 2000, 164–65 n. 13.

[29] See Boyd 1953, 154; Russell 2016, 123–25; Luci 2019, 127 n. 220. Pliny, citing Varro, uses a less precise formulation of the temple (*nat*. 36,40: *in Metelli aede*), which may be explained similarly; cf. Russell (2016, 125): "the genitive is more suitable for the portico, but since portico and temple are so intimately associated the word – and the concept, that this space is connected to Metellus individually – comes to apply to both."

[30] Panciera 2003; Gregori 2009.

[No. **24**]; for the *Silvanus Flaviorum*, see **Ch. 8**). However, the evidence for this usage is scarce. Regarding the Genii, their relationship to humans, or to anything, was always expressed using the genitive of the object under their protection (for "*Genius Ulpius*" and "*Genius Alotianus*", see the new interpretations at Nos. **8** and **84**, respectively).[31] The same applies to the guardian spirit Juno, the female functional equivalent of the Genius of a man, which starts to be documented in the Augustan period.[32]

Just like the Genii and the Lares, traditional deities like Fortuna sometimes also act as personal guardians of people and their houses. In such cases it was possible to combine the name of a deity with a genitive indicating an individual, a group or a house specially associated with it. Some such instances as well as the question regarding the difference between an adjectival and a genitival epiclesis are briefly addressed in Ch. 8.

The survey concludes with some thoughts on the derivation of divine epithets from human names on the one hand and the association between them on the other (Ch. 9). These questions are illustrated by a few examples (*Bona Dea Agrestis Felicula*; *Nymphae Geminae*; *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Purpurio*). In none of these cases is the divine epithet (*Felicula*, *Geminae*, *Purpurio*) directly derived from a human name, but rather has an associative connection with a personal name appearing in the dedication.

---

[31] *Genius* (and *numen*): Fishwick 1991, 375–87 (esp. 382–83).

[32] Rives 1992. Cf., e.g., the Augustan *CIL* XI 3076 (= *ILS* 116; Falerii Novi): *Genio Augusti / et Ti. Caesaris, / Iunoni Liviae Mystes l(ibertus)*. Genius and Juno in funerary dedications: Gebhardt-Jaekel 2007, 167–76.

2. Theonym + nomen

It is generally thought that this type represents the seemingly old Republican usage in which the family defined the protective sphere of its patron deity by using the adjectival form of the proper nomen gentilicium as a divine epithet. The subject is important because several names of this type have been taken as linguistic evidence for the existence of family cults in Roman religion. However, even if several gentilician cults and sacrifices are attested in ancient sources for certain periods of the Roman Republic (Hercules: the *Pinarii* and *Potitii* — Minerva: the *Nautii* — Vediovis: the *Iulii*, etc.),[1] a closer look shows that this phenomenon is hardly ever reflected by the use of divine epithets. The interpretation and reading of the available evidence are complicated by the fact that the sources reporting Republican gods and their cults are usually much later and therefore do not necessarily provide effective evidence of earlier naming conventions. In addition, the connection of a divine epithet with a gentile name may be apparent, indirect, secondary, or completely non-existent (because of misinterpretation, for example).[2]

I have considered only those cases in which the alleged epithet seems to be clearly connected with a theonym. Therefore, some deities known from the literature have been omitted, even though their name apparently coincides with, or at least seems to be closely related to, a nomen gentilicium. Such instances are found in an earlier writer like Varro (e.g., *ling*. 5,72: sea goddess *Venilia*, also in Verg., Ov., etc., and known as well in the form *Venelia*[3]), or in later ones who drew on him, like Tertullian (e.g., *apol*. 24,8: *Ancharia* in Asculum Picenum, or *Hostia*, whose cult was peculiar to Sutrium), or Augustine (*civ*. 4,8: goddess *Seia*, etc.). In the past, it was often suggested that in such cases we would be dealing with deities who were worshipped by, or somehow related to, a specific family (cf. *gens Venilia/Venelia, Ancharia, Hostia, Seia*). In other words, the name of the god would have been formed from that of the *gens*.[4] However, even if deities of this

[1] Fiorentini 1988; Id. 2007–2008; Smith 2006, 44–50; Dunning 2020, 225–26.

[2] Good and sufficiently critical observations in De Franzoni 2012–2013, 4.

[3] An addition in the Fasti of Tauromenium on December 1 (Bacci 1984–1985, 722–25, tav. 159), cf. Rüpke 1995, 137. *Venel* was a common Etruscan praenomen, also attested in Praesamnitic and Oscan forms. Latin had the nomina *Venelius* and *Venilius*.

[4] E.g., Schulze 1904, 123 and *passim*; Otto 1909; Wissowa 1912[2], 33 n. 3; Latte 1960, 58–59 (but see following note); Weinstock 1971, 293. For the view that the effect went rather in the opposite direction, see, e.g., von Blumenthal 1941, 317–22; Radke 1979[2], 11. See, in general, Fishwick 1991, 447–48.

type may have been associated with Roman families of the same name, it would probably be wise to avoid taking it for granted that in these cases the theonym was derived from the nomen gentilicium, or the other way round;[5] it is generally safer to state that deities and families sometimes shared the same name, or at least had a name that looked similar in both cases. On the other hand, sometimes the assonance, similarity, or identity between theonyms and family names might be due to the fact that an archaic family monument was later interpreted as the shrine of a divinity bearing the family's nomen; this may have been the case with the "god Minucius", after whom the Roman *porta Minucia* would have been named.[6]

The suffix *-ianus* might make interpretation easier. For Narnia, Tertullian (*apol*. 24,8; *nat*. 2,8,6), drawing on Varro, records the theonym *Visidianus* (i.e., *Narnensium Visidianus*) which looks less problematic because the name may point to the family of the *Visidii*: a knight with this nomen appears in Cicero (*Phil*. 7,24). However, the case is not as simple as it may seem: the theonym could be explained in various ways, and after all it may be that *Visidianus* and the nomen *Visidius* really have nothing in common other than that they shared the same linguistic origin, such as an unknown toponym. See, in more detail, No. **53**.

Two cases attested in the literary sources are often introduced to show that Roman family cults are reflected in the designations of gods, that is, *Ianus Curiatius* and the *Lares Hostilii*. All the other instances I know of that have generally been taken as examples of the type "theonym + nomen-adj." occur in inscriptions: *Bellona Rufilia*, *Fortuna Flavia* and *Hercules Fundanius* from Rome, *Diana Karena* from Aquinum, and *Minerva Matusia* from Sentinum. Each of them is dubious or problematic in its own way. In addition, there are the cases of "*Genius Ulpius*" and "*Mercurius Silvius*" from Africa, and the "*Deae Lucretiae*" from Lower Germany, all of which, however, must be explained differently.[7]

---

[5] Concerning the concept of derivation, Latte (1960, 58–59 n. 2) put it right in saying, "aber bei den behandelten Namen liegt nicht eine Ableitung des Geschlechtsnamens aus einem Götternamen vor, sondern Identität des Gentile und des Götternamens. Eine Dea Hostia ist von einer weiblichen Angehörigen des Geschlechts in der grammatischen Form nicht unterschieden."

[6] Fest. 109 L: *Minucia porta Romae est dicta ab ara Minuci, quem deum putabant* (131 L: *sacellum Minucii*), cf. Weinstock 1971, 293–94, 366; Wiseman 1996, 58–60. The existence of an altar would suggest a place sacred to a god, but the "family divinities" are typically female.

[7] Several other theonyms have sometimes been unduly considered as examples of the present type, such as Pais 844 (Sesto Calende, VA): *Herculi Ovanio Surunopa v. s. l. m.* (*Ovanius*: Schulze 1904, 364), where Hercules is rather embodying a deity of Celtic origin, cf. Haeussler 2015, 270 n. 83 (unless OVANIO was erroneously read for *Quartio*, i.e., the dedicator's name, cf. *EDR*-124736 [S. Zoia]).

2.1. Rome

(1) *Bellona Rufilia* (*)
This goddess is known from the second-century AD (?) epitaph of her *fanaticus* L. Cornelius Ianuarius (*CIL* VI 2234 = *ILS* 4181a = *RICIS* 501/0104: *D. M. / L. Cornelio Ianuario / fanatico ab Isis Serapis / ab aedem Bellone Rufiliae*, */... fec(it) / C. Calidius Custos amico / b. m.*).[8] The epithet has been explained with reference to the founder of the temple but has also been interpreted to mean 'blood red'.[9] The former explanation must be correct, but it requires consideration. Much has been written on this case, but I cite only R. E. A. Palmer who, followed by many, argued that the temple was dedicated by P. Cornelius Rufinus, Sulla's ancestor, after his triumph over the Samnites in 290 BC, and subsequently named after him. What is more, the style "*Bellona Rufinia*" (or "*Rufina*") would still have been in use in the early Imperial period before it was changed to "*Rufilia*".[10]

If not for other reasons, at least onomastically this is impossible,[11] but a simple solution to the problem may be found. When one looks closely at the photograph of the inscription (*EDCS*-18100948: image 3/4), one may notice that the last small-size character of RVFILIAE does not look like the letter E because its top horizontal line is tilted downward. Rather, it could be the letter N, in which case the reading should be *Bellone Rufilian(ae)*.[12] It is worth noting that if the epithet really were *Rufilia*, its genitive would probably have been spelled *Rufilie*, just like *Bellone*, not necessarily for any reason other than lack of space at the end of the line. If this is correct, the onomastic issue concerning the unexpected use of the unadjusted nomen disappears, but the substance does not change, for in any case we seem to be dealing with a sanctuary built by an unknown Rufilius.

---

[8] In his commentary, Henzen (*CIL*) compared this case with those of *Hercules Fundanius* (No. **3**), *Minerva Matusia* (No. **7**) and *Fortuna Flavia* (No. **2**).

[9] Cf. E. Aust, *RE* III (1897) 256: "fraglich bleibt nur, ob der Name im Hinblick auf den Kult (s. o.) von *rufus* (blutigrot) abzuleiten ist, oder ob an ein andres nach dem Erbauer benanntes Heiligtum gedacht werden muss (vgl. *Fortunae Flaviae* CIL VI 187)." The latter guess, of course, hits the mark (except for the reference to *Fortuna Flavia*).

[10] Palmer 1975, 654–55 (with n. 3), 662 (discussing irrelevant evidence, that is, *CIL* VI 2233 which mentions a C. Quintius Rufinus as dedicating a funerary monument to a *cistophorus* of Bellona Pulvinensis). A. Viscogliosi (*LTUR* I [1993], 194) did not refer to Palmer's work.

[11] As noted also by Assenmaker 2014, 244 n. 125.

[12] That this letter has always been difficult to decipher is shown by the reading RVFILIAS in some manuscripts (see Tedeschi Grisanti – Solin 2011, 291, c. 42v; also available at *EDR*-137110).

(2) *Fortuna Flavia* (††)
The inscription *CIL* VI 187 (ms. *Fortunae Flaviae CALLITATORIO*) has usually been taken as evidence for the type "theonym + nomen", i.e., *Fortuna Flavia*.[13] However, this is rather a dedication to an individual's Fortuna (cf. Ch. 8). As for the reading, Silvio Panciera's proposal may well be correct: *Fortunae Flaviae Galittae Orio* (*CIL* VI, p. 4130), that is, a dedication by a man called Orio to the Fortuna of Flavia Galitta. In substance, this would correspond to the type "theonym + cognomen-*ianus*" (No. **72**: *Fortuna Zmaragdiana*, etc.) as well as the cases where someone's Lares are referred to either by an adjective derived from a personal name or by its genitive form (see Ch. 8 below).

(3) *Hercules Fundanius* (†?)
The evidence concerning this god is conveniently collected in D. Palombi, *LTUR* III (1996), 14–15 (that the form of the epithet is uncertain is revealed by the entry title, "Hercules Fundan(i)us, templum"). There seem to be two references in the ancient literary sources to the temple in question: Porphyry (Hor. *ep*. 1,1,4), commenting on a sanctuary of Hercules mentioned by Horace, gives *Herculi Fundano*, while HA *Tac*. 17,2 has *in templo Herculis Fundani*, where the epithet could be either *Fundanus* or *Fundanius*. Based on these, it has often been concluded that the god is *Hercules Fundanus*, that is, the mythical founder of the city of Fundi in southern Latium and probably a major god in that town.

However, the matter is complicated by a dedicatory inscription to Hercules, which is usually said to have been found in Rome, *CIL* VI 311 (= *ILS* 3449): *Herculi Fundanio / Ti. Claudius Habitus / libens votum solvit*. This is the base of a small bronze statue of Hercules that long ago ended up in the Collection Foucault in Paris,[14] where it still was in the early eighteenth century. It then came under several new owners, but its current location appears to be unknown. In his description of the monument from 1719, Bernard de Montfaucon said he was sceptical as to whether the base and the statue originally belonged together.[15]

As stated above, the style "*Hercules Fundanius*" would be an anomalous designation for a sanctuary, not to mention a dedication. Rather, one would

[13] Thus, also Kajanto 1981, 513.

[14] Perhaps through the Roman antiquarian Luca Corsi who, according to Fabretti (1699, 692, No. 131), kept the monument in his possession.

[15] De Montfaucon (1719, 200): "Cet Hercule sans barbe porte le diademe , & tient la massue élevée. Il est peutêtre ici de la même forme que dans le temple. Je parlerois plus positivement , si j'étois persuadé que la base où est l'inscription incontestablement antique , fut faite pour la statue ; mais j'ai quelque doute là-dessus."

expect either "*Hercules Fundanianus*" (at least from the late Republic onwards) or, possibly, if the mention appears in a literary source, "*Hercules Fundani(i)*". It has been suggested, in support of the god's epithet *Fundanius* being identical with the family's nomen, that it could be toponomastic in nature and thus be modelled upon the allegedly nearby *lacus Fundani* (and the *vicus* of the same name) on the Quirinal.[16] Although there is danger of a vicious circle here, this is not impossible if *CIL* VI 311 may be deemed authentic and actually comes from the vicinity of the *lacus Fundani*. On the other hand, the proximity of the temple to the *lacus* could also have had the effect that the real epithet of the god, *Fundanus*, was carelessly spelled as *Fundanius* in the dedication. In fact, one should not reject the possibility of Hercules Fundanus of Fundi, and I must say that this seems to me the more likely of the two alternatives. It was not uncommon for the major civic deities to be worshipped beyond their city's territory (e.g., Hercules Victor of Tibur, Fortuna Primigenia of Praeneste, Diana of Aricia).

(4) *Ianus Curiatius* (†)

It should be clear that the altar of *Ianus Curiatius* near the Tigillum Sororium in Rome (at the beginning of the modern Via dei Fori Imperiali near the Colosseum) relates to the transitional rites through which boys became citizens and entered the curiae, and the epithet therefore originally had nothing to do with the plebeian *gens Curiatia*.[17] If this epithet was ever borne by Janus, one wonders if its original (or earlier) form was *Curiatus* (cf. *lex* / *comitia curiata*) which later changed to *Curiatius* when the altar began to be associated with this family in the popular imagination (whose members, significantly, featured in the story related to it).

(5) *Lares Hostilii* (††?)

The other case known from the literary sources is the well-known one of the *Lares Hostilii*, that is, the Lares who presumably in ancient times acted as protectors of the Hostilii and thus enjoyed an ancestral cult within the family. This has been

---

[16] J.-C. Lacam, in: Ferrante – Lacam – Quadrino 2015, 12 (with bibliography). *Vicus laci Fundani*: Coarelli 2014, 69–72. Location of the *lacus*: Gruchalski 2020. The determining name normally seems to have been in the genitive, though in the first of the following inscriptions an adjectival nomen is also possible: *CIL* I^2 721: *vicus laci Fund(ani)*; *CIL* VI 9854: *redemptor a laco Fundani*; 31896: *[a lacu Fu]ndanii* (?, later 4th cent. AD); Tac. *hist.* 3,69: *circa lacum Fundani.* The *lacus* also appears in two glossae of Placidus (*CGL* V 15,36: *lacus funditur*; 53,5: *lacus funditus*), where the badly transmitted term has been emended to *Fundani*. This *lacus* is not to be confused with the *Fundanus lacus*, or Lago di Fondi.

[17] See, e.g., Latte 1960, 133; Ogilvie 1965, 117; Palmer 1970, 137; Solodow 1979, 263; F. Coarelli, *LTUR* V (1999), 75; Sandberg 2018, 369.

the prevailing opinion for a long time.[18] The designation *Lares Hostilii* is possible linguistically, but the source from which it is known is problematic and so one wonders if this case should be understood in a different way.

The relevant entry in Festus is as follows: *Hostiliis Laribus immolabant, quod ab his hostes arceri putabant* (90 L; "Hostilis *G ante corr*."). The term to be explained, be it *hostiliis* or *Hostiliis*, is hardly compatible with the explanation. This is, of course, normal in Festus, but the entry would become less disturbing if *hostiliis* were emended to *hostiis*, i.e., *hosti{li}is Laribus immolabant*, which is not only good and idiomatic Latin (Cic., etc.), but also a logical expression in content.[19] In addition, of the two options, *hostiis* (< *hostia*) would be phonetically closer to *hostes*. The form *hostiliis* may have originated and entered the ms. tradition due to the adj. *host-ilis*. That this may be the case is further suggested by ancient comments on *hostia*: according to Ovid, the *hostia* took its name from the conquered enemies (Ov. *fast*. 1,336: *hostibus a domitis hostia nomen habet*) which accords with other accounts relating the sacrifice of the *hostia* to battle contexts (Serv. *Aen*. 1,334; Isid. *diff*. 1,523).

With this reading of Festus, the Lares would have been given offerings (*hostiae*) to help protect from the enemies (*hostes*), and indeed the Lares were often associated with the battlefields on which the soldiers (*milites*) fought, as shown by one of their epithets, *Militares*.[20] In the domestic sphere, however, they would have repelled household enemies, such as mice and other rodents. As for the family of the Hostilii, there should be no doubt that they venerated their domestic Lares, but this does not seem to be the information Festus conveys.

---

[18] Since Otto 1908, 120. Another deity sometimes (unduly) connected with this family is the *Hostilina* mentioned by Augustine (*civ*. 4,8; from Varro): Otto 1909, 454; Radke 1979[2], 146; Lipka 2009, 169. Similarly, the goddesses *Statilina* and *Tutilina* are often unwarrantedly considered to have functioned as the gentilician deities of the Statilii and Tutilii, respectively (see, correctly, Skutsch 1970, 122).

[19] This idea, or rather an inferior version of it (acc. *hostiam* instead of abl. *hostiis*), is not new, as it was attacked as early as the 15th century. In the second draft of his commentary on Ovid's *Fasti* from 1489, Antonio Costanzi from Fano wrote as follows (at 1,336): "*Sed hi Festi Pompei locum deprauerunt pro «hostiliis laribus» «hostiam laribus» legentes*" (ed. Toscano 2015–2016, 329). "These" (called *quidam* just above) perhaps refers to some early commentators of the incunabula of Festus's work, which appeared from 1471.

[20] John Scheid (in a private communication) thinks that the *Lares Militares* were not so designated for war, or the battle itself, but for the land and region where the *milites* acted.

2.2. Italy

(6) *Diana Karena* (†?)

The cult of the goddess *Diana Karena* is known only from Aquinum in southern Latium, where she was honoured by her *magistrae* with dedications: *AE* 1978, 97 (later 1st/early 2nd cent. AD): *Firidia Veneria Calvisi / Secundi (uxor), magist(ra) Dianae / Karenae d(ono) d(edit). L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*; *AE* 1978, 99 (but cf. Solin 1993, 403 n. 126; early 1st cent. AD): *Tettia M. l. / Myrtale, / Cupania N.f., / magistr(ae) / Dianae Karen(ae) / d(ono) d(ederunt)*; *CIL* X 5406 (= *AE* 2015, 314; 2nd cent. AD?): *D(ianae) K(arenae?) / Aemilia / Restituta / Dentri Cresc[en]/tis uxor, ma[g(istra?)] / d(ono) d(edit). / L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*.[21] Despite various explanations,[22] the meaning and origin of *Karena* is unexplained, but the name is probably old. The possibility that Karena was originally an independent goddess whose name survived locally as the epithet of Diana cannot be excluded.[23]

According to one view, the worship of *Diana Karena* could have originated as a family cult, within a *gens Carena*.[24] But this nomen is not known anywhere near Aquinum, being attested, on Italian soil, only in a late document related to a *collegium centonariorum* of Ostra that was found in nearby Sentinum in Umbria (*CIL* XI 5750 = Liu 2009, 350, No. 69; AD 260; a Carenus Vibianus).[25] However, what is more essential is that, as this work hopefully demonstrates, if the epithet was derived from a human name, one would expect, especially in the first and second centuries AD, the name form to have been "*Diana Kareniana*", and not *Diana Karena* ("theonym + nomen-adj."), this type being very poorly documented, perhaps non-existent. Therefore, it is very unlikely that the epithet *Karena* could have come from the nomen *Carenus/Karenus*. On the contrary, if there is a connection between the theonym and this nomen, it was probably rather *Karena*, the goddess's name, or epithet, that came to be used as a nomen at some point (cf. No. **42**: *Mefitis Utiana*, No. **7**: *Minerva Matusia*).

---

[21] See Molle (2015, 488), who accepts the reading of the epithet by Paola Vittucci, which is probably correct.

[22] E.g., *Karena* derived from Gr. κάρανος 'chief' (whence the mythol. name Κάρανος/Κάρηνος); related to the Italic goddess Carna (whose cult was also known in Rome and elsewhere) or to the god Quirinus; her name recalling some Umbrian terms. There is a useful survey of the views in Molle 2009, 119–20. For a detailed account of Carna and her festivals, see Šašel Kos 2002, 137–44.

[23] See Rizzello 1994, 77.

[24] Solin – Tuomisto 2005, 375.

[25] The only other attestation is in Vasio, Gallia Narbonensis (*CIL* XII 1326).

However, the late appearance of the nomen *Carenus* in the surroundings of Sentinum may not be insignificant. Diana Karena's cult was indeed firmly established in Aquinum, at least towards the earlier Principate (when Juvenal probably also mentioned the goddess in connection with the city, 3,320: *vestramque Dianam*), but the possibility that the cult, or a goddess called Karena, had immigrated there from somewhere else should not be dismissed. Although it may be just a coincidence that the goddess of the following entry, *Minerva Matusia*, whose epithet may be functionally comparable to that of *Diana Karena*, also comes from Sentinum, one should perhaps not be surprised if one day a dedication to (Diana) Karena appears somewhere in Umbria. Further exploration of this path might not be fruitless.[26]

(7) *Minerva Matusia* (†?)
The goddess is documented from a third-century AD dedication made to her in Sentinum in ancient Umbria (*CIL* XI 5740 = *ILS* 3133: *[Min]ervae Matusiae / [Me]mmius Caec[il]ianus / [Plac]idus cos. au[gur] / v. s.*; the reading seems acceptable, see the photograph at *EDR*-016192). This type of theonym might, in principle, seem to suggest a family cult, and so the conclusion could be that Minerva was at least sometimes worshipped locally by the Matusian family. This is how the epithet has usually been understood. The problem is, however, that the nomen *Matusius* does not seem to be otherwise reliably attested.[27]

But the major issue concerns the date. While a deity with this type of name might perhaps be conceivable in much earlier times, especially during the Republican period, it would be most anomalous as late as the third century AD, a period in which one would certainly expect the epithet to have been "*Matusiana*". Therefore, the designation *Minerva Matusia* rather suggests an old theonym that still endured in the later Principate, a Minerva whose epithet, or the second element of the onomastic formula, which may have originally denoted an independent goddess, is perhaps best explained as a survival of more remote Sabellic linguistic practices. If, as has been assumed, *Matusia* is a

---

[26] Rizzello (1994, 76) thought that *Karena* could recall some terms attested in Umbrian. A connection to Umbria was also considered possible by Bellini 2008, 45.

[27] Schulze (1904, 200) refers to *CIL* V 6575 add. from Novaria (but "*Matusius*" is the dedicator, i.e., T. Maius Iustinus). In *RIB* I 2044, l. 4, MATVSI, perhaps the dedicator's name, is probably to be understood *M. Atusi [---].* Cf. *Matisius* in *CIL* II 4970, 309 (Tarraco; recorded by Schulze 1904, 275): *Off(icina) Matisi* (but this is probably *M. Atisi*). For some other, probably unrelated, names occurring in provinces and beginning with *Matus(s)-*, see Tramunto (2006, 133), discussing the present inscription).

descriptive adjectival epithet derived from *mātu-* (< **meh$_2$-to*), it could show an otherwise undocumented cognate of *matura*, *matuta*, etc. (cf. *Mater Matuta,* Osc. *maatúís*).[28] Whatever its etymology, however, the existence of *Matusius* as a nomen is quite plausible. But this should not be taken to mean that the family name was given unchanged to the goddess as an epithet; rather this old term, which may have been attached to Minerva from early times, at some point began to function as a nomen gentilicium as well.[29] Parallels for such a scenario may exist (cf. No. **6**: *Diana Karena*, No. **42**: *Mefitis Utiana*).

2.3. Africa

(8) *Genius Ulpius* (††)

An early second-century AD[30] dedication from the Trajanic military camp of Sidi Moussa Bou Fri, c. 20 km southwest of Volubilis in Mauretania Tingitana, has been read as follows: *Genio Ulpio / L. Fabius Flac/cus, praef(ectus) / coh(ortis) Part(horum) [---] / [---]T[---]* (*AE* 1956, 62 = 1989, 915 = *IAM* II 814 with Suppl. = Schmidt Heidenreich 2013, 383, No. C554). Various proposals to explain the epithet of the first line have been advanced: *Genio Ulpio* would be a mistake for, or a variant of, the expression *Genio Ulpi*, the genitive referring to the name of an otherwise unattested military camp called Ulpium.[31] By another hypothesis,

---

[28] De Simone 1999, 397.

[29] Von Blumenthal (1941, 321–22) rejected the idea of *Matusia* being a family god of the Matusii. Paci (1990, 18) opted for a surviving indigenous deity. Fortson (2007, 88) thought of a local goddess identified with Minerva. Cf. also Poccetti 2009, 232 (*Matusia* is either an adjectival epithet or one coinciding with a nomen gentilicium). Ancient Umbrian deities: Bradley 2000, 178–79.

[30] Holder 1980, 18 and No. 25.

[31] Rebuffat (1987, 39 n. 41), following earlier research: "une inadvertance ou une variante de l'expression *genio Vlpi(i)*"; similarly, Id. 1992, 465, No. 814 (introducing the fourth-century AD statue base *BCTH* 1893, 162, No. 43: *Sanctum Genium Thamogadensem civis et amator constituit civitatis*, as a parallel in support of the adjectival form *Ulpius*; but in this comparison the adjective derived from the alleged toponym Ulpium should be **Ulpiensis*. In no way can the adj. *Ulpius* be considered a variant of gen. *Ulpi* < *Ulpium). Cases comparable to the Thamugadian one may be found in Celtic Spain: *Genius Laquinie(n)sis* (*CIL* II 2405 = *RAP* 206; conv. Bracaraugustanus); *Genius Viriocelensis* (*AE* 1998, 759; *ibid.*); *Genius Tiaurauceaicus* (*ILS* 9297 = *AE* 1952, 65 = *RAP* 207; Estorãos, Ponte de Lima; Hisp. Cit.), all names of native deities derived from a local toponym or ethnonym, cf. Olivares Pedreño 2008, 221; Wodtko 2009, 10–24 (showing that when a Latin word like *Genius* is used in the Galician-Lusitanian area, the ending of its epithet is expected to display Latin morphology); Luján 2011, 236–37.

Genius Ulpius would quite uniquely indicate the Genius of a *cohors Ulpia*.[32] As both these proposals are most unlikely to be correct, a third alternative has been proposed: the reference would be to the Ulpian *genius*, i.e., that of the emperor Trajan or his family.[33] This interpretation is obviously correct, but the reading of *Ulpio* as a dative is not:[34] the name following Genius must be in the genitive (just as the Genius of the Caelian Hill is duly called "*Caeli montis*" in a Roman dedication discussed below (No. **20**), whereas the Jupiter recorded in the same inscription uses the adjectival epithet *Caelius*; and cf. below No. **84** on "*Genius Alotianus*", which is to be understood as *Genius Alotiani*). Only when the term functions as a generic noun equivalent to a term like *deus* (or, sometimes, *numen*), can it be accompanied by an adjectival epithet or a theonym.[35] Moreover, in the case where the emperor is recorded in the genitive, the phrase should be *Genio Augusti* / *Imperatoris* (or *Imp. Caes. Nervae Traiani Aug.*, or similar), and in no case *Genio Ulpi*. As we may see in this Chapter, the use of the bare nomen *Ulpius* would also be most unexpected in this sort of context: the derivative *Ulpianus*

[32] Euzennat (1989, 193–94), not only assuming that the *cohors Parthorum* under Flaccus's command was in fact called "*Ulpia Parthorum*", but also arguing that the dedicator deemed it superfluous to state specifically that the Genius to whom the dedication was made was that of the cohort. But even in the hypothetical case that the *cohors* was *Ulpia*, its Genius cannot possibly have been named *Ulpius*.

[33] Brahmi 2017, 48; Gasparini, forthcoming.

[34] Gasparini, forthcoming, claims that the Imperial gentilicium *Ulpius* was used as an adjectival attribute of his Genius, involving a "specific attempt of stressing the active participation of Trajan in the divine nature of the *puissance* guarding him", the "grammatical choice" thus appearing as "a hybrid, sophisticated and very innovative strategy" aimed at simultaneously manifesting "the numen's protection of the emperor, the elevation of the latter to a divine status and the reflection of his benevolence on the Roman military camp." However, at least from an onomastic point of view, this line of reasoning is hardly convincing.

[35] Cf. the Celto-Iberian cases mentioned in n. 31. Also Celtic is *Genius Arvernus* (*CIL* XIII 1462 = *ILS* 7037 = *ILA-Arve* 3; Augustonemetum), as is *Genius Acorus/Adcorus* (*AE* 1977, 533; *ILN* III 202, 270; Gall. Narb.) – there are other examples from other regions. Sometimes, rarely, the theonym following *Genius* is in the genitive (*Genius Iovis* / *Martis*, etc.; similarly, *Numen Apollinis* / *Minervae,* etc.). Cf. further, e.g., *Genius Forensis* (*CIL* XII 1283; Gall. Narb.; inscr. *Genio Forensi*: but this might be the genitive of the name *Fore(n)sius/-us*, unless one reads *Genio forensi(um)*, with reference to a collegium of *forenses*; cf. *CIL* VI 30884: *collegium fore(n)s(ium) ad Genium loci*), *Genius Infernus* (~ Pluto / Dis Pater; *CIL* VI 28668 = *ILS* 8045; cf. *AE* 1998, 1572 [Afr. Procons.]: *Numini Sancto Inferno deo*) and perhaps *Genius Dom(i)nicus* (*CIL* XI 356 [Ariminum], known from old sources): *[G]enio* / *Domnico* / *Zoila vilic(a)*. However, since the expression *Genius Dom(i)nicus*, though possible (cf. the *Lares Domnici* in *CIL* VI 40414–15; *I.Ephesos* 4112, 16), does not really sound quite idiomatic in the meaning "the Genius of the master", I am wondering if this should be rather *[G]enio dom(ini)* [or *dom(us)*] *Nico, Zoila vilic(a)* [or *vilic(i)*]. The *Genius Domesticus Aug(ustus)* from Virunum (*CIL* III 11542 = *ILLPRON* Ind. 827) seems a rare variant of *Genius domus Augustae*, perhaps modelled on *deus domesticus* / *Lares domestici*, or similar.

would be somewhat better, but the problem of the adjectival form where a genitive is required would remain.

It follows that the only reasonable possibility is the abbreviated form of the genitive plural, *Genio Ulpio(rum)*, with reference to both the emperor and his family in the broad sense. After Trajan's formal adoption by Nerva in AD 97, *Ulpius* was not part of his official name formula, yet he kept his biological father's name which was used in many imperial contexts (Trajan's freedmen were Ulpii, and colonies, military units, and buildings could be named after his original nomen). One wonders if the dedication to the Genius of the Ulpii was set up after Trajan's reputable father and sister Marciana had been deified in the early 110s AD.[36] As for the use of the genitive plural, it is onomastically unproblematic, the epigraphic and other evidence showing that Roman families were often referred to by the plural form of their nomen gentilicium (cf. also *Silvanus Flaviorum*, below p. 95). Concerning the abbreviation, the use of the form *Ulpio(rum)* instead of the more normal *Ulpior(um)* may have been influenced by the fact that VLPIO is inscribed on the very right edge of the stone.[37]

(9) *Mercurius Silvius* (††)

A god by this name is allegedly known from a base dedication found in his temple in Thugga, perhaps from the later second century AD (*CIL* VIII 26486 = Saint-Amans 2004, 309–10, No. 67). At first sight, the text would seem to read: *Mercurio Silvio / sacrum*. The nomen (and cognomen) *Silvius*[38] is, of course, well known, but the epithet must rather relate to Silvanus.[39] These two gods often appear jointly in African dedications (*Mercurio Silvano sacrum*, also in the reverse order), possibly, sometimes, embodying the cult of the Punico-Libyan

[36] The Elder Trajan, who had probably died well before Trajan's adoption, was also honoured, together with his daughter, in some African inscriptions during his son's reign, see *PIR*^{2} U 864. For the historical background, see esp. Hekster 2015, 66–78.

[37] For some cases of the *-o(rum)* type in brick stamps, where the genitive plural is commonly found, see, e.g., *CIL* XV 990: *Aniceti Domitio(rum)*; *CIL* XV 992a: *Duor(um) Domitio(rum) Callisti*; *CIL* XV 993: *Cypherus Domitio(rum)*; *CIL* II 4970, 183e-g (Tarraco): *Of(ficina) Fabio(rum)*; *CIL* XIII 10009, 262b (Gall. Belg.): *Cinnam(us) Titio(rum)*; *CAG*-80-01 (Amiens), p. 261 (Gall. Belg.): *III Ennior(um) Iulio(rum)*; *CAG*-66 (Eastern Pyrenees), p. 505 (Gall. Narb.): *Cleopatra socio(rum)* (this genitive is also in *CIL* I^2 2696, Minturnae).

[38] Solin 1995.

[39] Cf. Cadotte (2007, 564, No. 258): "Il s'agit certainement du Mercure Silvain, qu'on trouve en bon nombre d'endroits." Bullo (1994, 523 n. 32) has "Mercurio Silvano-Silvio"; Villaret (2019, 208): "Silvain comme *Mercurius Silvius.*" Gasparini, forthcoming, thinks that *Silvius* is an epithet drawn from the nomen *Silvius*.

deity Baal Addir.[40] But although it is commonly assumed that the dedication concerns Mercurius and Silvanus, the form *Silvius* has not been explained. One might wonder if the ending of *Silvio* was contaminated by the ending of *Mercurio*. However, if one looks very closely at the photograph (*EDCS*-25601193), it appears that the letters VAN of *Silvano* are inscribed in ligature (it was not uncommon especially for VA to be written this way). Thus, the dedication should not only be interpreted as made to "*Mercurius Silvanus*", but it in fact was offered to this divine combination.

2.4. Germania Inferior

(10) *Deae Lucretiae* (††?)
Deities so named are attested in two dedications from Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium, *CIL* XIII 8171 = *I.Köln*^{2} 111 (2nd cent. AD, unless earlier): *Deabus / Lucretis / Iulia Mate/rna votum / solvit libens / merito Drou/sa filia res(tituit)*; *I.Köln*^{2} 110 = Kakoschke 2017, 4–6 (2nd cent. AD): *Lucretis Aṇą[i]l̤l̤[us] / pro se / et suis / v. s. l. m.* (both are listed in Girardi 2019, 240).[41] The goddesses' name is often thought to have derived from that of the local *vicus Lucretius*, of which they would have been the guardian spirits (*CIL* XIII 8254 = *ILS* 7071 = Tarpin 2002, 378: *possessor[es] ex vico Lucr[e]tio primo scamno*, "landowners from the *vicus Lucretius* on the first strip of field").

It was possible, though not common, that a *vicus*, just like a *pagus*, was referred to with the adjectival form of a nomen (e.g., *vicus Sulpicius* in Rome, or *pagus Iulius, Valerius* in the Alimentary Tablet of Veleia [*ILS* 6675]). However, it would be very surprising for a deity protecting a *vicus* or *pagus* to be referred to in the same manner, where one would expect a suffixed epithet, like *Lucretianae* in the present case. Moreover, to my knowledge, the type "*deus/a* + nomen-adj." is epigraphically unparalleled: while a *dea Satriana* is attested (No. **23**), there was no "dea Iulia" and no "deus Valerius" (the style "*theos-a/deus-a/divus-a* + name" used of Roman emperors and empresses is not pertinent). In fact, instead of functioning as an epithet of *dea* or of anything else, *Lucretiae* must be the actual theonym, and so this case cannot be compared to those in which the divine epithet seems

[40] Cadotte 2009, Ch. 3, and many others (cf., however, Miatto [2017, 225], arguing against the idea of the *interpretatio* of a local deity). See also Dorcey 1992, 64–65.

[41] The form *Lucretis* may also appear in a late first-century BC graffito on a funerary olla from Montebelluna in the Venetic region (*AE* 2013, 550b): *A(---)? M(---)? Pulio Lucretis* (?), but this is not a sacred dedication, cf. Cresci Marrone 2012, 228–29.

to coincide with an onomastic element that was also used as a nomen gentilicium (*Diana Karena*, *Mefitis Utiana*; cf. *Minerva Matusia*). This means that the only parallel cases might be found in the above-mentioned literary records (Augustine, Tertullian, both drawing on Varro: pp. 17–18), whose interpretation is not unproblematic (e.g., goddess Ancharia ~ nomen *Ancharius/a*). But such evidence reflects earlier Italic practices, and the deities concerned are always individual, whereas in the present case we are in Lower Germany and the goddesses operate as a group. This may suggest native religious traditions.

Regardless of whether there was a direct connection between the *deae Lucretiae* and the *vicus Lucretius*, it seems to me that we are dealing with otherwise unknown local matronal deities (who were normally labelled *deae, matres,* or *matronae*, in the inscriptions). It might seem easy to assume that such goddesses were just referred to by a Latin unsuffixed nomen right from the beginning, but this practice is not documented in the Celto-Germanic evidence, or anywhere else. Could it be that their name (Celtic, Germanic, or Celto-Germanic) resembled, or roughly coincided with, and was perhaps adapted to, the nomen *Lucretius*? And who knows if the street shared its name with the goddesses, a name which in both cases was associated with the Roman nomen and which, when defining the *vicus*, functioned adjectivally?[42] Alternatively, one could speculate that *Lucretiae* was based on a semantic association between a native theonym and Lat. *lucrum* 'gain, profit', *lucror*, etc. (which outwardly resembled the nomen *Lucretius* and thus might have been connected with it). That the idea of *lucrum* was linked with gods is shown by the collective of the *dii lucrii* (Arnob. 4,9). Finally, it has been claimed that the name of the local goddesses was *Lucretae*, not *Lucretiae*.[43]

In any case, the inscriptions where the mother goddesses of the Lower Rhine region appear are always in Latin, but these deities do not have Latin names,[44] which, however, does not mean that their names could not have been to some extent Latinized, and, surely, they could include not only flectional but

[42] The *vicus Lucretius* is listed under "local and ethnic names" in Whatmough (1970, 221, p. 927), as is also (*ibid*. 80, p. 181) the *pagus Lucretius* of *CIL* XII 594 (= *ILS* 6988 = Tarpin 2002, 405; territory of Arelate): *pagani pagi Lucreti* (unless *Lucreti(ani)*). Cf. also *CIL* XI 7265 (= *ILS* 6596 = Tarpin 2002, 398; Saturnia): *curatori pagi Lucreti* (unless *Lucreti(ani)*), and the toponym *Logrosán* in Extremadura in Spain, perhaps from *pagus Lucretianus* (with the influence of the popular etymology *lucrum sanum*): González Salgado 2006, 1448.

[43] Thus Ferlut 2011, Corpus 445–46, Nos. 809–10; Ead. 2017, *passim*. However, this form does not seem to be morphologically paralleled by the Lower Rhine evidence.

[44] Vennemann 1995, 272–73.

also other elements linguistically related to the Latin ones.[45] That names (at least apparently) similar to those of the mother goddesses are sometimes found as nomina gentilicia is shown respectively by the (phonetically un-Germanized) name of the *matronae Lubiciae* of Cologne (*CIL* XIII 8220 [dat. *Lubicis*]; cf. the toponym *Lövenich*, earlier *Louenich*, some 7 km from the dedication's place of discovery) and the name of *L. Lubicius Secundus* in Brixia (*CIL* V 4757 = *Inscr. It*. X 5, 574). However, the rare case of *Lubicius* is not quite comparable to that of *Lucretius*, because anthroponyms and toponyms in *Lub(o)-* were peculiar to Celtic regions,[46] whereas *Lucretius* was a relatively common nomen in Rome and the Roman world from early times. Otherwise, there are several Celtic or Celto-Germanic theonyms that coincide with a nomen gentilicium.[47]

[45] *Matronae* names exhibiting characteristics of language contact: Graf 2011. Buchmann (2020, 256) lists the *Lucretiae* among the matronal deities (p. 257: "möglicherweise im Zusammenhang mit *vicus Lucretius*"). Cf. the settlement name *Iuliacum* (Jülich, west of Cologne), if in any way related to Lat. *Iulius*, and the *Matronae Iulineihiae* (*CIL* XIII 7882; probably from the doublet **Iuliniacum*). The roots of the names of *Amnesa[henae?]* (*CIL* XIII 12066; Thorr, near Cologne) and *Lanehiae* (*CIL* XIII 7976; Lechenich, near Cologne), though not derived from Latin, are related to *amnis* and *lacus*, respectively.

[46] Petracco Sicardi – Caprini 1981, 60; Delamarre 2003^2, 209.

[47] E.g., *Abianius*, *Albius*, *Brittiae (matres)*, *Cis(s)onius*, *Gabiae (matres)*, *Narius/a*, *Vintius*, etc.

3. Theonym + nomen-*ianus/-a*

This type is by far the most common in our material. It seems to be frequently associated with temples, altars, or similar places of worship, in both public and private contexts. The epithet could simply record the builder's name, bringing glory and fame to him and his family, but one of its further purposes must have been to bring the deity closer to the worshipper and to establish a protective relationship with his or her person and property. However, as said above, the epithet in *-ianus* could surely also be perceived as referring to a family or its representative without an association with a particular sacred area.

Most of the evidence consists of dedications to deities, some otherwise popular gods being understandably well represented, such as Hercules and Silvanus. Of these, the latter receives, not surprisingly, dedications especially in rural areas, obviously due to his important role as a guardian of *fundi* (e.g., nomen *Lusius* > *fundus Lusianus* / *Silvanus Lusianus*).[1] In such cases, naturally, the epithet could also function as a topographic reference.[2] However, these and many other gods could also be worshipped within a *domus* or in a shrine in any populated environment. Unfortunately, the historical and archaeological context usually remains obscure, though, occasionally, the inscriptions may reveal a connection between the divine epithet and the name of a dedicator. It is not rare, however, that no dedicator is mentioned (e.g., *CIL* XI 3082 [Falerii Novi]: *Silvano* / *Veturiano*; *CIL* IX 2631 [Aesernia]: *Libero* / *Gratilliano*; see below Nos. **50** and **86**).

Concerning the use of the epithets in the longer term, important (but complex) information is provided by the Trajanic alimentary tablet found at Ligures Baebiani near Beneventum (*CIL* IX 1455; AD 101). Just as the evidence of this document suggests that the name of a *fundus* often remained unchanged on the arrival of new proprietors (and in fact many names can go back in time considerably earlier than Trajan),[3] so its tutelary deity would not have been affected by the change of ownership but would probably have been worshipped with the original anthroponymic epithet for generations. This may be reflected to some extent in the fact that most often the name of the dedicator does not match the deity's epithet. However, the matter is complicated by the fact that there is

---

[1] Maio 1976; Matijašič – Tassaux 2000, 75; Camodeca 2017, 120–22; Id. 2021, 108.

[2] De Fino 2014, 633.

[3] Champlin 1981, 246–50; Torelli 2002, *passim*.

usually no way of knowing whether the dedicator was a later owner of a *fundus*, or perhaps rather someone employed by, or otherwise dealing with, either the person from whose name the epithet was derived, or with a new owner (in some cases, the dedicator is styled *actor, dispensator*, or similar). It is, moreover, conceivable that a divine epithet could emerge only at a later stage after the establishment of a cult. According to *CIL* IX 1546 (lost), a certain L. Tarquinius Ianuarius offered a dedication to Hercules "*in suo fundo*"[4] in the Beneventan region. Who knows if a person with a different name later called this god "*Hercules Tarquinianus / Tarquinianensis*"? In any case, however, it can be assumed that divine epithets were often long-lived. For example, the god *Silvanus Lusianus* (No. **46**) received a dedication in AD 236 (*CIL* IX 2125) while a *fundus Lusianus* (owned by a certain P. Camurius Fortunatus) is attested 135 years earlier (*tab. Baebiana*). If Silvanus was the guardian of this earlier *fundus* (and not of another one with the same name) and was named after it, he was still *Lusianus* in AD 236, regardless of what the farm was called in that year. The cult of *Silvanus Curtianus*, perhaps related to the *fundus Curtianus* attested in AD 101, may also have survived into the fourth century AD (see No. **45**).

While the existing cases of Silvani or other protecting deities named after *fundi* or *villae rusticae* and their owners are relatively few in absolute numbers, the farms known by name are considerably more numerous. Most of them could have had their own Silvanus worshipped by the landowners and their staff, e.g., "*Silvanus Messianus*" (*fundus Messianus* < *Messius*, in Veleia), "*Silvanus Gentianus*" (*fundus Gentianus* < *Gentius*, in Volcei), "*Silvanus Peticianus*" (*fundus Peticianus* < *Peticius*, in Ligures Baebiani), etc. It is obvious that the worshippers of Hercules in the *fundus Domitianus* in Aquinum in southern Latium could have made dedications to their own "*Hercules Domitianus*".[5] One may remember what Dolabella, a Roman land surveyor from the Later Empire, stated: "Why does every landholding worship Silvanus? Because he was the first to establish a boundary stone in the ground. Every holding has three Silvani [*nam omnis possessio tres Silvanos habet*]. One is called *domesticus*, sacred to the holding; the second is called *agrestis*, sacred to shepherds; the third is called *orientalis*, in whose honour a grove was established on the common boundary, from which boundaries between two or more properties originated. So, the grove itself constitutes a boundary

[4] As the sacred dedications made on private land were legally profane, the formula *in suo* (*posuit*, sim.) ensured, where necessary, that the owner could sell the land or use it for other purposes; cf. Zimmermann 2012, 282.

[5] *CIL* X 5386 (= *ILS* 7324), a burial association of the *cultores Herculis in fundo Domitiano*.

between two or more properties."[6] Of these titles, *Domesticus* is well known as Silvanus's epithet, presumably representing the life and property inside the holding, while *Agrestis*, referring to life outside it, is very rare.[7] The title *orientalis*, associated with boundaries, does not seem to be epigraphically attested at all in reference to gods. However, the evidence of Dolabella may suggest that the roles and responsibilities of the rustic Silvani in our material could, in principle, cover areas not only inside the property, but also outside it, as well as along the boundaries between holdings.

As for the city of Rome, three major temples deserve special attention: one is *Apollo Sosianus*, the other two were consecrated to Diana, that is, the *Diana Cornificiana* on the Aventine, and the *Diana Planciana* on the Quirinal. All are from the end of the Roman Republic, that is, the period in which public buildings gradually ceased to be named after their founders. *Apollo Sosianus* and *Diana Cornificiana* were perhaps the last senatorial eponymous temple dedications (or restorations). From the onomastic point of view, *Cornificiana* and *Sosianus* are unproblematic, but *Planciana* requires some reflection (see below No. **13**).

3.1. Rome

(11) *Apollo Sosianus*

The temple of *Apollo Medicus* that was founded in 431 BC at the god's ancient cult site, the Apollinar, in the Campus Martius, next to the later Theatre of Marcellus in Rome, and restored on various occasions during the Republic, may have come to be called *Apollo Sosianus* following its rebuilding started by Octavian and completed by C. Sosius (cos. 32 BC) in an unknown year in the early Augustan age.[8] A hundred years later, Pliny (*nat*. 36,28) has *in templo Apollinis Sosiani*, while one of the works of art inside the temple, the ancient cedar-wood image of Apollo brought by Sosius from (the Syrian?) Seleucia to Rome, the "*signum Apollinis Sosianum*", appears as *cedrinus Apollo Sosianus* in *nat*. 13,53 (see above p. 10).[9] No

[6] *Grom.* p. 302, 13–19 (ex libris Dolabellae), transl. Campbell 2000, 223, 12–17.

[7] *CIL* VI 646 (= *ILS* 3570): *Silvano / Lari Agresti / A. Larcius Pro/culus d(ono) d(edit)*. The title was also borne by Bona Dea (see below No. **96**).

[8] A. Viscogliosi, *LTUR* I (1993), 49–54. For the chronology of the Sosian project, see now the detailed discussion in Hölscher 2017, 21–23.

[9] According to Gros (1976, 163), the Plinian expression "*in templo Apollinis Sosiani*" does not imply a restoration by C. Sosius, but rather refers to the statue brought to Rome by him. This is very unlikely, as was also pointed out by Hölscher 2017, 21 n. 24.

inscriptions related to the temple are known, but contemporaneous epigraphic evidence from similar contexts (*Diana Cornificiana* and *Diana Planciana*) instructs us that a dedication to *Apollo Sosianus* would not be a big surprise, nor would a document with the mention of an *aedituus Apollinis Sosiani*.

Bellona Rufiliana
See: **(1)** *Bellona Rufilia*.

(12) *Diana Cornificiana*
The goddess's ancient temple on the Aventine (cf. *Aventina Diana*: Prop. 4,8,29; Mart. 6,64,13, and *Aventinensis Diana*: Val. Max. 7,3,1; *Dianae Aventinen<sis>*: Fest. 164 L)[10] was known as *Cornificiana* after L. Cornificius (cos. 35 BC), who had started restoring the building somewhere around the mid-30s BC (Suet. *Aug.* 29,5).[11] The new denomination appears in *CIL* VI 4305 (= *ILS* 1732; Claudian) recording an Imperial freedman who, besides other offices, served as an *aeditus Dianae Cornif(icianae)*.

The divine epithet also occurs in the Severan Forma Urbis (*CIL* VI 29844 + 36619; *FUR* pl. 22: *[--- Dianae] Cornificia[nae]*), where its form is often claimed, most implausibly, to have been *Cornificia*.[12] It should be noted, however, that the goddess would often have been known as the "Aventine Diana", even during the Principate, just as the hill could be called "*collis Dianae*", at least in poetry. According to the epigraphic calendars of the Imperial age, for example, offerings continued to be given to the "Diana on the Aventine" (*Dianae in Aventino*, e.g., *Inscr. It.* XIII 1/2: *Ant. min.*, *Vall.*, *Allif.*, *Amit.*).

(13) *Diana Planciana*
The existence of the sanctuary of *Diana Planciana* on the Quirinal in Rome is attested by inscriptions related to its wardens. *CIL* VI 39845 (mid to late 1st cent. AD) is a dedication to the goddess: *Dianae Planc(ianae) sacrum / Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. / Heroicus, aeditus / d(e) s(uo) d(ono) d(edit)*, while *CIL* VI 2210 (= *ILS* 4999) records the epitaph of C. Iulius Hymetus, an *aedituus Dianae Plancianae*,

[10] Cf. L. Vendittelli, *LTUR* II (1995), 11–13, and Prim 2021, 365–90.

[11] For the historical context and the choice of the Aventine temple of Diana for rebuilding, see Hekster – Rich 2006, 153–54; Prim 2021, 370.

[12] E.g., recently, Prim 2021, 371 and *passim* (she also restores *Cornif(iciae)* in *CIL* VI 4305). Note that the *FUR* pl. 22 fragment could perhaps be read (*Dianae) Cornificia[nae]*, as there seems to be no space for writing before the epithet (see Quaranta 2004, 286–96). However, the theonym might well have appeared on the other side of the temple in the lost part of the map.

who is also known, with the same title, from his wife's dedication to Silvanus (*AE* 1971, 31; mid to late 1st cent. AD). This evidence may be associated with the statue of a Plancus along the *vicus Longus* nearby.[13]

What has been in dispute, however, is the identity of the cult's founder. Generally, divine epithets in *-ianus/a*, just like the similarly structured personal cognomina, are more commonly derived from the nomen than from the cognomen. In the present case, however, what might seem more relevant to some is that female cognomina coined from other cognomina with *-iana* do not become common before the second century AD, and most of the senatorial women with a cognomen of this type come from the late second or third century.[14] This might suggest that the epithet *Planciana* must be derived from the nomen *Plancius* "in the usual way", and indeed one candidate for building the temple is the Cn. Plancius (aed. cur. 55/54 BC) who issued coins with symbols of Diana in 55 BC (and was defended by Cicero, on a charge of election bribery, soon after). Another much-featured candidate is L. Munatius Plancus (cos. 42 BC),[15] but although he could, for historical reasons, be identifiable as the builder, someone might feel tempted to argue, for the above reasons, that the epithet derived from his cognomen should have been *Plancina* (cf. the Munatia Plancina who died in AD 33). And if Diana had been named after this builder's nomen, as was the case with *Apollo Sosianus* and *Diana Cornificiana*, she would have become "*Diana Munatiana*", though, of course, *Sosianus* and *Cornificiana* are not suitable benchmarks because, in their case, neither temple builder had a cognomen.

However, names of gods and buildings behave in their own way. The derivation of *Planciana* from *Plancus* can in no way be ruled out, considering that in the context of temple projects the adjectival divine epithet in *-ianus/a* was, understandably, the standard one at least from the late Republic onwards. In the case of other buildings too, the same suffix was occasionally used to coin adjectives from similar cognomina (cf. *CIL* VI 33838a [Flavian]: *a theatro Marcelliano*[16]), and there were the *horti Tauriani* ([*CIL* VI 29771; first cent. AD]

---

[13] *CIL* VI 9673 (= *ILS* 7605): *ad statuam Planci*; *CIL* VI 10023: *[--- vico] / Longo ab statua Pl[anci]*. Cf. L. Chioffi, *LTUR* II (1995), 15.

[14] Nuorluoto 2021, 84–85.

[15] Panciera (1987, 80–84) tends to favour Munatius Plancus (see also *CIL* VI, p. 4195), thus also Coarelli 2014, 190–93. The construction of the temple has also been associated with the family of the Plancii from Perge (Jones 1976). However, though onomastically valid, this proposal has received less support for other reasons.

[16] That some uncertainty as to the current style was felt might be suggested by the fact that the mason perhaps first wrote MARCELLANO and then added an I after the second L. The form

< *Taurus*), *Torquatiani* ([Frontin. *aq*. 1,5] < *Torquatus*), etc. In such cases, the cognomen from which the attribute was derived was typically hereditary within the family. Thus, a temple of Diana built by a Munatius Plancus and then named after his cognomen could well have been called *Diana Planciana* (< *aedes Dianae Planciana*), just as his gardens could have been known as the "*horti Planciani*" (or "*horti Planci*"). Actually, the temple should have been so named, as divine epithets derived from anthroponyms with the suffix *-inus/a* are not reliably documented in any period (above p. 12) and so "Diana Plancina" would not have been a feasible option anyway. Moreover, this style would have produced an undesiderate homonymy with the Plancinae of the family. If we can trust Pliny the Elder, a statue of Athena dedicated below the Capitol by the Younger Catulus (cos. 78 BC) could be labelled *Catuliana*, at least in Pliny's time (see No. **79**: *Minerva Catuliana*).[17] This is not a cultic epithet, but here too a standard designation in *-iana* was employed to identify the statue's dedicator, one that would not have been used as a female personal name at that time.[18]

On balance, onomastic arguments suggest that while Diana Planciana's epithet being derived from *Plancius* would be perfectly in line with the practice prevailing at the time, a derivation from *Plancus* is equally possible. In the light of other arguments, however, the consul L. Plancus would appear to be a more likely builder.

(14) *Diana Valeriana*

CIL VI 135 (= *ILS* 3254; Rome; first half of the 1st cent. AD) is a dedication to Diana Valeriana by the equestrian P. Valerius Bassus and his wife (as it seems): *P. Valerius Bassus* / *praefectus fabrum* / *et Caecilia Progne* / *Dianae Valerianae* / *d(ono) d(ederunt)*. Since *Valerius* is a common nomen, it is not absolutely certain whether the goddess got her epithet from this Valerius or from someone else of the same family, or from a completely different Valerius.[19]

Marcellianum is also in Suet. *Vesp*. 19,1 and Mart. 2,29,5.

[17] Plin. *nat*. 34,77: *huius est Minerva, Romae quae dicitur Catuliana, infra Capitolium a Q. Lutatio dicata*.

[18] The daughter of a senatorial Lutatius Catulus would not have borne any cognomen in the early first century BC, and if a later Lutatia did, she perhaps would not have been called *Catuliana* until the second or third century AD. In the early Empire, the cognomen would have been either *Catulina* or, simply, *Catula* (for this name, possibly of a Lutatia, cf. *IG* II/III^2 4239 [early first cent. AD]; Kajava 1990, 77–78, 117, No. 38).

[19] Note also the early Imperial dedication to Iuppiter Libertas from Tusculum (*CIL* XIV 2579 = *CIL* I^2 1124 = *ILS* 3066 = Gorostidi Pi 2020, 151–52, No. 9), dated after the aedileship of a

(15) *Fons Lollianus*

CIL VI 162 (cf. p. 4125; AD 160) is a list of *magistri Fontis Lolliani* from the western slopes of the Caelius. That this Fons is a deity is shown by other cases where the *magistri* and *ministri* make a dedication to a Fons. Several such dedications are attested, but in only one further case does the spring deity bear an epithet derived from an anthroponym (No. **67**: *Fons Scaurianus*).[20] The epithet may suggest a Lollius as the builder of a fountain (cf. J. Aronen, *LTUR* II [1995], 258–59). Naturally, this is also a topographic designation while in some other cases of *fontes* we seem to be dealing with pure toponyms, e.g., the *fons Cati* in Rome (Fest. 39 L: *dictus quod in agro cuiusdam fuerit Cati*; cf. F. Coarelli, *LTUR* II [1995], 257–58).

(16) *Fortuna Iuveniana* (*)

CIL VI 189 (cf. p. 4131 = *ILS* 3715): *Fortuna / Iuveniana / `Lampadia/na´*. The goddess's name in the nominative (which must indicate her statue)[21] is followed by two epithets, the second of which is a later addition (cf. C. Lega, *LTUR* II [1995], 272). This fact undermines some previous explanations that linked Fortuna to both epithets at the same time.[22] As for *Iuveniana*, the context seems to require a person or house of some rank and so one might think of the nomen *Iuvenius* which is rare but attested at least for a prefect of Egypt (AD 267; *PIR* I^2 878). There is also the late cognomen *Iuvenius* (also rare), but it is more provincial and found only in the lower social classes. One might also wonder if the epithet could be derived from the cognomen *Iuvenis* (cf. *Natalis* > *Natalianus*, *Nobilis* > *Nobilianus*, etc.), which is attested for a long period of time, including among senators. *Lampadiana* may suggest some fourth- to fifth-century AD aristocratic Lampadii, but it remains unclear whether the two epithets reflect kinship or some other connection between persons and families.

---

homonymous *praefectus fabrum* (*positum aedil(itate) / P. Valeri Bassi / praef(ecti) fabrum*). We may well be dealing with one and the same prefect (*pace* Demougin [1992, 647–48, No. 764], who mistakenly argued that the Bassus at Tusculum was the dedicator, and since in her opinion this dedication is later than the Roman one, the two Valerii Bassi could not be identical, though perhaps closely related).

[20] For a new epigraphic fragment coming from the area of the "piccolo Aventino" and belonging to the same series of lists of *magistri fontani*, see Gregori – Narducci – Rustico 2018.

[21] Cf. *Diana Cariciana* (No. **66**), *Iuno* / *Venus Cassiana* (Nos. **56**, **58**), *Venus Lucilliana* (No. **81**).

[22] Kajanto (1983, 17–20) considered three different explanations: 1) nomen *Iuvenius* + cognomen *Lampadius* (thus also Kajanto 1981, 513); 2) double cognomen *Iuvenius Lampadius*; 3) epithet derived from the name of a youth club called *iuvenii Lampadii*.

In any case, the epithet(s) may refer to the Fortuna of an individual or a house, or both simultaneously.

(17) *Fortuna Plotiana*
CIL VI 39860 (= *AE* 1926, 41; 2nd cent. AD) is a statue base inscribed *Fortunae / Plotianae*. This seems a dedication to the Fortuna of the Plotian family, perhaps indicating a statue of the goddess (C. Lega, *LTUR* II [1995], 273).[23]

(18) *Fortuna Tulliana*
CIL VI 8706 (= *ILS* 3717) is an epitaph of an Imperial freedman who served as a temple warden of the goddess: *Ti. Claudius Aug. l. / Docilis, / aeditus aedis / Fortunae Tullianae*.[24] It is perhaps a reference to a cult founded by a Tullius. A connection has sometimes been assumed with one of the temples traditionally ascribed to King Servius Tullius, the alleged founder of the cult of Fortuna.[25] However, in addition to the fact that it is hardly possible to show that any of the "Servian" temples of Fortuna mentioned in the later literary sources were in fact connected with King Servius,[26] one may ask whether the epithet *Tulliana* would even have been perceived as referring to this king; a more apposite style might have been *Serviana*, using the praenomen by which the king is often recorded in the literary sources.

(19) *Hercules Cocce[ianus?]* (*)
CIL VI 3687 (= 30902; 2nd cent. AD; lost) is a dedication to Hercules Cocceianus (?) by Flavianus, *dispensator* and *negotiator* of a L. Aemil[ius ---]: *Herc[uli] / Cocce[iano] / sac[rum] / Flavia[nus] / L. Aemil[---] / disp(ensator) it[em] / nego[tiator] / d. [d.]*. A connection with the house of Nerva is possible. In line 2, one could also consider the genitive, *Herc[uli] / Cocce[iorum]* (cf. *CIL* VI 644: *Silvanus Flaviorum*).[27]

---

[23] Cf. Kajanto 1981, 513.

[24] For the monument's modern history in England, see Caldelli 2019, 78–81.

[25] Platner – Ashby 1929, 219; Kajanto 1983, 14.

[26] Perceptive discussion in Miano 2018, Ch. 3. According to Perrin (1994, 713–14), the sacristan would have taken care of an *aedes* originally consecrated by Servius and rebuilt by Nero to house a statue of Fortuna in the gardens of the *domus Aurea* (Plin. *nat*. 36,163). However, this idea has no evidential basis. It is equally unlikely that, based on the epithet, the cult was specifically associated with water (cf. *tullius* 'cascade, gushing stream'; L. Chioffi, *LTUR* II [1995], 279).

[27] Wojciechowski 2013, 100 n. 18. Instead, *Coccei[anorum]*, in reference to the *familia Caesaris*, is more unlikely.

(20) *Hercules Iulianus* (*)
CIL VI 334 (= 30739 = *ILS* 3080 = *Suppl. It. – Imagines. Roma* 1: *Musei Capitolini*, 574–75, No. 2196; cf. Cook 1925, 400 n. 11; J. Boardman, *LIMC* V [1990], 168, No. 3377; Fittschen 2011, 293, No. 4.37; late Antonine) is a joint dedication to three different deities (*Herculi Iuliano, Iovi Caelio, Genio Caeli montis*), all portrayed in relief on the monument, by a woman called Anna,[28] or so it seems at first sight (in the third line below the names of the gods is inscribed *Anna sacrum*). Earlier interpretations unconvincingly identified this Hercules with Didius Iulianus, emperor briefly in AD 193.[29] Others have implausibly thought of a private apotheosis involving the identification of a Iulianus with the god Hercules.[30] However, we are clearly dealing here with a god named *Hercules Iulianus*, not with a Hercules and a Iulianus, whether the latter was deified or not. Therefore, though different in form and in terms of derivation, *Iulianus* seems to be a divine epithet like those of the two Caelian deities. The most plausible explanation is that the cult of *Hercules Iulianus* was founded by a Iulius (or Iulia). The specific reasons for the association of Hercules's cult with those of the two Caelian gods are beyond reach, yet all these deities commonly appear variously combined in joint dedications. Regarding the provenance of the monument, it must be closely related to the Caelian Hill, although it was claimed in a sixteenth-century source that it was found on the Quirinal (in a place called *ad Malum Punicum*).[31]

---

[28] Women dedicating to Hercules: Schultz 2000; Ead. 2006, 64–65.

[29] Colini 1944, 42–43; Palmer 1976, 47 ("can be accepted without question"); Wrede 1981, 125, 245, No. 133 (with bibliography), noting, however, that in the case of the emperor one would necessarily expect the addition of *Augusto* (but this would not help, because the epithet is derived from *Iulius*).

[30] E.g., E. Simon, in: Helbig 1966[4], II, 575–76, No. 1806 (possibly a freedman of Didius Iulianus [*sic*]); Fittschen – Zanker 2014, 101–102, No. 102 (the Iulianus identified with Hercules would have been deified after his death). Note also the comment (*ibid*. 2014, 102 n. 7) on Donderer (2008, 185 n. 4), who dismissed the idea of a "Götterangleichung" (because this case is not related to a burial): "Warum M. Donderer in diesem Fall eine Divinisierungsabsicht bestreitet, verstehe ich nicht; um was soll es sich denn sonst handeln?" For the monument, see also Vout 2012, 127–28 (who seems to take Anna as commemorating a male named "Hercules Iulianus" and represented *in formam deorum*). According to Borg (2019, 219), "Hercules is related to a certain Iulianus, whose portrait features he assumed and who may have been the husband of Anna, the dedicator." However, all claims of this type are basically mistaken, because *Iulianus* must be derived from the nomen *Iulius*.

[31] Faunus 1549, lib. IV, p. 98 ("Hic olim ... inventam scimus"). This is somewhat suspect, however, not only because of the content of the dedication, but also because the information conveyed by Faunus perhaps rests on the fact that the monument was displayed in the nearby villa of Cardinal

However, the phrase *Anna sacrum* deserves some reflection. Though entirely possible, the dedicatory formula "theonym in the dative – P(ersonal) N(ame) – *sacrum*" is relatively rare, being sometimes found in provincial inscriptions.[32] "*Herculi sacrum* PN", "PN *Herculi sacrum*", or "*Herculi* PN *d. d.*", etc., would be more in conformity with epigraphic dedicatory conventions. In theory, one might think that *sacrum* is elliptic for *sacrum dedit* / *(ex voto) solvit*, or similar, but this is pure speculation and does not help very much. However, a major issue concerns the way the dedicator is recorded because if she was freeborn or a freedwoman, one would expect her to be referred to not just by the simple individual name. Therefore, it does not seem likely that Anna was a freedwoman of the *gens Iulia*, as has been assumed, an idea that by itself could be worth considering.[33] On the other hand, for her name, Anna could well have been a slave (recorded without the mention of her master or mistress, possibly from the Iulian family[34]), yet the absence of any reference to her status and position would be somewhat surprising. Moreover, even if slaves with enough freedom and the resources to commission a monument could put up inscribed dedications,[35] the present relatively elaborate relief does not quite look like one set up by a slave.

But what if *Anna* is not a personal name at all? It was suggested long ago that the phrase might be understood as *anna(le) sacrum*, that is, an annual sacrifice offered to the three gods represented on the relief panel, possibly on the Caelian Hill.[36] This option sounds interesting, but there is hardly any way to prove it, and

---

Jacopo Sadoleto (his property from 1518: Samperi 2011, 122), where it was reportedly seen later (Pighius 1599, 117) and where it could have ended up from anywhere in Rome. However, Palmer (1976, 47) linked the monument to *CIL* VI 377 from the Quirinal, which mentions *Iuppiter Fulgerator* and the *dei montenses*, arguing that all these cults were located there (but the cult of Jupiter Fulgur must be placed on the Campus Martius, cf. D. Manacorda, *LTUR* III [1996], 136). For the cults of Hercules (including the *Hercules Iulianus*) on the Caelius, see now Abbondanza 2020.

[32] E.g., Nesselhauf 159 (= *CBI* 53; Bonna; AD 233): *Sanctis* / *Aufanis* / *C. Tauricius* / *Verus b(ene) f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis)* / *sacrum* / *pro se et suis*; Nesselhauf 166 (Bonna): *Matronis* / *Aufanis* / *L. Aquinius* / *Candidus* / *sacrum*; *CERom-4*, 294 (Moes. Inf.): *De[ae]* / *Minervae* / *matri* / *Musarum* / *Iul(ius) Iucun/dus sacrum*; *CIL* XIII 7794 (= *CBI* 86; Rigomagus; AD 242): *Deo Sil[vano]* / *M. Superin(ius)* / *Felix* / *b(ene)f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis)* / *sacr(u)m*. Cf. *Conimbri* 11 (= *RAP* 210, Lusitania): *Lares Lubanc(os)* / *Dovilonicor(um)* / *horum* / *Albuiu(s)* / *Camal(i) f. sacr(um)*.

[33] Schraudolph (1993, 209, No. G23, and p. 69), suggesting that the dedicator Anna, a freedwoman ("trotz des fehlenden *cognomen*" [*sic*]), or the Iulian family lived on the Caelian Hill.

[34] E. Simon (in: Helbig 1966², II, 576, No. 1806) claimed that Anna could have been either a slave or a freedwoman of the *gens Annia*, to which Emperor Marcus Aurelius was born (*sic*).

[35] For a discussion, see Padilla Peralta 2017, *passim*.

[36] Gori (1727, 186), followed by Gatti 1887, 316–17. For *annale*, cf. *CIL* X 1584 (= *ILS* 3365;

the abbreviation would be somewhat odd (in any case, the spelling would not have been due to lack of space).

I am also wondering if the line could be read as a dedication to a further deity, i.e., *Anna(e) sacrum* with reference to Anna Perenna.[37] The festival of this goddess on the Ides of March appears as "*Annae Perennae*" in the earlier calendars, but the Philocalian Calendar of AD 354 has "*Annae sacrum*" on 18 June.[38] This means that, at some point, Anna's festival was moved from 15 March to 18 June, perhaps long before the mid-fourth century because an allusion in Martial already seems to presuppose it.[39] That Anna appears alone would perhaps not be surprising by itself, because Anna and Perenna also figured as two separate entities.[40] It could also be conceivable that Anna was not depicted visually while the three male gods are shown in relief. There is, in fact, no clear evidence of a statue of Anna Perenna from anywhere in Rome, though a late Republican coin portrait might possibly reflect the appearance of her statue if one existed as Ovid stated.[41] However, as far as I know, Anna Perenna did not have any special connection with the Caelian Hill,[42] just as it remains quite uncertain whether she ever had a temple in Rome (besides her well-known fountain at Piazza Euclide in modern Parioli).[43] Moreover, I do not know any parallels for Anna Perenna being similarly coupled with other deities, and why would the dative of her name be abbreviated?[44] In conclusion, this option does not feel particularly attractive.

Puteoli): *Libero patri sacrum XX annale T. Fl. Eglectiani sacerd(otis)*, etc. (a dedication celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the man's priesthood).

[37] This possibility was noticed but rejected by Guarducci 1936, 37 n. 4 (followed by Colini 1944, 42 n. 22).

[38] *Inscr. It.* XIII 2, 42, pp. 249, 472 (cf. Salzman 1990, 124).

[39] Mart. 3,68,8 (*sexto mense*), see Wiseman 2019, 13–14.

[40] E.g., Varro *Men*. fr. 506: *Anna ac Peranna*; see Wiseman (2019, 1–2), noting further that for the Ides of March, the annotation in the Fasti of Antium (84-47 BC) reads *Ann(ae) / Perennae*, on two separate lines, making it unclear whether this was the festival of a single deity, or of two, Anna and Perenna.

[41] *RRC* 366/1 (82–81 BC); Ov. *fast*. 3,673–74; cf. Ramsby 2019, 114, 120.

[42] Unless this could have something to do with the presence of Minerva on the Caelius (or, rather, the Caeliolus, F. Coarelli, *LTUR* III [1996], 255; see Cinaglia 2018, 83–84), considering that Anna's cult was associated with that of Minerva (Cinaglia 2018, 63–64).

[43] Piranomonte 2010, 193 n. 7 (cf. Ead., *LTUR Suburb*. I [2001], 59–63). The Bamberg ms. reading *Annae templum* in Plin. *nat*. 35,94 is generally held to be corrupt.

[44] The first-declension dative singular in *-a* exists, but it belongs to Old Latin and is rare in Rome.

Complicating matters may be the fact that the word *sacrum*, following a gap of some six letters, is not inscribed centrally in relation to *Anna* and its appearance may suggest it was inscribed by another hand, or at least not at the same time as the rest of the inscription. If so, one wonders if the original text of this line was, or was intended to be, something other than *Anna sacrum*. Some traces slightly resembling parts of letters are visible, but they may not belong to writing, and one cannot detect any signs of erasure, at least from a photograph (see *EDR*-121737).

(21) *Hercules Pompeianus*
This temple in archaic style near the *Circus Maximus*, which was perhaps connected with the *ara Maxima* of Hercules, seems to have been renovated by Pompey. The denomination *Hercules Pompeianus* is found in Vitr. 3,3,5 (*ad Circum Maximum Cereris et Herculis Pompeiani, item Capitoli,* the underlying term being "*aedium*"), while Plin. *nat*. 34,57, recording the god's image by Myron inside the temple (perhaps part of the spoils of victory from one of the general's campaigns), employs the term *aedes Pompei Magni* (cf. F. Coarelli, *LTUR* III [1996], 20–21). In the *fasti Amiternini*, the entry for 12 August shows *Herculi Invicto ad Circum Maxim(um)* (*Inscr. It*. XIII 2, 25, p. 191).[45] By itself, the title *Pompeianus* might suggest the appropriation of the god as Pompey's personal protector, but as the epithet is found in only one literary source in reference to Pompey as a builder, it is highly unlikely that it was ever used in sacred dedications, nor is there any information on how firmly Pompey's name became attached to the building. Cf. Introduction pp. 11–14.

(22) *Lares Volusiani*
In Augustan Rome, the senatorial family of the Volusii Saturnini established a well-organized association devoted to the cult of their domestic Lares, named *Lares Volusiani*. Inscriptions show that this slave *collegium*, which even had *decuriones*, survived through much of the first century AD (*CIL* VI 10266–67: *decurio / decuriones Larum Volusianorum*; cf. *ILS* 3606). Parallel to this cult the Volusii had a special organization for the worship of their Penates as well as the Genius of the *paterfamilias* L. Volusius Saturninus (cos. suff. 12 BC).[46]

[45] A similar entry is found in the *fasti Allifani*, but the location for the festival is missing (*Inscr. It*. XIII 2, 24, p. 181).

[46] Várhelyi 2010, 190–92. For the organization for the worship of the Lares of the patron or head of family, see Wojciechowski 2021, 91–92.

(23) *dea Satriana* (††?)

While there is considerable evidence in the Graeco-Roman world for deities being styled simply "gods" or "goddesses" (*deus/dea, theos/thea*, etc.), often appearing jointly as *dii deaeque* (etc.) and using a wide range of attributes (*dei patrii, propitii*, *salutares*, etc.), there also seem to have been "gods" and "goddesses" named after humans, thus having some sort of relationship with a family or an individual. One such case is known from Rome, a sacred grove of the *dea Satriana* somewhere near the complex of S. Spirito in Sassia in the Vatican area, a neighbourhood known for its many *horti* in antiquity (*CIL* VI 114 = 30695 [add. p. 3755] = *ILS* 3989: *Lucus* / *sacer* / *deae* / *Satrianae*; 1st/2nd cent. AD; lost). As is typical, there is no clue to the closer relationship between the goddess and the *gens Satria* in question, but it may well be that the grove served for a family cult (cf. D. Palombi, *LTUR* II [1995], 7; M. G. Granino Cecere, *LTUR Suburb*. V [2008], 46–47).

However, although *Satriana* appears to have originated as an adjectival determiner of *dea*, being morphologically derived from the nomen *Satrius*, it must function as an independent theonym, not an epithet (which is why one should preferably write *dea* with a lowercase initial). In fact, this would be the only epigraphically confirmed example of the syntagm "*deus*/*dea* + nomen-*ianus/a*", whereas *deus/dea*, or another term for 'deity', quite often accompanies a theonym (*deus Mercurius*, *dea Minerva*, etc.). Another possibility could be that the theonym *Satriana* is not actually derived from the name of a specific Satrian family but shares a common origin with the nomen and the other *Satr-* names (*Sadrius*/*Satrius* [Osc. *sad(i)riis*, Pel. *sadries*], *Satrienus*, etc.).[47] Nor is it entirely impossible that there was also a nomen **Satrianus/a*, identical with the theonym.[48]

(24) *Silvanus Aurelianus*

CIL VI 631 (= 31006 = *ILS* 5084 = *EAOR* I 45; AD 177) is a list of the members of an association of gladiators (*initiales collegi Silvani Aureliani*), one of the managers of which was an Imperial freedman. The guild bestowed Commodus's name as an epithet for Silvanus who seems to have acted as the emperor's protective god (differently, Dessau, adn. 4: "agnomen Silvano datum, fortasse

[47] Solin – Salomies 1994[2], 163. The meaning and origin of these names is uncertain (an Etruscan background has sometimes been assumed, cf. Belfiore 2012, 424–25, with bibliography), but they were perhaps often felt to be connected to Gr. Σάτυρος because of the strong assonance between them, cf. Pesando 1996, 221.

[48] Cf. No. **53** *(deus) Visidianus*, and pp. 17–18 for the goddesses *Ancharia*, *Hostia, Seia*, *Venilia,* and Nos. **6**, **7**, and **42** for the epithets *Karena*, *Matusia*, and *Utiana* (with the respective nomina in each case).

a M. Aurelio Hilaro curatore").[49] Cf. *Hercules Cocceianus* (No. **19**) and *Hercules Commodianus* (No. **73**)

(25) *Silvanus Naevianus*
CIL VI 645 (= *ILS* 3468; 2nd cent. AD?): *Silvano Naeviano / et Herculi / Romanilliano / Calvius / Iustus / d(ono) d(edit).* This is the only case in the material where two deities, each with an anthroponymic epithet, appear in the same dedication. The fact that these deities are Hercules and Silvanus is no surprise, as it was not uncommon for them (or any other deities in general) to receive joint dedications. It would be interesting to know more about these gods, or their joint cult, but unfortunately the exact place of discovery of the dedication is unknown. However, considering that Hercules's epithet may refer to a cult founded by a woman named Romanilla (see No. **75**: *Hercules Romanillianus*) and that the cult of Silvanus was probably founded by a Naevius, one wonders if this was a family business. Perhaps the two founders were husband and wife, or they both came from the same family of the Naevii. Or who knows if Romanilla was somehow related to the dedicator (concerning him, Dessau, *ILS*, wondered if he could be identical with the contractor P. Calvius Sp.f. Iustus known from *CIL* VI 8455 = *ILS* 1470).[50]

(26) *Silvanus [---]rilianus*
CIL VI 649 (lost) is a dedication by a *dispensator* called Daphnus: *[S]ilvano / [---] riliano / sacrum / Daphnus disp(ensator)*. Probably from a nomen in *-rilius* (like *Egrilius*), provided the reading is correct (the text was copied by Giovanni Battista Doni along the Via Tuscolana in the first half of the 17th century).[51]

---

[49] Correctly, Bömer (1981^2, 75): "... der Gott sein Cognomen vielleicht von dem Curator der Vereinigung ..., wahrscheinlicher aber doch wohl ... vom Kaiser selbst her trägt." Sabbatini Tumolesi (*EAOR*) seems to have thought that *Aureliani* determines the word *initiales*. One may further note that in AD 177, the name *Aurelianus* could also have been associated with the co-ruler Marcus Aurelius.

[50] Gagé (1961, 85, and elsewhere), while assuming imaginatively that both *Naevianus* and *Romanillianus* were ancient divine designations, associated the former with the grove of Faunus that is mentioned in the literary sources near the *prata Naevia* around Caere (thus, e.g., Dion. Hal. *Ant*. 5,14–16, describing the battle between Romans and Etruscans in 509 BC, would refer to *Silvanus Naevianus* by mentioning the oracle of Faunus on the one hand, and the Naevian Meadow on the other). Bömer (1981^2, 83) seems to have thought that the two epithets could be related to the names of slaves' cult associations. In Palmer's opinion (1978, 244), the original donors were a Naevius and a Romanill(i)us.

[51] The name was unlikely interpreted as *[Au]riliano* by Latte 1960, 324 n. 2.

(27) *Stata Secciana*
CIL VI 975 (= 31218, lat. dextr. col. ii, 31= *ILS* 6073; AD 136): *vico Statae Seccianae* (a new reading instead of *Siccianae*: C. Lega, *LTUR* V [1999], 191–92). However, as Lega observes, the Seccian family is not known to have been of particular importance while some plebeian Siccii are on record from the early Republic onwards. The street (in Reg. XIV) perhaps had its name from a sanctuary, or a cult statue, dedicated to Stata Mater by someone from the *gens Seccia* (or *Siccia*).

3.2. Italy[52]

(28) *Bona Dea Sevina* (†?)
In the *CIL* reading, the epithet of this *Bona Dea* from Praeneste is given as *Sevina* (*CIL* XIV 3437 = Brouwer 1989, 84-85, No. 74; lost): *Iulia Athenais, mag(istra) / Bonae Deae Sevinae*, etc. If this is correct, the use of the suffix *-ina* would probably exclude the possibility of a derivation from the nomen *Sevius* (see above p. 12), and so *Sevina* might perhaps be taken as a kind of descriptive cult title, e.g., "goddess of the sowing-seed".[53] However, since SEVINAE is very poorly transmitted,[54] one wonders if it could be understood as SEVIANAE (perhaps with AN inscribed in ligature). In that case, the epithet could well be derived from *Sevius*, this spelling probably often standing for *Saevius*.[55] This nomen is fairly well documented, and the form *Sevius* is found in Rome, central and northeast Italy, and some provinces. Interestingly, there may perhaps also be an attestation in Praeneste: in the first line of the lost inscription *CIL* XIV 3380

[52] Note that both *Bona Dea Sevina* and *Hercules Victor Certencinus* are listed here, because their epithets may have, in fact, ended in *-iana* and *-ianus*, respectively.

[53] Thus Eisler 1910, 143. Just for curiosity, one may note that, in the past, *Sevina* was also connected with the Sabine people (who, according to some, would have been called *Sebini*, cf. Gr. σεβ-), e.g., Orelli (1828, 299, No. 1520), taking the epithet to mean 'Veneranda', 'Augusta', with reference to Festus 465 L (*Sabini a cultura deorum dicti, id est* ἀπὸ τοῦ σέβεσθαι) and Plin. *nat*. 3,108 (*Sabini, ut quidam existimavere, a religione et deum cultu Sebini appellati*). This etymology was also known to Varro (Fest. 464 L).

[54] *CIL*, comm.: "SEVNA vel SEVINAE Suaresius (sed neutrum ut lectum in lapide, verum pro supplemento), SEVUNAE Fabretti."

[55] Cf. Lucil. 1130, probably concerning precisely Praeneste: *Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat*, "let Caecilius not be appointed a rustic praetor", which describes the monophthongal pronunciation /*ē*/ as rustic.

(*Q. Seveio Sp.f. COL* ...), J. M. Suarès (17th century) gives the nomen as *Sevio*.[56] Based on the above, one might wish to consider seriously the possibility that the Praenestan cult of Bona Dea, of which Iulia Athenais was a *magistra*, had been either founded or restored by a Sevius and that therefore the goddess was called *Seviana*, and not *Sevina*.

(29) *Diana Pamnetiana* (*)
This goddess is attested in *CIL* X 5960 (Signia; lost; perhaps from the 2nd cent. AD): *Diane Pamne/tiane Q. Iuli/us Pompo/nianus*. The epithet looks suspicious and may rather be derived from the nomen *Panentius* (Schulze 1904, 44), in which case it should be emended to *Panentiana* (note that one of the copies in Mommsen's possession had *Panne/iane*).[57] Perhaps it was a family cult.

(30) *Hercules Aelianus*
CIL IX 1095 (= *ILS* 3444; later 2nd cent. AD) is a dedication, it seems, of a cult statue to Hercules Aelianus: *Herculi / Aeliano / sacrum, / quem consacra/vit Sammius / Tertullinus, / ex maioriario*.[58] The epithet perhaps refers to Emperor Hadrian who conferred the title of *colonia Aelia Augusta* on Aeclanum,[59] but a local family cult cannot be excluded.

(31) *Hercules Cefr(ianus)*
Johnson 1935, 116 n. 2 is a brick stamp from Minturnae in southern Latium (1st cent. BC): *Herc(uli) Cefr(iano) sacr(um)*. The epithet is probably derived from the rare nomen *Cefrius*. Perhaps it was a local family cult, which, in one view, could have been related to economic activities such as breeding and trading of livestock.[60]

---

[56] *Cod. Barb*. 30, 182 f. 20; *cod. Vat*. 9140 f. 269r (Q SEVIO SPF COL). The *CIL* reading is based on Cecconi (1756, 100): Q SEVEIO SVE COI ("Da un'antico marmo ho copiato", but, as can be seen, he did not always copy very accurately). The nomen *Seveius*, in reference to this inscription, is listed with a question mark in Solin – Salomies 1994[2], 170.

[57] As already assumed in Kajava 1987, 210 n. 4. "*Panneiana*" would not sound bad either, but apparently a nomen **Panneius* is unattested.

[58] For this title (mostly military, sometimes perhaps civilian), see Buonocore 2011, 322.

[59] Thus, S. Segenni, *Suppl. It*. 29: Aeclanum, p. 92: "l'epiteto assunto dal dio potrebbe aver avuto il duplice scopo di indicare l'importanza del culto cittadino d'Ercole e, nello stesso tempo, quello di omaggiare l'imperatore il cui l'interesse per Aeclanum è noto."

[60] Coarelli 1995, 210. However, this is a guess without evidential basis (the local *salinae* were probably located at the mouth of the river Liris in Minturnae; another (originally) gentilician

(32) *Hercules Victor Certencinus* (†?)
CIL XIV 3553 (= *ILS* 3418 = *Suppl. It. – Imagines. Latium vetus* 1, 636–37, No. 856; Tibur; AD 224) is a dedication to Hercules Victor, a major god in Tibur, by a *nomenclator a censibus* called Aurelius Zoticus:[61] *Herculi Victori / Certenc`i´ino / M. Aurel(ius) Aug. lib. / Zoticus / nom(enclator) a censibus / d(ono) d(edit)*. (dating follows). Concerning the so far unexplained epithet *Certencinus*, it does not look like a derivation from a Latin anthroponym,[62] unless this is an error for *Certencianus*, in which case one might assume the existence of a nomen **Certencius* (cf. *Certius*, and *Cupius ~ Cupencius*, *Pacius ~ Paciencius*, etc.). Interestingly, between the letters C and I, the only point where there was space left, the stonecutter added a small-size vertical stroke inside the letter C, as if having noticed a mistake was about to correct it somehow (see photograph at *EDR*-127756). This is why the epithet is often indexed in the form *Certenciinus*, with double *i*. In any case, if *Certencianus* is correct, it could suggest a cult of Hercules Victor founded or restored by a Certencius, which may have been located on his property, or which at any rate was probably related to a place named after a Certencius.[63]

(33) *Hercules Front(---)* (*)
CIL XI 4669a-b (Tuder; 1st/2nd cent. AD?; lost), two identical boundary stones delimiting the grave area of a sodality of the worshippers of Hercules: *Cult(oribus) Hercul(is) / Front(oniani?) loca data / ab C. Vibenn(io) Honorato. / In fr(onte) p(edes) CL, / in a(gro) p(edes) CXX.* The epithet is normally understood as

---

cult of Hercules, the god's Ara Maxima in Rome, was located close to the Salinae, or 'Salt-works', inhabited by Cacus, who had stolen Hercules's cattle, etc.). Further bibliography in D. Quadrino, in: Ferrante – Lacam – Quadrino 2015, 123.

[61] By some (boldly) identified with Aurelius Zoticus, the famous chamberlord of Elagabalus.

[62] Dessau, *CIL,* comm.: "cognomen videtur derivatum a loco nobis ignoto"; G. Mancini, *Inscr. It.* IV 1, 30, No. 57: "unde ductum sit non liquet." Cf. Granino Cecere (2012, 500): "dal misterioso appellativo *Certencinus.*"

[63] It seems to me that Borghesi (1872, 332) was close to the right solution in assuming, in a letter of 1852, that the epithet could derive from the name of a street or a place where the god was worshipped ("Il cognome Certencino attribuito ad Ercole nell'altra lapide mi è non solo ignoto ma anche inintelligibile, e credo che lo sarà probabilmente anche a molti altri. Però la lapide trovandosi a Tivoli, e l'Ercole essendo il tiburtino a motivo del solito epiteto Victori, potrebbe nascere il sospetto, che fosse il nome di un vico, o di altro luogo del vicinato, in cui quell'Ercole avesse avuto un'ara, come ai nostri giorni frequentemente aggiungiamo ai santi il nome della parrocchia o della villa in cui hanno una chiesa"). Cf. also Henzen, *Orell. Suppl.* (1856), 147, No. 5727: "Nomen *Certenciini* fortasse de vico desumptum."

Front(onianus). Perhaps from either *Frontinius* or *Frontonius* (or from some other nomen beginning with *Front-*), though a derivation from a cognomen (*Fronto, Frontinus*) with the suffix *-ianus* would be equally possible.

(34) *Hercules Gagilianus*
CIL IX 2679 (= *ILS* 7323; cf. M. Buonocore, *CIL* IX S. 1, 1, add. p. 1096; 1st/2nd cent. AD; Aesernia) is the epitaph of an *Augustalis*, who was also a patron of the *collegium* of the worshippers of *Hercules Gagilianus*:[64] *C. Ennius C. l. / Faustillus / sevir Aug., / patronus collegi / cultorum Hercul(is) / Gagiliani. V(ivus) f(ecit)*.[65] This may suggest a cult established by a Gagilius; otherwise, this rare nomen is found perhaps only in Beneventum,[66] which makes one wonder if this Gagilius had connections with the Beneventan area or had his roots there.

Hercules Hervianus (††?)
See: **(36)** *Hercules Nerianus*.

(35) *Herc(ules) Nel(---)* (††?)
CIL I^2 3610 (Interamnia Praetuttiorum; 1st cent. BC; lost) is an inscribed votive[67] *pondus* weighing 16.1 kg: *Herc(uli/-ulis?) Nel (---)*. If the god bears an epithet, it might be derived from a nomen beginning with *Nel-* (e.g., *Nellius*, *Nelpius*).[68] However, this could also be an otherwise unknown local title that is not derived from a person's name; nor can we rule out the possibility that the letters following Hercules's name include abbreviations for something. The text is said to run on

[64] The epithet is given as *Gagillani* in the mss. (similarly, Dessau, *ILS*), for which Mommsen, *CIL* comm., thought of a *Hercules Gallicus* (which is found in *CIL* IX 2322 from Allifae).

[65] For this and the other relatively rare cases of freedmen appearing as corporate patrons, see Wojciechowski 2021, 68, 72.

[66] *CIL* IX 2000; *AE* 2013, 336 (see now Camodeca 2021, 115–19). Cf. also the signaculum *CIL* XV 8236 (possibly a freedman of a Beneventan). There is the further possibility, observed by Salomies (2010, 199 n. 43), that the nomen *Gaegilius* (Γαιγίλιος) that is found as a single name at Messene in the Peloponnese (*Roman Peloponnese* II, Me 202) is identical with *Gagilius*.

[67] Evidence for votive *pondera*, including the present case: Orlandi 2016.

[68] Cf. Degrassi, *CIL,* comm.: "*Nel* quid significet, mihi non liquet." See also Guidobaldi 1995, 260. Buonocore (2009, 304), probably correctly assuming a connection with a landed property, suggested, following some early commentators, *Herc(uli) Nel(eio?)*, but to name the protecting god of a *fundus* belonging to someone from the *gens *Neleia* (?), one would expect the form *Neleianus*.

one of the long sides of the weight, but at the top between the holes for the handle there are reported traces of the letter L.[69]

(36) *Hercules Nerianus*
CIL X 4851 (= *ILS* 7318a; Venafrum; 1st cent. AD): *Amicitiae / Herculis / Neriani. / [I]n fr(onte) p(edes) C*. Probably from the nomen *Nerius*, suggesting that the family had a special relationship with Hercules. This case must be compared with another, later, text from Venafrum, *CIL* X 4850 (= *ILS* 7318), also concerning a grave area of a sodality involved in the cult of the god: *amicitiae Herculani/orum / Herviani(orum?)*. Does this mean that in Venafrum a *Hercules Hervianus* was worshipped along with a *Hercules Nerianus*? This is certainly possible, even if a nomen **Hervius* does not seem to be attested.[70] Yet, the similarity of *Nerianus* to *Hervianus* (or *Hervianii*) might make one wonder if the two inscriptions referred to one and the same *amicitia*, which is why Dessau assumed one of the epithets to be erroneous (*ILS* 7318a: "vix videtur dubitari posse quin altero uno loco erratum sit"). The last line of X 4850 is difficult to read. I saw and copied the inscription in 1998 (and there is a good photograph in the *CIL* X archives in Helsinki): to me NERIANI seems more likely than HERVIANI.[71] If this is correct, the association of the worshippers of *Hercules Nerianus* in Venafrum was called *amicitia Herculis Neriani* in one case and, later, *amicitia Herculaniorum Neriani(orum)* in the other.

(37) *Hercules Augustus Turranianus*
It was long ago reported in passing that this god with his name in the dative (*Herculi Aug. Turraniano*) appears in an unpublished dedication from Ostia (Bloch 1958, 213; cf. Meiggs 1973^2, 350 n. 3). Since then, the text has apparently fallen into oblivion in Ostian scholarship. The inscription perhaps still awaits publication, unless it is lost.[72] Although, unfortunately, the context of the dedication remains obscure (except that the monument should be much

[69] Barnabei 1893, 355.

[70] Di Michele, forthcoming, associates the epithet of the *Herculanii Hervianii* with the nomen *Ervius* attested by *CIL* X 4880 (Q. Ervius Bassus, an *aedilis* in Venafrum; 1st cent. AD), taking the initial H as a hypercorrection. Though possible, this may be less relevant if, as it seems, the existence of a cult of "*Hercules Hervianus*" in Venafrum cannot be confirmed by *CIL* X 4850.

[71] At *EDR*-113323, this is given as *Herviani/orum*, but ORVM is an old restoration (cf. Mommsen, *CIL* X 4850 comm.).

[72] It is not recorded in the principal databanks (*EDCS*, *EDR*), or in Ceccarelli – Marroni 2011, or van Haeperen 2019; 2019–2020. Christer Bruun (Toronto), who is currently working on Roman Ostia, confirmed to me that the inscription really appears to be unpublished.

later than the early Augustan period[73]), and the name of the dedicator is not cited either, the epithet suggests that someone from the Turranian family had founded or renovated a cult of Hercules Augustus at Ostia (for the form, cf. the *Caelestis Aug. Graniana* from Africa, No. **54**). The nomen *Turranius* is well attested at Ostia and Portus, as is the cognomen *Turranianus*.

(38) *Isis Geminiana* (†?)
This goddess is attested as the name of a *navis caudicaria* with grain cargo from a well-known, early third-century AD fresco found in a columbarium along the via Laurentina in Ostia in 1865 (now in the Vatican Museums, Cat. 79638; *CIL* XIV 2028 = *RICIS* 503/1132).[74] The epithet[75] might well originate from the nomen *Geminius*, though the cognomen *Geminus* as a source would be equally possible.

It was common in the ancient world for ships to be named after deities (Isis,[76] the Dioscuri, Hercules, Venus, etc.), but why would Isis have an epithet derived from someone's name in a context unrelated to a temple, statue, or a similar monument? It does not seem very likely that the ship was simply named *Isis Geminiana* after the goddess of the same name whose cult might have existed somewhere in Ostia. Perhaps, then, the owner of the river ship,[77] or some other person associated with it and perhaps at the same time with the grain transport, may have been called *Geminius* or *Geminus*? This is the usual explanation, the popularity of which is perhaps increased by the fact that the widely diffused nomen *Geminius* is also well documented at Ostia. It is conceivable, moreover, that the epithet helped differentiate this ship from others named after the same

[73] This was the only thing revealed by Herbert Bloch 1958, 213.

[74] Floriani Squarciapino (1958, 126) thought it likely that the fresco comes from columbarium No. 31 of the later first century AD (from which it was detached already during the first excavations). If so, the painting decoration must have been added in a later phase. Photograph: https://m.museivaticani.va/content/museivaticani-mobile/en/collezioni/musei/sala-delle-nozze-aldobrandine/affresco-raffigurante-limbarcazione-isis-geminiana.html.

[75] Frequently given as "*Giminiana*". The second letter, which looks like an I, must perhaps be read, and certainly understood, as an E. The form "*Isis Gemina*" in Deniaux (2007, 76) must be due to a simple slip.

[76] For the grain ship called *Isis* described by Lucian in his *Navigium*, see Houston (1987, 446 n. 9), pointing out that the name of the ship in Petronius's *Satyricon* (114) may also have been *Isis*.

[77] Thus Floriani Squarciapino 1962, 33, and many others. Vidman (1969, 254) claimed that the person who had named his boat *Giminiana* was the steersman (*Farnaces magister*) depicted in the fresco.

goddess.[78] As such, the practice of assigning double or even triple names to ships was common, as attested, for example, by several papyri (compare the ship called *Antinous Philosarapis Sôzôn* [*SB* VI 9571, 5; AD 149, Fayoum][79]), and by anchors inscribed with ship names.

However, although the derivation of *Geminiana* from a human name is linguistically and typologically quite possible, the ship context not only seems somewhat strange but is seemingly unparalleled for an anthroponymic epithet of this type. This is why I am wondering if it would be useful to look for an alternative solution: Could it be possible that *Geminiana* refers to cooperation between deities? I am thinking of the Dioscuri, who as patrons of navigation enjoyed a major cult at the port city of Ostia. Their temple may have been situated near the harbour where the grain fleet docked, before the cargoes were transported by river ships (like the *Isis Geminiana*) up the Tiber to Rome.[80] The twin brothers were often referred to this way (*Didymoi*, *Gemini*),[81] and like Isis these gods of the namesake constellation were long known as patrons of ships and seafaring, appearing as gods of St. Elmo's fire as early as Alcaeus (fr. 34). Both Isis and the Dioscuri not only often gave their own names to ships but they were also famously polyonymous, the former (*myrionyma*) known for her remarkable ability to identify and cooperate with other deities.

Divine names juxtaposed to those of other gods (and heroes) are well known, and sometimes when the field of action of a goddess associates with that of a god, or the other way round, this is grammatically expressed with an adjectival epiclesis (e.g., *Athena Areia* / *Hephaistia*; *Zeus Damatrios* / *Heraios*).[82] In some other cases, this sort of binomial theonym may be explained, in addition to the gender difference, or regardless of it, by the topographic closeness of two cults to

[78] As suggested by Bricault 2019, 272 n. 147.

[79] Laurent Bricault kindly pointed this papyrus out to me.

[80] Gartrell 2021, also suggesting (Ch. 1) that the area of the Circus temple of Castor and Pollux near the Tiber in Rome may have been linked to the grain trade, which in turn may be read in the light of the role of the Dioscuri as protectors of sailors (Ch. 3).

[81] Evidence for the Dioscuri as *Gemini* (literature; coins; the Caesars Gaius and Lucius sometimes linked to the Dioscuri and called *Gemini*, etc.): Gartrell 2021, Ch. 4. For the Dioscuri and the personal names *Didymus*, *Geminus* and *Gemellus*, see Solin 1990, 11–15, 63, 65, 77. As for the epigraphy of Ostia and Portus, the Dioscuri are not known to have borne real epithets there (they are qualified as both *Castor venerandeque Pollux* and *magna Iovis proles* in the early 3rd-century AD poem *CIL* XIV 1 = *CLE* 251); see Van Haeperen 2019–2020, 281.

[82] For the phenomenon, see Parker 2005, 219–21.

each other,[83] or by a deity having something in common with, or covering the qualities of, another.[84] The interpretation of *Geminiana* being derived from the Dioscuri, or the Gemini, might otherwise be supported by another ship image, from the acropolis of Nymphaeum in the Crimea in the Bosporan Kingdom from around the mid-third century BC, representing a trireme with the name *Isis* inscribed on its bow: the ship so named can be clearly associated with the *parasemon* of one of the Dioscuri on the same vessel.[85]

(39) *Lares Apic(atiani?)* (†?)
CIL IX 8193 (= *Suppl. It.* 9: Amiternum 5; second half of the 2nd cent. AD; see photograph at *EDR*-100054): *[Pro] ṣa[lut(e)] / [-] Ḅaebi Rufṛ/ịaṇị Iuliaṇi / Laribus Apic(atianis)*. If the reading is correct,[86] this could be a dedication to the *Lares Apic(atiani)* for the health of an individual. Although the precise context of the dedication remains obscure, the restoration of the epithet (suggested by S. Segenni) is possible because the nomen *Apicatus* is otherwise attested at

[83] E.g., *Bona Dea Apollinaris*, where the Apollo in question may be the *Medicus*/*Sosianus* (*CIL* VI 39819 = *AE* 2007, 251, found in reuse in the exedra of the Crypta Balbi); *Iuno Martialis* (whose cult in Rome is attested by third-century AD coins with the legenda IVNONI MARTIALI [also in the nominative], perhaps so named because of its location in the Campus Martius and/or because it was close to some shrine of Mars; cf. E. M. Steinby, *LTUR* III [1996], 123). A related, though not quite similar, case is found in Portus, where a priest of *Liber Pater Bonadiensium* made a dedication to Silvanus (*CIL* XIV 4328 = Brouwer 1989, 72–76, No. 67), his title suggesting that there was a cult of Liber Pater in a *vicus* called *Bonadiensium* (or *Bonadiensis*), obviously so named after a sanctuary there of Bona Dea. The intent would have been to differentiate this cult of Liber Pater from the public one at the god's temple overlooking the hexagonal basin of Trajan (see Van Haeperen 2019, 276–77, 291–92; Ead. 2019–2020, 285; Ead. 2021, 205). The god Liber himself probably could have been called "*Bonadiensis*" as well.

[84] Cf. *Venus Martialis* (together with Victoria and Isis, *CIL* XI 5165 = *RICIS* 510/0101; Perusia; 2nd cent. AD; lost. Schraudolph [1993, 68 n. 26] thought alternatively that the goddess used someone's personal cognomen as her epithet, but this is most unlikely); *Augusta Bona Dea Cereria* (*CIL* V 761 = *ILS* 3499) and *M(ater) D(eum) M(agna) Cereria* (*CIL* V 796 = *ILS* 4101), both from Aquileia; *Bona Dea Isiaca* (*Suppl. It.* 18: Ameria 1). As for the theonym *Mars Cyprius* of *CIL* XI 5805 (= *ILS* 3151; Iguvium), rather than with the Cyprian Venus, it may show the god Mars associated with the Umbrian goddess Cupra (or, at least, bearing an epithet derived from the Umbrian-Sabine lexical item ***kupro-*** meaning 'good'). Cf. also *Silvanus Pegasianus* (No. **91**) and *Liber Kallinicianus* (No. **77**).

[85] Murray 2001, 252, Fig. 2 (bow detail). Cf. Braund 2018, 162; Bricault 2019, 27, with n. 111. Incidentally, one may note that the Alexandrian ship Paul boarded after a period spent on Malta is reported to have had the Dioscuri as its device (*Acts* 28:11). Who knows if the ship bore the name of *Isis*?

[86] Line 1 is especially uncertain, and one may wonder whether a dedicator's name should be looked for in line 3.

Amiternum (*CIL* IX 8273–74 = *Suppl. It.* 9: Amiternum 76–77). This seems to be the current interpretation, and it may well be correct.[87]

On the other hand, if a name is needed, the abbreviation could as well stand for the genitive of a nomen or cognomen beginning with *Apic-*, unless, though less likely, the Lares are those of an *A. Pic(---)*. But it is equally possible that this is an epithet not derived from a personal name, or no epithet at all. In that case, APIC might belong to the name of a dedicator (cf. n. 86), or, to speculate further, it might stand for the offering given to the Lares. In this hypothetical eventuality, I cannot think of anything but *apic(em)* or *apic(es)*, a conical hat that was worn by at least some Roman priests. However, the term *apex* meaning 'mitre', 'diadem' or 'crown' is known almost exclusively from the literary sources[88] and does not seem to be epigraphically documented as a sacred offering. What is interesting, on the other hand, is that the Lares are sometimes represented as wearing a sort of *pileus*.[89]

(40) *Lares Marcellini(ani)* (††?)
A *coll(egium) Larum Marcellini* is known from Saepinum (*CIL* IX 2481 = V. Scocca, in: Capini – Curci – Picuti 2014, 90; probably 2nd cent. AD; lost). Although it is very likely that *Larum* is followed by the genitive of the cognomen *Marcellinus*, one may speculate that *Marcellini* (where the last two letters are said to be in ligature) is an abbreviation for *Marcellini(anorum)*, which could have been derived from the nomen *Marcellinius* (for an abbreviation resembling this, cf. *Neriani(orum)* at No. **36**). However, this nomen is relatively rare and mainly found in provincial territory. For this case, see also below p. 93.

Liber Gratillianus (*)
See: (**86**) *Liber Gratillianus*.

(41) "*Mars Sminthianus*" (††)
Regarding the denomination *mariś isminthians* known from a late fourth-century BC Etruscan mirror from Bolsena (*CIE* 10840 = Rix, *ET* Vs S. 14; G. Camporeale, *ThesCRA* II 54, No. 98), Heurgon (1950, 487) deduced from it the existence of

[87] The possibility of *a(rgenti) p(ondo) IC* is duly excluded by M. Buonocore, *CIL*.

[88] *ThLL* II 226–27. Cf. *CIL* VI 1288 = I^2 10 (Elog. Scip.): *quei apice(m) insigne(m) Dial[is fl]aminis gesistei*.

[89] See, for example, T. Tam Tinh, *LIMC* VI.1 (1992), 206–207, Nos. 16, 26–28 (paintings; Delos), 24 (bronze statuette; provenance uncertain); 209, No. 66 (painting; Pompeii). The participial adjective *apicatus*, 'wearing the *apex*', also exists, but is very rare (Ov. *fast*. 3,397).

the god "Mars Sminthianus", whose protective function would have been similar to that of *Apollo Smintheus* (cf. also Trinquier 2008, 182), adding that the epithet could have been derived from the family of the Sminthii of Bolsena (in the same way, he argued, as *Hercules Aemilianus* and *Silvanus Veturianus* were given their surnames after the respective nomina gentilicia). However, although *isminthians* might be related to *Smintheus* (rather than *Ismenios*, another epithet of Apollo that has also been proposed), not only is its precise meaning unclear, but also the identity of Etr. *mariś* with Lat. *Mars* remains linguistically uncertain.[90] Moreover, it is very risky to assume the existence of a theonym of the type "Mars Sminthianus" as early as the fourth century BC, while comparing it to the theonyms accompanied with epithets in - *ianus* that came into use considerably later. Therefore, even if the (originally Etruscan) nomen *Smintius* is attested,[91] there is nothing to suggest a derivation of *isminthians* from the name of an allegedly local *gens Sminthia*.

(42) *Mefitis Utiana* (†?)

For a long time, it was thought, and still is, especially following Lejeune (cf. 1986, 202; Id. 1990, 37), that the epithet *Utiana* is related to the ethnicon of the Lucanian community (**touto utianom*) that controlled the territory of Rossano di Vaglio and was thus also responsible for the great sanctuary of the goddess there. However, as there may be no evidence for tribal divisions among the Lucanians, according to a more recent hypothesis, the epithet, derived from the gentilician anthroponym *Utius*, would denote a cult going back to this ancient family, a prominent member of which would have led the Lucanians in the Vaglio area from their earlier seats.[92] Others have taken *Utiana* as derived from a toponym (**Utia*). The matter is complex and probably needs further investigation. In any case, Mefitis, whose cult spread extensively outside the original core area over time, was worshipped at the sanctuary of Rossano di Vaglio until at least the early Principate. From c. 100 BC, the inscriptions gradually begin to be in Latin, and later, in the Imperial period, the cult was transferred to the neighbouring town

[90] M. Cristofani, *LIMC* VI.1 (1992), 358–60; Domenici 2009, 232–35.

[91] Used as a cognomen in inscriptions from Etruria (*CIL* XI 1616 [Florentia]; *AE* 1987, 366 [Clusium]) and found in Oscan inscriptions (*Imag. It.* 450–52: Capua 36–37; c. 330 BC, a "Vibius Smintius"). For the possibility that the nomen *Mintius* (and *Minthius*?) features a development of *Smintius*, cf. Salomies 2012, 173 n. 100.

[92] Torelli (M. R.) 1990, 84–85. Cf. Torelli (M.) 2011, 333 (reviewing the different hypotheses). For the question, see also Perretti 2004, 58; Calisti 2006, 81–87; de Cazanove 2011, 37–38; Id. 2017, 213.

of Potentia. The binomial designation *Mefitis Utiana* occurs in both Oscan (early third to first cent. BC) and Latin dedications (Oscan: *Imag. It.* 1391–93: Potentia 17–18. — Latin: *RV*-22,[93] -32 [Lejeune 1990, 17–18], -45; *CIL* I^2 3163a; *CIL* X 131–133, with further discussion in, e.g., Lejeune 1990, 36–37; Perretti 2004, 59–62; Senatore 2004; Battiloro 2017, Ch. 4.3.2; De Martino, forthcoming).[94]

Although the theonym *Mefitis Utiana* seems typologically comparable to other cases where the epithet is derived from a nomen with the suffix *-ianus/a*, and the goddess might conceivably have originally been worshipped within a single family, her cult, unlike the others named by the same method, appears to have developed into an important regional institution documented over a considerable period of time, involving both the public and private sphere, and touching both genders as well as most levels of society. At Rossano, Mefitis was also associated with some of the major gods of the Italic pantheon (Jupiter, Mars, Hercules) and her close relationship with Juno and Leucothea is well known.[95] What would make the case of *Utiana* even more special is the possibility that in one Latin text from Rossano this same epithet relates to Venus,[96] which, if true, would testify to the mobility and flexibility of religious beliefs in this area, as well as to the interaction between the Italic and Roman cults, while providing further evidence for the otherwise known association of the Roman Venus with the cult of Mefitis at the Lucanian sanctuary.[97]

All this makes one wonder whether the epithet of *Mefitis Utiana* was based on something other than the name of one individual family, this idea perhaps having been influenced by the presumption that a divine epithet in *-ianus* should, in principle, be taken as having been derived from a family name, as indeed most often was the case. However, the evidence for *-ianus* being related to family cults is not, at least in the Latin-speaking areas, earlier than the Late Republic when the

---

[93] Note, however, that the Acerronius mentioned in this inscription (*[---] Acerro[nius ---] / [--- M]efitis U[tianae] / ---*) may not be the consul of AD 37, as Lejeune and many others claimed (now also Engfer 2017, 200), but an earlier exponent of this family; see the bibliography cited by Senatore 2004, 319 n. 96.

[94] As for *CIL* X 3811 from Monte Tifata (Capua), the reading *Mefiti(i) U[tia]n(ae) sacra* is to be corrected to *Mefitu(-) sacra* (see add. p. 976 and *CIL* I^2 3473).

[95] Poccetti 2008.

[96] *]Ven(eri) U<t>ian<ae>[* (RV-04bis, cf. Lejeune 1990, 15, 36, 61).

[97] Cf. *Imag. It.* 1399: Potentia 22 (= *ST* Lu 31): *ϝενζηι Μεϝ[ιτ---]* (the morphological problem with the name ending does not affect the association between Venus and Mephitis emerging from this document), cf. Poccetti (2008, 159–60), with a discussion of this and other evidence (e.g., the use of the epithet *Fisica* by both goddesses).

suffix *-ianus* came into wider use, whereas Mefitis is proven to be called *Utiana* at least as early as the third century BC. Could it instead be that *Utiana*, whatever its exact meaning,[98] was one of the adjectival determiners describing the nature and activities of Mefitis at Rossano where, in dedications, she was also *Aravina* and *Caporoinna*, the former epithet perhaps related to the agrarian world, and the latter to the pastoral one while also suggesting a connection with Juno? Then, at some early stage, derivatives from the same source would have come into use as anthroponyms, the epithet also being assigned to Venus during the process of convergence between the Italic and Roman religions.

Concerning the nomina *utiis*, *Utius* and *Utianus*, as well as the divine epithet *Utiana* and the assumed toponym **Utia*, it seems that they all rest on a common linguistic root. However, what we know of the use of the nomen *Utius* hardly confirms any connection with the local Mefitis. The Oscan form of this nomen seems to be attested only once (*Imag*. *It.* 504: Cumae 8; early 2nd cent. BC), and it may be significant that although *Utius* is well and widely documented from the late Republic onwards, it is not found in Lucania, and only rarely in the Latin inscriptions of other Oscan-speaking regions (Aesernia: *CIL* IX 2655 = 6763, 2673 [?, cf. M. Buonocore, *CIL* IX S. 1, 1, add. p. 1095], 2691. – Venafrum: Capini 1999, 210. – Iuvanum: *CIL* IX 2975 = *CIL* I^2 1761).[99] Instead, the nomen *Utianus*, which, perhaps by chance, does not seem to be attested as a cognomen (< *Utius*), is known from two Lucanian inscriptions (*CIL* X 442 = Sansone 2021, 132, No. 17 [Numistro, Muro Lucano/PZ]; *Inscr. It.* III 1, 113 = Sansone 2021, 237, No. 83 [Volcei]), the latter, and earlier, of which dates between AD 14 and 42.[100] What is interesting is that this seemingly local nomen is identical with the epithet of Mefitis. Could this be further proof that, in the earlier linguistic traditions of Italy, a divine epithet sometimes coincided with a nomen (cf. Introduction, and *passim*)? Almost nothing is known about the history of the

[98] Untermann (2000, 817): "Bd. unbekannt; Et. unbekannt; Ableitung von einem ON?" A reference to water (related to agriculture, fertility, health, ritual, etc.) might fit the context, considering that in the literary tradition the cult(s) of Mefitis were frequently associated with the presence of various type of water (sulphurean, etc.). Cf. Manco 2012 and 2016, who, while plausibly pointing out that there is no ethnicon or anthroponymic element behind the term, interprets *Utiana* as a term of the hydronymic type, that is, basically a toponym.

[99] The inscription *CIL* X 3667 (Misenum; epitaph of an Uttius) is often listed together with these inscriptions, but it likely comes from Rome (cf. Parma 2016). For the *gens Utia*, cf. also Priuli 1985, 221–26, and Stefanile 2017, 319–21 (especially concerning the origin of the Utii known from Spain)

[100] Solin 1981, 37. The man mentioned in the text, C. Utianus C.f. Pom. Rufus Latinianus, was a Latinius who had been regularly adopted by a C. Utianus (Salomies 1992, 21).

nomen *Utianus*, but it may be old if indeed it represents a transformation of the goddess's family-unrelated epithet into an anthroponym which, then, would not have been derived from the nomen *Utius*.[101] One might well imagine a "*Gaius Utianus*" who lived during the heyday of the sanctuary in the later Republic; his onomastic formula (praenomen + nomen-adj.) would have been structurally identical with that of *Mefitis Utiana* (name + adjective).

(43) *Nymphae Domitianae*
CIL XI 3286 (= *ILS* 3876; ad lacum Sabatinum) is a silver cup inscribed *Apollini et Nymphis Domitianis / Q. Cassius Ianuarius d(ono) d(edit)*. This is usually taken to refer to Domitian's contribution to the building or restoration of the baths of Vicarello, or at least to the emperor's possessions and personal interest in the thermal area.[102] However, although Domitian may have had to do with the baths, the epithet given to the Nymphs does not prove this,[103] the only sure thing being that it is derived from the nomen *Domitius*. In none of the several other dedications to Apollo and the Nymphs from Vicarello, which are usually dated between the first and the second century AD,[104] do the latter bear the epithet *Domitianae*. Although the absence of an epithet is often no reliable guide for dating, one wonders if this could suggest that these dedications predate the offering *CIL* XI 3286.

(44) *Silvanus Cornelianus*
AE 1925, 118 (Beneventum; 2nd/3rd cent. AD; for the reading of line 4, cf. *EDR*-072970 [G. Camodeca, U. Soldovieri]): *Sacrum / Silvano Co/rneliano / permissu C. L(---) R(---) et `Ạ. P(---)´ / Rufi M. Pampineius / Rufinus a(nimo) l(ibenti) v(otum) s(olvit)*; on the right, perhaps so abbreviated: *S(ilvano) M(arcus) P(ampineius) R(ufinus) D(eo) B(ono) b(ene) m(erito) a(nimo) l(ibenti) v(otum) s(olvit)*. It seems that Rufinus needed permission from two other persons to make his dedication. Silvanus is also *Deus Bonus*, if this is what is meant here (cf. *AE* 2008, 503 [Suasa; 3rd cent. AD]: *Silvano Deo Bono*, etc.). The god may have protected a fundus *Cornelianus*.

---

[101] Concerning the chronology, the evidence of the Oscan/Latin nomina in *-ianus* is of little help here (Oscan: almost non-existent: Salomies 2012, 167; Latin: Salomies 1984, 97–100).

[102] Cf. Basso 2013, 257; Petraccia 2013, 178–79, both with earlier bibliography.

[103] See also Maiuro 2012, 317 (and Buonopane – Petraccia 2014, 220).

[104] *CIL* XI 3287–88, 3289 (together with Silvanus), 3290 (the Nymphs alone), 3294 (together with Asclepius and Silvanus); cf. Calapà 2022, 105–108.

(45) *Silvanus Curtianus*
AE 1981, 240 (Beneventum; late 2nd to early 3rd cent. AD): *Silvano / Curti[a-] no / L. Staius / Herodotus / v. l. s. / `Νεικετι´*. A *fundus Curtianus* is attested in AD 101(*CIL* IX 1455, col. III, 69).[105] A child homonymous with the dedicator is known from *CIL* IX 1971. The fourth-century addition of the signum (voc. of Νικέτι(ο)ς),[106] whether referring to a later owner of the *fundus* or to some other person, might indicate that the cult still endured at that time.

(46) *Silvanus Lusianus*
CIL IX 2125 (AD 236; Beneventum) is a dedication to Silvanus inscribed on living rock by Q. Satrius Secundus. Besides recording the donation of at least a *sella* (perhaps reserved for the players of the *syntonum*) on the right-hand side of the monument, the text seems to mention, among other things, the god's *signum* within a *lararium*.[107] A connection with the otherwise known *fundus Lusianus* is likely (*CIL* IX 1455, col. II, 70; AD 101).

(47) *Silvanus Nervinianus*
CIL IX 8955 (= *AE* 1994, 560; Cures Sabini; 2nd cent. AD): *Silvano Nervi/niano sacrum.* Probably from the (originally Umbrian?) nomen *Nervinius*.[108] Perhaps there was a *fundus Nervinianus*, of which this Silvanus was the guardian.

(48) *Silvanus Settianus*
EE VIII 94 (Beneventum; AD 211): *C. Oppius / Athenio / Setti`a´no / Silvano vo/tum libe/ns solvit. Gentiano et / Basso co(n)s(ulibus) / k(alendis) Sep(tembribus)*. Note the reverse order of the god's names (***Settiano Silvano***).[109] The god may well have operated in a *fundus Settianus* (< *Settius*).[110]

---

[105] Cf. Maio 1976; De Carlo 2013, 305.

[106] The editor took the signum as either Νικήτι or Νικῆτι, but see L. Robert, *BullÉp* 1978, 575.

[107] Cf. Dorcey 1992, 25; Schraudolph 1993, 190, No. S37; Laforge 2009, 20 (on the term *lararium*); Falcone 2016, 170 (Silvanus and music).

[108] For the nomen, see Salomies 2010, 201. M. Buonocore, *CIL*: "Appellatio domestica Nerviniani, ex nomine gentilicio *Nervinius* (vel potius *Nervinus* ut cogitat H. Solin apud *AE*) deprompta."

[109] Cf. No. **95**: *Silvanus Valentius* (inscr. *Valentio Silvano*). However, this case needs complete reconsideration and is not pertinent here.

[110] Concerning the epithet, cf. Maio (1976, 292): "*Settianus* o *Settinus*", but the small letter A belongs, of course, to the epithet.

(49) *Silvanus Staianus*
CIL IX 1552 (Beneventum; lost): *Silvano Staiano* / *Plautia Felicitas* / *pro filio Crescentino* / *votum libens solvit*.[111] The god was perhaps the patron of a *fundus Staianus* (< *Staius*).

(50) *Silvanus Veturianus*
CIL XI 3082 (Falerii Novi; lost): *Silvano* / *Veturiano*. This may suggest that the god protected a *fundus Veturianus* (< *Veturius*, a nomen otherwise attested in Falerii).[112]

(51) *Victoria Mariana*
Gaius Marius, whose claims of victory rested primarily on that over the Cimbri and Teutones in 102–101 BC, seems to have associated himself with the figure of Victory.[113] Somewhat curiously, the writer Julius Obsequens refers to a statue of *Victoria Mariana* near Mutina in the context of a prodigy in 42 BC, that is, long after Marius (who died in 86 BC).[114] The source is very late but, if it rests on Livy, may be significant. However, as has been noted, the monument was not necessarily set up in Marius's day or, if it was, not necessarily called *Victoria Mariana* then.[115] In any case, nothing suggests that a victory goddess referred to by this epithet enjoyed an official cult in Marius's time. It is reported that Marius also had two victory monuments erected in Rome, but although there is no record of their having been referred to by any epithet,[116] the possibility exists that the statue at Mutina was not the only one representing *Victoria Mariana*. Cf. Introduction p. 14.

---

[111] Women involved in the cult of Silvanus: Dorcey 1989, 148–49.

[112] I. Di Stefano Manzella (*Suppl. It*. 1: Falerii Novi, p. 115) wondered if the dedication was made by the L. Veturius Clemens known from *CIL* XI 7535.

[113] Weinstock 1957, 224; Richard 1965.

[114] Obseq. 70: *In Mutinensi Victoriae Marianae signum meridiem spectans sua sponte conversum in septentrionem hora quarta* ("By Mutina, the statue of Marian Victory facing south turned, of its own accord, towards north at the fourth hour").

[115] Rawson 1974, 205; Clark 2007, 131 n. 44. Cf. Bernstein 1998, 322 (assuming that the *Victoria Mariana* in Obsequens was probably modelled on the analogy of *Victoria Sullana*; possibly so, according to Richard 1965, 85 n. 4).

[116] E.g., Val. Max. 6,9,14 (*cuius bina tropaea in urbe spectantur*); Suet. *Iul*. 11; Plut. *Caes*. 6; cf. Mackay 2000, 164–65.

(52) *[--- N?]ervaianus*
CIL IX 8154 (ager Aequiculanus; 2nd cent. AD): *C. +ullius P.f. [---] / dat don(um) / [--- N]ervaiano / [v. s.] l. m*. Perhaps an epithet coined from a nomen ending in *-ervaius* (like **Nervaius*), unless this is an attribute of unexplained meaning and origin, or the name of an otherwise unattested god. In the lacuna before ERVAIANO there may have been space for several letters. According to an earlier, implausible reading, the dedication would have been made to a "*Her(cules) Vaianus*" (see M. Buonocore, *CIL*, who opts for an epithet of Silvanus).

(53) *(deus) Visidianus* (††?)
According to a list of local deities of Italian municipalities given by Tertullian, and drawing on Varro, a god named *Visidianus* was worshipped in Narnia in southern Umbria (*Narnensium Visidianus*).[117] This would seem to suggest a god related to the *gens Visidia*, especially because a knight with this nomen, L. Visidius, active in 43 BC, is mentioned by Cicero (*Phil*. 7,24).[118] The nomen is not known from any other source. However, as noted in the Introduction (p. 18), although the theonym *Visidianus* would seem to be self-evidently derived from the nomen *Visidius*, its interpretation may be more complex than it seems at first glance. Are we dealing with a god, like "*Hercules Visidianus*", who is here recorded only by his epithet? This is not very likely, as the deities listed by Tertullian seem to appear by their own names. Would it be, then, rather so that the reference is to a *deus Visidianus*, where the latter element, derived from the nomen *Visidius*, is not an epithet, but functions as an independent theonym, just like *deus Apollo*, or *dea Minerva*? This is clearly a better option, and it could be paralleled by the case of the Roman *dea Satriana* (No. **23**). A further, albeit somewhat speculative, possibility would be that, in this specific case, *Visidianus* is a theonym coinciding

[117] Tert. *apol*. 24,8: *Casiniensium Delventinus, Narnensium Visidianus, Asculanorum Ancharia, Volsiniensium Nortia, Ocriculanorum Valentia, Sutrinorum Hostia; Faliscorum in honore patris Curris et accepit cognomen Iuno* (cf. Tert. *nat*. 2,8,6, mentioning Varro as his source: *vel quos Varro ponit: Casiniensium Delventinum, Narniensium Visidianum, Atiniensium Numiternum, Asculanorum Anchariam, et quam † praeuerint, Vulsiniensium Nortiam*). The god Visidianus is not attested by any other sources. Nor is anything known about the Delventinus of Casinum (Latte 1960, 58 n. 1, thought his name could be based on a toponym).

[118] This made Syme (1939, 83) wonder if Cicero's friend had a connection to Narnia (in the Index, p. 568, Visidianus is labelled his "family-god"). Cf. Id. (2016, 307), in reference to the same man, "The name Visidius has non-Latin stigmata, and a deity called the *deus Visidianus* was worshipped at Narnia—clearly the god of the *gens Visidia*" (edited from a typescript by Syme dating to the second half of the 1950s that was intended to be part of a book on Rome and Umbria).

with an otherwise unattested nomen gentilicium (**Visidianus*),[119] just as the other deities mentioned by Tertullian and his source shared their names with humans (goddess Ancharia ~ *gens Ancharia*, etc.).

However, any interpretation involving a family cult may be complicated by the god being labelled *Narnensium*, this perhaps suggesting that his worship was important among the larger civic community, and not only within the Visidian family (whose supposed connection to Narnia is based, significantly, on the theonym alone). In the case of a family cult, moreover, one could imagine that the deity was female. Therefore, one wonders if *Visidianus* was rather a local god with a name of unexplained origin who was related to the *gens Visidia* perhaps only in so far as the name of both was based on the same linguistic root which could have appeared, for example, in an unknown place name.[120] I must say that I am inclined to consider this a viable solution (cf. also the discussion of the epithet *Utiana* and the related nomina, No. **42**: *Mefitis Utiana*). In any event, I have listed this god under the item *Visidianus*, because this is the only name by which he is known and also probably the one applied to him in antiquity.[121]

3.3. Africa

(54) *Caelestis Augusta Graniana*

The inscription *ILAfr.* 345 from Zaouïa Mornag in Tunis (Africa Proconsularis), perhaps from the second century AD, records the transfer and restoration of a destroyed sanctuary of Caelestis Augusta, a goddess attested by numerous dedications from the African provinces: *Caeles[t]i Aug(ustae) Granianae sacr[um]. / Q. Voltius Senecio templum vi fluminis ereptum traṇstulit et a solo fecit idemque dedicạ[vit].*[122] The epithet *Graniana*, rather than emerging with the new dedication, presumably goes back to the time of the first sanctuary. It must be derived from the name of the Granii, probably Roman settlers of the late Republic or early Empire; one may think of the Granii of Puteoli in particular, a

[119] Cf. the nomen *Visidienus* in Salonae (*CIL* III 6382, a man from Urbs Salvia in Picenum).

[120] Von Blumenthal (1941, 322) claimed that the theonym is a compositum (*Visi-dianus*) with Illyrian background. Latte (1960, 58 n. 1) wondered if *Visidianus* could be derived from a place name.

[121] Claiming that "*deus Visidianus* means the (unnamed) god that protects the *gens Visidia*" (Fishwick 1978, 379) is odd, because clearly the god is named.

[122] Kolb 2015, 230; Ben Romdhane 2018, 328–29, No. 4; Gasparini 2020, 388–89.

prominent family that was active in various parts of the Mediterranean, as well as in Africa.[123] Perhaps the Granius who had built or restored the original temple was one of them or descended from them. In any case, the epithet must refer simultaneously to both the builder and his family.

(55) *Caelestis Sittiana*
The epithet *Sittiana*, derived from the nomen of P. Sittius, the founder of the Numidian colony of Cirta (*colonia Sittianorum Cirta*), seems to be coupled with a toponymic significance showing a close attachment of Caelestis to this city. This must have been a public cult, which was not confined to the Sittian family, the goddess Caelestis serving as the tutelary goddess of the entire civic community of Cirta.[124] Interestingly, the theonym is sometimes abbreviated to the sole epithet, e.g., *sacerdos loci secundi templi Sittianae*, "a priest of the second rank of the temple of Sittiana" (*ILAlg.* II 804, Cirta; for an example of variation, cf. *ibid*. 807: *sacerdos Caelestis Sittiane loci primi*).

(56) *Iuno Cassiana*
The goddesses *Iuno Cassiana* (*IRT* 317B; cf. Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 200, 288; Cadotte 2007, 442, No. 26) and *Venus Cassiana* (*IRT* 317A; cf. Brouquier-Reddé 1992, 204, 288), named, respectively, on two identical statue bases in Lepcis Magna,[125] had their epithet from the nomen *Cassius*. In both cases, the goddess's name is in the nominative (cf. *Diana Cariciana* [No. **66**], *Fortuna Iuveniana / Lampadiana* [No. **16**], *Venus Lucilliana* [No. **81**]). No dedicators are recorded, and the closer identity of the Cassius who sponsored the cults with the related statues remains unknown. These may have been private cults, but one could also think of an office holder like Q. Cassius Gratus, praetorian governor of the province of Crete and Cyrenaica and propraetorian legate of Africa under Claudius, who was involved in major building projects locally (Thomasson 1996, 104). On the other hand, it may well be that the statues were set up on the initiative of the

[123] D'Arms 1974, 108; Lassère 1977, 92; Camodeca 2018, *passim*. See also the evidence collected by Criniti 1993, 153–56 (bibliography on the Granii in Africa: 155 n. 255).

[124] Cadotte 2007, 90 (arguing that *Caelestis Sittiana* is the result of the assimilation between the Genius of the Sittian colony and the Punic goddess Tanit/Caelestis, the traditional protector of the Numidian city); Gasparini 2020, 386–88.

[125] There was also a third one, with an illegible inscription, see Gasparini, forthcoming.

city in thanks for the benefactions of a euergete from the Cassian family, perhaps precisely the Claudian Gratus, or another equally well-profiled figure.[126]

(57) *Nymphae Flavianae Septimianae Augustae*
In the Roman (military) bath of Aquae Flavianae (Hammam Essalihine) close to Mascula in ancient Numidia, several inscriptions were found, including dedications to the Nymphs, one of which was made to the *Flavianae Septimianae* (*BCTH* 1936-37, 110–11): *N<y>mp(his) Fl(avianis) Sep(timianis) Aug(ustis)*. The epithet *Flavianae* alludes to the Vespasianic foundation of the building, and *Septimianae* to its restoration carried out by Septimius Severus.[127]

(58) *Venus Cassiana*
See: **(56)** *Iuno Cassiana*.

[126] See Gasparini, forthcoming. Cadotte (2007, 223) thought of a private cult in each case. Whether the Cassian goddesses had anything to with the Punic Astarte or the Venus Erycina, as sometimes claimed, is unknown.

[127] For a full analysis of the epigraphic documents, see Ibba – Mastino 2017 (the present dedication: p. 196).

4. Theonym + nomen-*ian-ensis*

A divine epithet could also be derived from a personal name indirectly by being based on a toponym which in turn was named after a person, usually that person's nomen. Such epithets were coined with *-ensis*, a suffix peculiar to ethnics, the name of either a *fundus* or a *domus* or of some other place usually acting as an intermediary between the nomen and the new theonym (e.g., *Valerius* > *fundus Valerianus* > *Silvanus Valerianensis*).[1] In practice, there was probably no substantial difference between *Silvanus Valerianus* and *Silvanus Valerianensis*, except that *Valerianensis* referred more clearly and concretely to a cult located in a place owned and administered by someone from the Valerian family. At the same time, such an epithet signalled that a deity lived in a particular place, protected it, and influenced its surroundings. According to the same naming principle, those who in Rome's Trastevere lived in a *vicus* named after the statue of some prominent Valerius (*vicus statuae Valerianae*: *CIL* VI 975 = 31218, lat. dextr. col. iii, 6; AD 136), were known as *Statuavalerianenses* (*CIL* VI 41329, fr. a+b, col. xii, 6; AD 375/376; cf. Leumann 1977, 384).

Only a few examples of this epithet type are known.[2] Some of them require closer examination.

4.1. Rome

(59) *Bona Dea Annianensis* (†?)
CIL VI 69 (= 30689 = *ILS* 3511 = Brouwer 1989, 32, No. 19; late 1st/early 2nd cent. AD): *C. Tullius Hesper / et Tullia Restituta / Bonâe Deae Annia/nensi Sanctissim(ae) / donum / posuerunt*. The epithet *Annianensis* (earlier, often read as *Anneanensis*) is usually associated with the *domus* of an Annian family (*domus Anniana*) located somewhere in Rome, of which Bona Dea would have been the

[1] Some evidence for this type is collected by Camodeca 2017, 120–22; Id. 2021, 108.

[2] As for a theonym like *Saturnus Privatensis* from Africa (*ILAfr*. 347), rather than derived form a personal name the epithet seems of toponymic origin, perhaps drawing on the expression "*privatum/a* + genitive" (like *privata Traiani / Hadriani*, or *(iter) privatum*, *(via) privata*, etc.). Other, similar African theonyms in *-ensis* (*Belensis*, *Sobarensis*, etc.) must also be derived from local toponyms. Sometimes, of course, such a toponym may be variously related to a personal name, but this is a different matter completely.

patroness. However, despite attempts to relate the inscription to a given house,[3] the provenance of the small altar is unknown. Onomastically, *Annianensis* may, of course, be associated with a *domus Anniana*, but equally it could be related to a *fundus Annianus* or to some other place or monument connected with the Annian family.

Concerning the modern history of the altar, in the second half of the eighteenth century it was still in the collection of antiquities of Cardinal Domenico Passionei at Camaldoli above Frascati. It then ended up in the Townley Collection in England and finally in 1805 in the British Museum, where it still is. In addition to inscriptions from Rome, Passionei's collection contained epigraphic materials from different places in Rome's surroundings (Tusculum, Praeneste, etc.). As for the question of their origin, several inscriptions of the collection that were published as Roman are actually of unknown provenance, and of these many should not necessarily be considered as Roman.[4] Unfortunately, there is no mention of the origin of the Bona Dea altar in the catalogue made by the Cardinal's nephew Benedetto, nor do Donati or Orelli provide additional information.[5] Thus, the provenance of the altar seems uncertain, but it may not be Roman.[6]

However, there seems to be at least one source that refers to the origin in more detail. Charles Townley, the previous owner, who bought the altar from his dealer Thomas Jenkins by about 1779 (*BM Townley Archive* TY 10/7) affirmed in his own *1804 Parlour Catalogue* that it was found on Tiburtine territory close to the river Anio, while also assuming a link between *Annianensis* and a locality called *Annia*, "which was situated upon the river of that name".[7] There is no such

---

[3] Platner – Ashby 1929, 185; L. Chioffi, *LTUR* I [1993], 199–200. According to Lipka (2009, 175), the goddess should be associated with the "equestrian family" of the Annii (whatever this refers to).

[4] Solin 2019, 103.

[5] Passionei 1763, 4, No. 9; Donati 1765, 50; Orelli 1828, No. 1516 ("sine loco").

[6] The Hesper mentioned in the inscription is perhaps identifiable with a person of the same name whose epitaph is known from Rome (*CIL* VI 36467 = *ILS* 8184), but this is not relevant to the question of the altar's origin.

[7] "Cippus … dedicated to the Bona Dea of Annia, which was situated upon the river of that name, not far from Tivoli, the ancient Tiburtinum, and in the Vicinity of which this monument was found" (*1804 Parlour Catalogue*, dining room 51). Similarly, Hawkins 1845, 132, Pl. 53,1. For a quite different interpretation, see *Visit* 1838, 204, No. 67 (describing the Sixth Room of the Gallery of Antiquities in the BM): "A votive altar dedicated to Bona Dea Annianensis, a Goddess worshipped in the city of Anagnia" (a vague reference to Anagnia is also in Ellis 1846, 276 n. 6). Passionei (1763, 4) wondered if *Anneanensi* (as he, and many others later, read the term) could indicate a people named "*An(n)ienses*": "Se siano quei popoli, che … si chiamano ora *Anienses*, ora *Annienses*, non so asserirlo."

place, but Townley was perhaps on the right track. A provenance from Tibur is quite possible considering that the Passionei collection contained at least one inscription that certainly comes from this town (*CIL* XIV 3777).[8] One can, of course, speculate that the idea of Tibur as the provenance had come to the mind of Townley or one of his predecessors because of the assonance between the goddess's epithet and the name of the river. However, this does not seem likely because Townley explicitly refers to a discovery and therefore it was rather this information that led him to consider the meaning of *Annianensis*.

It seems possible, therefore, that we are dealing with the Bona Dea of an Annian farm or house that was located somewhere in Tibur. However, there may be more to this. If the altar really originates from Tibur and was found on the banks of the Anio, then one might wonder if the epithet could be boldly read as *An(n)i{an}ensis*, i.e., a dittographic spelling influenced by the initial */an/* (*Ann-* would not be a problem, as the name of the tribe was also sometimes written this way, and cf. *CIL* VI 2343: *aquae Annesi*; *CIL* VI 2344–45: *aquae Annionis*). This would evidently mean that the epithet of this Bona Dea was derived from the name of the river Anio. As such, this would not be surprising, as the goddess's Tiburtine cult is otherwise known, but of particular interest is that, according to an inscription of AD 88 found on Tiburtine territory (*CIL* XIV 3530 = *Inscr. It.* IV 4, 1, 611),[9] a local shrine of Bona Dea was restored in gratitude for the fact that, in Domitian's time, this goddess had protected and helped complete some construction works related to the Aqua Claudia; this aqueduct got its water from a number of springs in the Anio Valley, then continuing along the banks of the river to Tibur and from there towards Rome.[10]

4.2. Italy

(60) *Fortuna Folianensis*
CIL IX 2123 (= *ILS* 3718; Beneventum; early 3rd cent. AD): *Numini / Fortunae Folianensi[s] / pro salute Libera[lis] / Umbr(ius) Polytimus ac[tor] / haram donum dedit. / Verzobi, vivas! [t]ibi et / tuis omnibu[s]*. The goddess's epithet must be

[8] Solin 2019, 102.

[9] Cf. Brouwer 1989, 78–80, No. 70; Granino Cecere (1992, 132–41), noting (at p. 140) that Bona Dea also appears as the patroness of the *castra fontanorum*, i.e., the seat of the collegium of the *fontani* (*CIL* VI 70), who were probably involved in the supervision of the springs in Rome (Bruun 1991, 143–45).

[10] Z. Mari, *LTUR Suburb*. II [2004], 103–105.

derived from the name of a *fundus Folianus* (< *Folius*; cf. *Foglianise*, in the province of Benevento[11]). The senatorial (C. Umbrius) Liberalis (*signo* Verzobius), for whose safety the dedication was made, also receives an augural wish from his *actor*. The master's signum *Verzobius* (Kajanto 1966, 71) is relevant as it occurs in the name of a Beneventan association of the worshippers of Mars and may thus possibly suggest a cult of *Mars Verzobianus*. For the *Marteses Verzobiani* and *Palladiani*, see Nos. **88**–**89**.

(61) *Fortuna Taurianensis* (*)

AE 2004, 367 (Ostia, Casa delle Ierodule; late 2nd cent. AD) is a graffito recording a private vow to the deity (*XII Kal. Aug<u>stas* / *promisit votum* / *Lucceia Primitiva* / *Fortunae Tauria/nensi*).[12] The suffix *-ensis* was widely used to coin ethnics, and it is in this light that *Taurianensis* was usually interpreted (with reference to Taurianum in South Italy) until it was suggested that the epiclesis may be derived from the personal name *Taurianus* (Molle 2004 [= *AE* 2004, 367], thinking of the local notable called T. Statilius Taurianus who might have been the patron of the house where the graffito is[13]). This idea seems to have been shared by many, but it needs revision.

First, a tutelary Fortuna named after the property of a Statilius Taurianus would probably have been named "*Statiliana*", or "*Statilianensis*", or possibly "*Taurianiana*". Regarding *Taurianensis*, it is obviously derived from *Taurian-*, which parallel evidence, however, suggests should be taken here as a topographic designation rather than a personal name, that is, *(domus) Tauriana*, *(fundus) Taurianus*, or similar. Such a name, in turn, points to the *gens Tauria*, and so it would have been the house of this family that was under the protection of the *Fortuna Taurianensis*. Though not common, the nomen *Taurius* is decently attested.[14] It is true that *Taurianus*, whether a personal name or a toponym, may be derived from *Taurus* (*Statilii Tauriani, horti Tauriani*), but this may not be relevant here. As for the cognomen of the Ostian Statilius Taurianus, that too could derive from the nomen *Taurius*, though a link with the Statilii Tauri is very likely.

---

[11] Kajanto (1981, 515) refers to the neighbourhood of *Folianum*, but not to the nomen. Iasiello (2007, 183) records some ninth-century documents with the indication "*in loco qui dicitur Folianense*".

[12] For the possibly significant chronological context (July 21), perhaps to be related to a cult of Fortuna, see Bruun (2019, 378–79), who thinks of the day of the dedication of the temple of Fortuna Redux in the Campus Martius (which took place in the Flavian era).

[13] Similarly, Van Haeperen 2019–2020, 291.

[14] For Ostia, see Caldelli 2018, 127, No. 281 = *AE* 2018, 260 (*Tauria Neice*).

(62) *Silvanus Caeserianensis*
CIL IX 2113 (= *ILS* 3538; ager Beneventanus; seen by Dressel): *Silvano / Caeserianensi / Trophimus / act(or) / ex voto*. The epithet is probably derived from the name of a *fundus Caeserianus* (< *Caeserius*, a relatively rare nomen). The *actor* was perhaps employed by a Caeserius or a later owner.[15]

(63) *Silvanus Publicensis* (*)
The epithet of Silvanus appearing in *CIL* IX 2126 (Beneventum; AD 252; seen by Dressel) is usually taken to be *Publicensis* (or, sometimes, *Publicensianus*[16]): *Silvano / Publicensi[-] / [-]o Praestant[-]s / [-]oncordius*, etc.). At first sight, lines 3-4 could perhaps be understood this way (but see below): *[De]o Praestant[i]s(simo) / [C]oncordius*. As for the unique form *Publicensis*, a divine epithet formed in this way (*-ensis*) would probably refer to a deity related to some public place (land, street, building, etc., see *ThLL* X 2, 2453 *s.v. publicus*; and cf. *Saturnus Privatensis*, above p. 65 n. 2). However, one may wonder if the epithet, perhaps with ANE inscribed in ligature, is rather *Publianensis* (i.e., *Silvano Publianensi*), which would thus probably have been derived from the name of a *fundus Publianus* (< *Publius*). A landed property so named is attested on Beneventan territory (*CIL* IX 1455, col. ii, 51).

On the other hand, considering that Dressel both read PVBLICENSI and reported a lacuna immediately after it, the above-mentioned alternative *Publicensianus* is surely worth considering, especially because it would be idiomatic for the suffix. In fact, the way lines 2 and 3 are given in *CIL* (l. 2: PVBLICENSI/; l. 3: /O PRAESTANT/S) might suggest the following reading: *Silvano / Publicensi[a]/[n]o Praestant[i]s(simo)*.[17] If this is so, the divine epithet

[15] The epithet has sometimes been taken to show that this god operated on an Imperial estate, as if *Caeserianensis* was somehow derived from, or related to, or a mistake for, *Caesar-* (thus, already, Henzen, *Orell. Suppl.* [1856], 148–49, No. 5740 n. 1; Bömer 1981[2], 81; Dorcey 1988, 295 n. 7; Id. 1992, 30–31 n. 82; Matijašič – Tassaux 2000, 75. Torelli [2002, 113 n. 35] has "Caesariensis", probably by a simple slip; similarly, Étienne 1958, 344; Latte 1960, 333. Cf. also *EDCS*-12401624: *Caes<a=E>rianensi*). The adjective *Caesarianus* is, of course, well known, and mediaeval toponyms like *fundus Caesarianus* and *massa Caesariana* are found especially in the surroundings of Rome.

[16] Carter 1898, 35 n. 6; von Domaszewski 1902, 6 = Id. 1909, 64; Kahane – Kahane 1979, 433 (cf. Maio [1976, 292]: "*Publicensis* o *Publicensianus*"; Torelli [2002, 113 n. 35]: *Publicensi[anus?]*). Matijašič – Tassaux (2000, 75) print "*Publiensis*" (deriving it from "*Publii*").

[17] Unless, perhaps, which seems less likely, the dedicator was called *Praestant[iu]s / [C]oncordius* (the nomen *Praestantius* is known, but the lacuna may be too small for two letters). The title *Praestantissimus* (and *Praestans*) is found as a divine epithet in second- and third-century AD sacred dedications.

would be derived from an otherwise unattested nomen **Public(i)ensius* (< *Publicius*, cf. *Cercius ~ Cerciens(ius?)* [*CIL* VI 9716]; *Hortius ~ Hortensius*, etc.). If the inscription still exists, it would be worth the effort to check its reading.

(64) *Silvanus Valerianensis*
AE 2016, 336 (Aequum Tuticum [Beneventum]; early 3rd cent. AD): *Silvano Valerian/ensi Felici/anus, C. Beti/ti Pii ser(vus) ac/tor, / ex voto.* It seems that a *fundus* called *Valerianus* (< *Valerius*), of which Silvanus must have been the protector, was owned by C. Betius Pius, who is very likely identical with the consular Betitius known as a patron of Canusium in AD 223 (*CIL* IX 338 = *ERC* 35). The dedication was made by the *servus actor* Felicianus, a manager of Pius's landed property.[18]

(65) *Venus Utiana* (†?)
See: (**42**) *Mefitis Utiana* (p. 55 n. 96).

[18] Cf. Camodeca 2017, 104, 119–21, No. 2; Id. 2021, 94, 106–108, No. 2.

5. Theonym + cognomen-*ianus/-a* (or *-anus*)

Some of the cases in this category may seem difficult to interpret because, especially in the case of the guardian gods, the divine epithet derived from a cognomen could be associated either with an individual or his house. However, overclassification is better avoided. A dedication originally intended for a single person may well have been felt to apply to the whole family.

5.1. Rome

(66) *Diana Cariciana*
CIL VI 131 (= *ILS* 3253; AD 218) is a dedication of a statue to the goddess: *Diana Cariciana. / M. Aurelius Caricus, / aquarius huius loci, / cum libertis et alum/nis sigillo Dianae*, (dating follows). This is one of the rare cases in which the divine epithet is undeniably derived from the dedicator's name. The "*hic locus*" cannot be established because the monument's exact provenance is unknown. However, considering that the same man is also found in a fistula inscription from Albano Laziale (*M. Aureli Karici Aug. lib.*; *NSc* 1914, 429 = *AE* 1975, 158), one might wish to speculate if his preference for Diana had something to do with the goddess of Aricia.[1]

Diana Planciana
See: (**13**) *Diana Planciana*.

(67) *Fons Scaurianus*
The dedications *CIL* VI 164-65 (= *ILS* 3889; AD 165/166) to the god of this specific spring (*Fonti Scauriano sacrum*) that were found under S. Prisca on the Aventine were made respectively in two consecutive years by groups of *magistri* and *ministri*.[2] The epithet suggests that the fountain was built or restored by a Scaurus, perhaps one of the Aemilii Scauri, but the closer identity of the person must remain uncertain. See *Fons Lollianus* (No. **15**).

---

[1] Cf. Kajava 2015, 480–81. For Caricus's professional status, see Bruun 1991, 192–93, 347–48.

[2] J. Aronen, *LTUR* II (1995), 258–59; La Rocca 1998, 210; R. Narducci and L. Rustico, in: Gregori – Narducci – Rustico 2018, 368.

(68) *Fortuna Crassiana*
CIL VI 186 (= *ILS* 3714; first half of the 3rd cent. AD) is an altar dedication to *Fortuna Crassian(a)* for the safety of Severus Alexander (originally perhaps for that of Elagabalus) made by a father with his son and daughter: *Pro salute / et reditu et Victoria / Imp. Caes. M. Aurelli Seve/ri Alexandri Pii Felic(is) Aug. / aram Fortunae Crassian(ae) / Fabricius Iustus cum / Iusta et Iusto filis d(ono) d(edit).* This Fortuna was probably the protector of either a Crassus or his house (*domus Crassi* / *Crassiana*);[3] cf. Ch. 8 below. What the relationship of the dedicators from the Fabrician family with Crassus's house was is unknown. Cf. C. Lega, *LTUR* II (1995), 268.

(69) *Fortuna Lampadiana*
See: (**16**) *Fortuna Iuveniana*.

(70) *Fortuna Pientiana*
CIL VI 30874 (= 36753 = *ILS* 3716; lost) is a statue base inscribed *Fortunae / Pientianâe / «feliciter»*. This Fortuna has been tentatively interpreted as that of a Pius.[4] This may be possible, even if *Pientiana* must be derived from the positive grade *piens*, *pient-*, which in turn was coined from the superlative *pientissimus*. In fact, one could also consider a derivation from the rare name *Pientius*, which is found in the later Empire, though not among people of rank.[5] Precisely this circumstance, however, could in the end make one prefer the Fortuna of a prominent Pius or Pia living in the fourth century AD, to which the dedication can be dated (line 3 is a later addition struck over erasure). On Fortuna, cf. also Ch. 8 below.

(71) *Fortuna Torquatiana*
CIL VI 204 (= 30713; 1st cent. AD?) is an altar dedication to the protecting Fortuna of either an individual (Torquatus/a) or a house (*domus Torquati / Torquatiana*) by a certain Narcissus: *Fortunae / Torquatianae / Q. Caecilius / Narcissus / d(ono) d(edit)*. A connection with the *horti Torquatiani* of the Junian family has been assumed but cannot be proven (cf. C. Lega, *LTUR* II [1995], 278–79). On Fortuna, see Ch. 8.

---

[3] Cf. Kajanto 1981, 513. Of course, the Crassus in question was not necessarily a Licinius.

[4] Cf. Kajanto 1981, 513 ("probably"); Id. 1983, 14 ("of a somewhat uncertain interpretation: the *Fortuna* of a Pius?").

[5] For *piens*, *pientissimus*, etc., see Tantimonaco 2020, esp. 294–95 (anthroponyms: *Pientius*, *Pientinus*, *Pientianus*; also, Kajanto 1965, 251).

(72) *Fortuna Zmaragdiana*
CIL VI 39862 (= *AE* 1978, 40; late 2nd / 3rd cent. AD) is a statue base inscribed *Fortunae / Zmaragdianae.* The dedication was made to the Fortuna of either an individual (Zmaragdus/a) or a house (*domus Zmaragdi / Zmaragdiana*). On Fortuna, cf. Ch. 8.

(73) *Hercules Commodianus*
In AD 190, before he himself became the "Roman Hercules" the following year, Commodus issued coins and medallions celebrating *Hercules Commodianus*, the emperor's personalized version of the god (evidence in Szaivert Nos. 813–14, 1144–45; *RIC* 3, 581, 586, 591; discussion in Hekster 2002, 104–106). Cf. *Liber Pater Commodianus* (No. **87**).

(74) *Hercules Invictus Esychianus*
According to *AE* 1924, 15 (= 2000, 153) from Rome, Hierus and Asylus, both slaves of the Trajanic pretorian prefect Claudius Livianus (and recorded by Martial 9,103 for their beauty), set up an *aedes* to Hercules Invictus Esychianus: *Hierus et Asylus / [T]i. Iulii Aquilini Castricii Saturnin[i] / [C]laudii Liviani, praef(ecti) pr(aetorio), ser(vi) vilici aedem / Herculi Invicto Esychiano d(e) s(uo) fecerunt*. The same men also offered an inscribed club to the god (*CIL* VI 280 = 30728): *Hierus et / Asylus / T[i. Cl.] Liviani / ser(vi) Hêrculi / d(ono) d(ederunt).* The epithet must be derived from the cognomen of M. Claudius Esychus who is known to have made a dedication to Hercules Invictus, perhaps towards the later first century AD (*CIL* VI 322 = 30736, cf. E. M. Steinby, *LTUR* III [1996], 17). It is reasonable to assume that the shrine stood close to where *CIL* VI 280 and 322 were found, that is, near the railway station of Trastevere on the Via Portuensis. It seems that Esychus had either founded this cult of Hercules or perhaps rather reorganized the sacred area.[6]

(75) *Hercules Romanillianus* (*)
This god is known from the second-century AD dedication *CIL* VI 645 (= *ILS* 3468) which in addition to him included *Silvanus Naevianus* (see No. **25**): *Silvano Naeviano / et Herculi / Romanilliano / Calvius / Iustus / d(ono) d(edit)*. The epithet is noteworthy. Considering that female cognomina in *-illa*, unlike those in *-illiana*, were very common, whereas the suffix *-illus* was always relatively unpopular in

[6] For all these dedications, see Gregori 2000; G. L. Gregori, *LTUR Suburb*. III (2005), 56–57; E. M. Loreti, *LTUR Suburb*. IV (2006), 226; Zaccagnino 2004, 101–104; Rigato 2016, 205.

men's nomenclature, it has been duly pointed out that the formations in *-illianus* could have been normally, though, of course, not exclusively, derived from female names in *-illa*.[7] This means that there is a good probability that *Romanillianus* is derived from *Romanilla* (this name is decently attested while *Romanillus* is not). Based on this, one could infer that the cult had been founded or restored by a woman called Romanilla (much more likely than by a man called Romanillus), in which case we would have a further case to be added to those relatively rare ones in which Hercules was worshipped by a woman.[8] If this is so, a marriage or family relationship could perhaps be assumed between a Romanilla and a Naevius (see No. **25**: *Silvanus Naevianus*). Cf. also *Liber Gratillianus* (No. **86**) and *Venus Lucilliana* (No. **81**).[9]

(76) *Hercules Sullanus*
The denomination appears in the *Regionary Catalogues* of Rome in the *Reg. V Esquiliae* (*Curios. urb*. p. 80, 5 N: *Herculem Syllanum*; *Reg. urb*. p. 80, 4 N: *Herculem Sullanum*), in possible reference to a small sanctuary (or, perhaps, rather a statue) set up by Sulla in commemoration of his victory over C. Marius in 88 BC.[10] Considering the apparently official status of *Victoria Sullana* (see No. **83**), it is not entirely impossible that *Hercules Sullanus* also enjoyed a cult in Rome at some stage. However, just as *Victoria Sullana* is not documented before Augustus, the denomination *Hercules Sullanus* may date much later than Sulla, and in any case the type and nature of the monument named in the *Catalogues* must remain undefined. Cf. Introduction p. 14.

(77) *Liber Kallinicianus* (*)
CIL VI 463 (cf. p. 3756 = *ILS* 3358; late 2nd / 3rd cent. AD) is a dedication that a certain Kalandio made to Liber Kallinicianus for his own health: *[---] Kalandio*

---

[7] Salomies 2019, 207. Cf. Nuorluoto 2021, 85.

[8] Schultz 2000.

[9] For the implausible ideas of J. Gagé concerning the epithets of both *Hercules Romanillianus* and *Silvanus Naevianus*, see above at No. **25**. Regarding *Romanillianus*, Gagé (1976, 202 n. 13) not only states that "sa forme, *Romanillius*, paraît dérivée du nom des *Romani*" (*sic*), but he also finds it significant that the name of the dedicator of *CIL* VI 645, a Calvius, recalls that of a plebeian tribune who prosecuted the consul T. Romilius in early 454 BC (on p. 200, the epithet is given as *Romanilius*).

[10] For these and other possible contexts, see D. Palombi, *LTUR* III (1996), 21–22. Hercules and Sulla: Luke 2014, 81–82. Lanciani (1907, 161–62) mentioned a "*vicus Herculis Sullani*" in connection with *Hercules Sullanus*, but I cannot find this street name in the ancient sources.

pro sua salute donum / [dedit L]ibero Kalliniciano. It is usually thought that the epithet was derived from the name of a Kallinicus who had renovated or dedicated a cult place to Liber within the *praedia Amaranthiana* (Tor Marancia) in the southern *suburbium* of Rome.[11] This is indeed the most plausible explanation.

On the other hand, considering that *Kallinikos*, 'of fair victory', was a relatively common epithet of Herakles in the Greek world,[12] one wonders if the theonym *Liber Kallinicianus* could refer to an association between the two deities (cf. *Isis Geminiana*, *Bona Dea Apollinaris*, *Silvanus Pegasianus*, etc.). One may note that Liber Pater often figures in the company of Hercules (joint dedications, coins, etc.), especially in the Severan period to which the present dedication may belong (and by which the *praedia Amaranthiana* probably had become Imperial property).[13] However, this idea is only a guess and perhaps not a good one. In addition to the possibility that the designation *Kallinicianus* may have arisen earlier (see n. 11), the Roman concept of the "victorious" and "invincible" Hercules that was used as a military model in the Severan era was probably ultimately based on mid-Republican innovations which lacked an obviously clear connection with the Greek cults of *Herakles Kallinikos* or *Herakles Aniketos*.[14] Moreover, unlike *Victor* and *Invictus,* two old and common titles of Hercules in Rome, the term "*Callinicus*" does not seem to be associated with the god anywhere in the Latin sources.

---

[11] Dessau, *ILS* 3358; Degrassi 1949, 73 (= 1962, 343). Caldelli (2004, 233–34) tentatively thought of P. Aelius Aug. lib. Callinicus, known from *CIL* VI 657, as a possible founder, which would suggest that the cult was born around the second quarter of the second century AD. For the sacrarium (?) of Liber Pater within the *praedia Amaranthiana* (L. Spera, *LTUR Suburb*. I [2001], 48–49) and the material evidence there for a Dionysian cult, see M. L. Caldelli, *LTUR Suburb*. III [2005], 231–32; Galli – Ippoliti 2020, 193–94; Ippoliti 2020, 206.

[12] Guarducci (1942–1943, 317–18, 328–29), followed by Bruhl (1953, 204, with some reservations in n. 38), implausibly thought that Liber's epithet could go back to the use of the title *Kallinikos* by Dionysus/Bacchus in Greek literature (cf. Eur. *Ba*. 1147, 1161).

[13] Liber/Bacchus and Hercules were not only the guardian deities of Lepcis Magna, Septimius Severus's hometown, but they were also regarded as protectors of the princes, Caracalla and Geta. The Severan coinage and the epigraphic (and other) evidence: Bruhl 1953, 190-91; Krawczyk 2021, 142–49; Daniels 2022, 111. For the question of the existence and location of the Severan temple to Dionysus and Hercules in Rome (mentioned by Dio 77,16,3), see R. Santangeli Valenzani, *LTUR* III (1996), 25–26; Rowan 2012, 67–75; Siwicki 2021, 502. *Praedia Amarant(h)iana* and the Imperial *fiscus*: *CIL* VI 10233 (AD 211), with Caldelli 2004, 248–51; Alessandri 2021.

[14] Weinstock 1957, *passim*; Orlin 2010, 62.

(78) *Liber Pater Proclianus*
CIL VI 466 (= *ILS* 1930 = *RICIS* 501/0213; 1st/2nd cent. AD[15]) is a dedication to the god by *C. Avillius Ligurius Lucanus*, who was also a priest of Isis: *Libe[ro] Patri Procliano sacru[m] / C. Avillius C.f. Romilia Ligurius / Lucanus pater, viator IIIv[iralis] / IIIIviralis, sacerdos Ìsis [et ---]*.[16] It has been implausibly suggested that the epithet derives from a vineyard called "*Procliana*".[17] More probably, this was a cult founded by an unknown Proc(u)lus.

(79) *Minerva Catuliana*
According to Pliny the Elder, a bronze statue of Athena by Euphranor dedicated below the Capitol by the Younger Catulus (cos. 78 BC) was called *Catuliana* in his time.[18] It is unknown when the epithet was first used, but it may well date after Catulus's lifetime (he died in 61 BC). There is no evidence that *Catuliana* was ever used as a cult title. For the form in *-iana*, see above pp. 12 and 36.

(80) *Tutela Candidiana*
According to the Severan dedication *CIL* VI 776 (= 30829 = *ILS* 3727), an Imperial slave who was *tabularius* of the *summum choragium* (between the Baths of Titus and S. Clemente) dedicated, together with his wife, "a vault with columns and curtains and a fragrant altar" to Tutela Candidiana, for the health of his family: *Tutele Candidiane / Constantius Augg. / et Caes. tabul(arius) s(ummi) c(horagi) / una cum Sergiam / Siricam couiugem / suam caelum / cum columnis et / velis et aram / odoribus re/pletam erga suo/rum sanitatem d(ono) d(edit)*. The epithet of Tutela is probably derived from the cognomen *Candidus* (rather than the rare nomen *Candidius*).[19]

---

[15] Hardly from the "early Principate" (thus Haeussler [2013, 233], and some others).

[16] On the Industrian Avil(l)ii and their connection with the cult of Isis, see Bricault 2007, 53.

[17] Wissowa 1912[2], 302.

[18] Plin. *nat*. 34,77: *huius est Minerva, Romae quae dicitur Catuliana, infra Capitolium a Q. Lutatio dicata* (for the statue and the artist, see Palagia 1980, 34–35). Palmer (1975, 655 n. 3), perhaps drawing on early 19th century scholarship, assumed an earlier "Minerva Catulia" (*sic*).

[19] Sabbatini Tumolesi (1988, 28, No. 15) hypothesized that the Tutela protected the *area Candidi* (in Reg. VI) known from the *Regionary Catalogues* (onomastically, this would be quite possible), which in the second century might have belonged to the senatorial Iulii Candidi (thus F. Coarelli, *LTUR* I [1993], 114; Id. 2014, 358–68). Marroni (2010, 204) took the epithet as referring to Tutela's health-protecting character. In that function, however, a derivative in *-iana* would be strange (but neither would the basic form be easily related to health, as the deities and mythological figures that are sometimes described as *candidi/ae* [in poetry] are so named because of their beauty and splendour). For this and similar dedications made to deities in gratitude for health and cures, see Ehmig 2017, 61.

(81) *Venus Lucilliana*
CIL VI 36833 (2nd cent. AD) is a statue base inscribed *Venus Lucilliana / Sancta ex viso posita*.[20] The epithet is probably derived from the cognomen *Lucilla* (cf. *Hercules Romanillianus* [No. **75**] and *Liber Gratillianus* [No. **86**]). This Venus perhaps assumed the role of a tutelary deity like Fortuna. For the rarely occurring nominative case, see *Diana Cariciana* (No. **66**), *Fortuna Iuveniana* / *Lampadiana* (No. **16**), *Iuno* / *Venus Cassiana* (Nos. **56, 58**).

(82) *Victoria Glaucopiana*
CIL VI 792 (3rd to 4th cent. AD): *Victoriae / Glauco⌜p⌝ianae* (thus, plausibly, Henzen, *CIL* comm., emending the ms. reading *Glaucorianae*, but cf. *ibid*. "Titulus quomodo intellegendus sit, non perspicio.") The type of the monument is unknown, but it was probably a statue base. The epithet seems to be derived from the signum *Glaucopius*, which is attested by the epitaph *CIL* VI 1424 (= *ILS* 8061) from the later third century AD, showing the double signum *Glaucopi Veneri* related to the senatorial *clarissima puella* Gellia Agrippiana (*PFOS* 405).[21] It may not be excluded that Victoria's epithet is derived precisely from this signum. The possibility of a female double name (either a double cognomen or a combination of nomen and cognomen) seems less likely.

(83) *Victoria Sullana*
To commemorate his success in the battle against the Samnites at the Porta Collina in 82 BC, Sulla established public festivals in honour of his personalized *victoria* that were originally called *ludi Victoriae* and later, in the usual view in order to distinguish the celebrations from those of the *Victoria Caesaris* instituted in the mid-40s BC, *ludi Victoriae Sullanae*. The new denomination is not attested before Augustus (Fast. fr. Arv. *Inscr. It.* XIII 2, 2, p. 39: *ludi Victoriae Sul[lan(ae)]*; Fast. Sab. *Inscr. It*. XIII 2, 5, p. 53: *lud(i) Vic[tor(iae)] Sull(anae)* [perhaps after AD 14 because of the mention of the *Augustalia*, see Scheid 1999, 9–12]; in literature, the epithet *Sullana* first occurs in Vell. 2,27,6).[22] Considering that the *ludi* of

[20] The epithet *Sancta* is very rarely associated with Venus: Gregori 2020, 218.

[21] Kajanto 1966, 75. The signum in the vocative is often understood mistakenly as the dative of "Glaucopis Venus".

[22] Cf. Bernstein 1998, 321; Behrwald 2009, 156. The Augustan Fasti Maffeiani (*Inscr. It.* XIII 2, 10, p. 81; after AD 8) have simply *lud(i) Vict(oriae)* (no mention in the Fasti Praenestini or Amiternini). For parallelism between Sulla's Roman *ludi* and the Athenian *Sylleia* (*IG* II^2 1039, 56–58; *SEG* XXXVII 135), see Santangelo 2007, 215–18. However, these two festivals never shared the anthroponymic epithet at the same time because the Athenian civic games must have been

Victoria Sullana had an official status, it would not be surprising if dedications were made to this goddess after the epithet's introduction.[23] Cf. Introduction p. 14.

5.2. Italy

(84) *Genius Alotianus* (††)
CIL X 1560 (= *ILS* 3659; Puteoli; 2nd to early 3rd cent. AD; now in Florence, cf. *CIL* XI 250*, 2c): *Ex imperio / Genì Alotianì / Euaristus, servì/tor deorum, ex vì/so lib(ens) an(imo)*, that is, a certain Euaristus, called *servitor deorum* (not an official title), made a dedication to a Genius, following a command given by the same deity in a dream. The nature and role of this Genius has remained unexplained. According to a common interpretation, he was the protecting spirit of someone bearing the relatively rare Greek name *Halotus* (Dessau: "Fortasse ab Haloto quodam nomen ductum"; index: *Genius Alotianus*).[24] Thus, in one view, Euaristus would have honoured the Genius of his master, called Halotus.[25]

That we are dealing with Euaristus's master is possible, but the interpretation of *Alotianus* is not: the Genii of individuals were always accompanied by a personal name in the genitive, and thus, to my knowledge, this would be the only case in which this deity bears an adjectival epithet derived from an anthroponym. Only if *Genius* were equivalent to 'god', as it sometimes was, especially in the Celtic regions,[26] would the theonym following it not have to be in the genitive,

---

discontinued sometime after Sulla's death. For the adjective/noun *Sullanus*, see also Santangelo 2012.

[23] Clark (2007, 132 n. 47) did not exclude the use of the epithet in the Republican period. However, this possibility must concern the very end of the Republic, as the Victoria festival was unlikely referred to with the name *Sullana* at the time of its foundation in 81 BC.

[24] De-Vit, *Onomasticon* 233 (*Genius Alotianus*, "Quis fuerit, ignoro"); *ThLL* I 1716: "Alotianus genius". According to Peterson (1919, 121), referencing H. Steuding's article in Roscher's Lexikon, *Alotianus* could be associated with the festival of *Alotia* at Tegea in Arcadia in honour of a solar divinity (Paus. 8,47,4), regarding which, see Nilsson's (1906, 88 n. 4) comment: "dies kann davor warnen, die Namensform anzutasten, ist aber gewagt. Daß er ein Genius der Sonne sei, muß bestritten werden. Wir wissen doch gar nichts von den Halotien!"

[25] Laforge 2009, 161 n. 613 (citing the text as "*ex imperio / Geni(i) (H)alotiani*"): "L'esclave Evaristus se voit donner l'ordre d'honorer le Génie du maître de maison, Halotus."

[26] See above No. **8** ("*Genius Ulpius*"). Concerning the present case, Becker (1858, 78) claimed that the *Genius* stands for 'god' and so *Alotianus* would be the name of a Celtic deity (cf. above p. 25 n. 31 and p. 26 n. 35).

both elements taking the same grammatical case. However, as we shall see, even if the expression *ex imperio Geni Alotiani* could, according to epigraphic dedicatory conventions, denote a command issued by a god called Alotianus, this option is very unlikely in the light of other evidence. Therefore, the dedication must have been made in accordance with the order of the Genius of a person called Alotianus (perhaps Euaristus's master).[27]

How, then, should the name *Alotianus* be explained? A clue may be found in a well-known series of third- to fourth-century AD glass flasks decorated with town views of Puteoli and Baiae. In a new piece found at Mérida and concerning the topography of Puteoli, an inscription attached to what seems a *porticus* reads ALOTIANA (*AE* 2005, 763c). Because the adjacent text, ANNIANA (< *Annius*), seems to name a basilica, i.e., the *basilica Augusti Anniana*, (unless it indicates a *regio*[28]), *Alotiana* is probably a similarly functioning designation derived from an anthroponym. Furthermore, given that the Genius inscription must relate to Puteoli (although it was once in Naples), it is not unlikely that one and the same name appears both on the flask text and in the dedication. However, if this name was derived from *Halotus*, we should have to accept it was spelled *Al-* in both cases. To avoid this inconvenience, and because buildings were often (and *regiones* sometimes) referred to by adjectives derived from nomina gentilicia, one might prefer to assume the existence of a nomen **Alotius*, perhaps of Celtic origin.[29] Whence we have *Alotianus*, which in one case served as a cognomen and in the other as an adjectival epithet to name a building (or a *regio*).

Hercules Front(---) (*)
See: (**33**) *Hercules Front(---)*.

(85) *Hercules Hermogenianus*
CIL XIV 4287 (= *AE* 1924, 109; Ostia): *Herculi* / *Hermogeniano* / *sacrum*. This case is interesting, as the dedication was found close to the funerary monument

[27] For dedications made at the order of a Genius, cf. *CIL* VI 36778: *iussu Geni(i) Sancti h(orreorum) S(eianorum)*; *IRPLeon* 20 (Hisp. Cit.): *ex iu(ssu) G(enii)*, a dedication to the Genius of the *legio VII Gemina Felix*. Otherwise, sacred dedications prompted by gods were common in antiquity.

[28] Cf. Camodeca 2018, 58 (and 380 n. 84), noting that the *basilica Anniana* might have been restored under Severus Alexander, in which case it would have been called *Alexandriana* by the time the glass flasks were produced (an otherwise unknown basilica named *Alexandriana* is mentioned in *CIL* X 1693–94 [late 4th cent. AD], but the possibility remains that this is a new building).

[29] Caridad Arias (2006, 352) relates "*Genius Alotianus*", together with many other names beginning with *Al(l)o-/Al(l)u-*, to the Celtic and Celto-Iberic name *Ad-luco* (*ad-l* > *al-l* > *al*).

of the equestrian C. Domitius L.f. Pal. Fabius Hermogenes (*CIL* XIV 4642 [post-Hadrianic], also known from *CIL* XIV 353). A connection with the two texts is likely.[30] It may well be that the cult of this Hercules was founded by the equestrian, and the god was worshipped as the protector of his house.

(86) *Liber Gratillianus* (*)
CIL IX 2631 (= *ILS* 3357; Aesernia; 2nd/3rd cent. AD): *Libero / Gratilliano*. The epithet is generally considered to be derived from the nomen *Gratil(l)ius*.[31] While this is possible, the form of the ending may rather suggest the cognomen *Gratilla*. For the ending *-illianus/a*, see *Hercules Romanillianus* (No. **75**) and *Venus Lucilliana* (No. **81**).

(87) *Liber Pater Commodianus*
CIL XIV 30 (= *ILS* 392; Portus): *Pro salute Imp. / M. Aureli Commodi / Antonini Aug. / Pii Felicis / Libero Patri / Commodiano / sacrum / Iunia Marciane / ex voto fecit*, i.e., a private *ex voto* dedication to *Liber Pater Commodianus* for the safety of Emperor Commodus by a woman called Iunia Marciane.[32] Interestingly, the god uses an epithet derived from the name of the person for whose safety the dedication is made. The inscription was found at the temple of Liber Pater in Portus, perhaps surnamed *Commodianus* for the emperor. This may suggest the prominence of the Portus cult in the time of Commodus, especially in the early 190s AD, for in this period the epithet is known to have been given elsewhere only to the emperor's favourite god Hercules (see *Hercules Commodianus*, No. **73**).

(88) *Mars Palladianus* (††?)
Second- to early fourth-century inscriptions from Beneventum attest the existence of a local association of the worshippers of Mars, which in the later documents is called *collegium Martense Verzobianum* (*CIL* IX 1684, 1686) after the signum *Verzobius* (probably of Illyrian origin) that was used especially by some

---

[30] Ceccarelli – Marroni 2011, 287; Van Haeperen 2019–2020, 291. Note, however, that the dedication is sometimes dated to about AD 50 (e.g., van der Meer – Stevens 2000, 172), but judging from the photograph (*EDCS*-11900009), the inscription may well belong to the early second century AD.

[31] Buonocore 2009, 259 n. 62: "derivante da un devoto di nome forse *Grati(l)lius*". Cf. M. Buonocore, *CIL* IX S. 1, 1, add. p. 1086: "Appellatio Gratilliani ad cognomen Gratilliani certe referenda."

[32] Bruhl 1953, 190-91 (epithet given "par flatterie ou par loyalisme"); Hänninen 2019, 73; Van Haeperen 2019, 294–95.

prominent Umbrii.[33] Another Martial association in Beneventum was named *studium Palladianum* after the signum *Palladius* (*CIL* IX 1681, 1683; later third to fourth cent. AD). In one later case (*CIL* IX 1682), the worshippers themselves are *Marteses Verzobiani* (gen. *Verzobianum,* perhaps a mistake for *Verzobianorum*) and *Palladiani.*[34] Parallel evidence may suggest that the god could have been worshipped with the epithets *Verzobianus* and *Palladianus* (cf. *Hercules Nerianus* and the *Herculanii Nerianii* (?), No. **36**).

(89) *Mars Verzobianus* (††?)
See: (**88**) *Mars Palladianus*.

5.3. Africa

(90) *Pollux Extricatianus*
This god is known from a second-century AD dedication made by a Iulia whose cognomen is lost (*ILAfr*. 253; Thuburbo Maius): *Polluci* / *Extrica/tiano* / *Iulia* / *[5-6]* (in line 6, the beginning of *sacrum* seems decipherable, unless this is part of the dedicator's name; see photograph at *EDCS*-10300580). The epithet must be derived from *Extricatus*, a name especially popular in Africa where accordingly the derivation *Extricatianus* is also well attested. In two further Thuburban inscriptions, a notable with one of these names is related to a woman bearing the nomen *Iulia*, but there is no way of knowing if they are involved.[35] In the present case, however, one may think of an Extricatus who had founded a cult of Pollux or was somehow associated with the god.

---

[33] Kajanto 1966, 51; De Carlo 2010, 246; Ead. 2013, 286.

[34] Cf. Torelli 2002, 269-70.

[35] *ILAfr*. 238 (Antonine): L. Decianus M.f. Arn. Extricatus whose wife was perhaps a Iulia (the reading is difficult); *ILAfr.* 280 (later 2nd cent. AD): the equestrian P. Attius P.f. Arn. Extricatianus whose mother was called Iulia Bassilia (or, perhaps, Bassilla). Gasparini (2020, 389–93) hypothesizes that Pollux's epithet *Extricatianus* might be a personal creation by the dedicator Iulia, who would be identical with the Bassilia of the preceding text (and perhaps also with the Iulia of the first inscription) and who, by that designation, would have referred to her son Decianus Extricatus to emphasize his close relationship with the god Pollux. This son, homonymous with his father, would then have become Extricatianus through adoption by a P. Attius. However, this reconstruction is quite speculative (as for the alleged adoption, it would have been a plenary one based on the filiation *P.f.*, which is unlikely in this period; moreover, the adoptee should have become a *Decianianus*. Note also, in this connection, that the equestrian P. Attius Annianus Iulianus P.f. Arn. known from *ILTun*. 723 is usually considered as a brother of Attius Extricatianus).

(91) *Silvanus Pegasianus* (†?)
The god seems to be attested in at least two dedications from the Asclepieum of Lambaesis in Numidia. One (*CIL* VIII 2579e = 18089e = *ILS* 3539 = Benseddik 2010, II 127, No. 17) was made to him alone by a propraetorian legate in AD 162 (*Silvano Pegasiano / D. Fonteius Frontinianus / L. Stertinius Rufinus leg. / Augustor. pr. pr., cos. des.*), while another, made by a Severan legate, if correctly restored, went to Silvanus Pegasianus jointly with other deities[36] for the safety of the imperial house (*CIL* VIII 2585 = 18091 = *AE* 1967, 571 = Benseddik 2010, II 135, No. 43 [early 3rd cent. AD]: ... *[Iovi Valenti, Aesculapio, Silvano Pega]siano, Dis Patriis* ...). The same group of deities appears in the dedication related to the Imperial foundation of the temple in AD 161-162, but in that case, Silvanus does not bear the epithet.[37] Perhaps this implies that the use of *Pegasianus* began to be established in the dedications made by the commanders and their staff.

Even if *Pegasianus* might come from the personal name *Pegasus* (rather than *Pegasius*, which is a later form),[38] and despite the missing gender difference between the deities,[39] the epithet is likely derived from the theonym *Pegasus* with military connotations (cf. *CIL* VIII 17977 = Schmidt Heidenreich 2013, 379, No. C535 [2nd cent. AD; Gemellae]: *Marti et Pegaso Augg. sac(rum)*).[40] Pegasus, the winged horse of Greek mythology, was a well-known legionary emblem (attested, together with the capricorn, for the *legio II Augusta*), and although there seems to be no direct evidence to suggest its use by the Third Augustan Legion (or its cohorts) which was stationed at Lambaesis at the time of the two dedications, this possibility should not be discarded.[41]

---

[36] The absence of the goddess Salus here would seem strange, though, for she appears after Asclepius in the founding dedication (see next footnote).

[37] *CIL* VIII 2579a-c (= 18089 = *ILS* 3841 = Benseddik 2010, II 121, No. 2).

[38] Dessau: "A quo Pegaso hic Silvanus nomen traxerit, nescimus."

[39] But see the evidence cited above p. 52 n. 84 (and note *Zeus Areios* in Paus. 5,14,6, with Parker 2005, 220 n. 13).

[40] Von Domaszewski 1909, 83–84; Veyne 1964, 39–41; Le Glay 1975, 127; Dorcey 1992, 64; Stoll 1998, 144; Benseddik 2010, I 176; van der Ploeg 2018, 42. *Contra*: Gasparini, forthcoming.

[41] Keppie 1984, 121.

6. Theonym + cognomen-*illa*

6.1. Rome

(92) *Bona Dea Galbilla* (††?)
CIL VI 30855 (= *ILS* 1621= Brouwer 1989, 22–24, No. 9; cf. Schraudolph 1993, 219, No. L15) is an altar dedication to Bona Dea Galbilla by an Imperial *vilicus coh. trium* of the *horrea Galbiana* (the form *Galbana* is attested in other documents): *Bonae Deae / Galbillae / Zmaragdus, / Caesaris Aug. / vilicus / horreorum / Galbianorum / coh(ortium) trium, d(ono) d(edit) / cum Fenia Onesime*. These storehouses built on the *praedia Sulpicia* by the ancestors of Emperor Galba were enlarged and restored by him in AD 68, from which time the inscription may stem.[1]

Galbilla has always been taken as an epithet of Bona Dea, and indeed at first glance it might seem that the epithet was derived from the name of the dedicator's workplace,[2] which could make it somewhat comparable to the surnames of the Silvani named after a *fundus*. However, regarding the epithet's typology, one would have expected *Galb(i)ana* (cf. *horrea Galb(i)ana*), but instead the epithet is coined from the name *Galba* with the suffix *-illa*, a very productive diminutive ending from the late Republic onwards. The problem here is that, unlike the divine epithets in *-ianus/a*, *Galbilla* is a personal surname that does not function as an adjective: names in *-illa* were not used as adjectives, and a "*Hercules Galbillus*" would, of course, be even more unthinkable (for *Felicula*, another epithet of Bona Dea that is not found as an adjective, see below No. **96**). In practice, by naming the goddess *Galbilla*, the dedicator would, quite strangely, have made her homonymous with women bearing the name *Galbilla*.

Therefore, instead of considering this case as an onomastic anomaly, it may be feasible to try to find a more valid explanation for it. I am wondering if we could be dealing not with a dedication to the Bona Dea protecting the *horrea Galbiana*, but with one made to the Bona Dea of a Galbilla from the prominent family of the Sulpicii Galbae (with her name in the genitive[3]), as if the goddess were taking

---

[1] For the dating, see Rodríguez Almeida 1984, 55–57.

[2] E.g., Brouwer 1989, 345; Van Haeperen 2010, 251–52; S. Panciera, *CIL* VI 8, 1, add. p. 4141. Cf. Rickman (1971, 80): "Such a dedication to a particular *bona dea* had nothing to do with the official worship of the Bona Dea at Rome, but was simply another way of referring to the tutelary deity of a place, the *genius loci*." For the unique title of the *vilicus*, see Carlsen 1995, 37.

[3] The dative would suggest a funerary context, which is not possible here. Bona Dea is one of those

on the role of a personal Juno, or that of a tutelary Fortuna. The use of just the individual name is common in similar contexts, and in the present case it would have been clear to everyone that the Galbilla mentioned in the inscription is a Sulpicia. As far as I know, the name *Galbilla* is attested exclusively within this family, where this would be its third occurrence, unless we are dealing here with one of the two previously known Galbillae.[4] This type of dedicatory pattern is known in connection with other guardian deities (Fortuna, Genius, Lares; cf. below Ch. 8), perhaps Bona Dea as well.[5] If, indeed, *Galbilla* is the name of a Sulpicia, the dedication might alternatively have been made to "*Bona Dea Galbilliana*", just as the Fortuna of a Galbilla could have been called "*Fortuna Galbilliana*" (cf. *Venus Lucilliana*, probably the protecting Venus of a Lucilla, No. **81**).

That an Imperial *vilicus* in charge of the Galbian granaries made, together his wife (?), a dedication to the Bona Dea of a Galbilla from the Emperor's family should be considered normal rather than a surprise. Nor should one automatically draw the conclusion from the dedicator's profession that Bona Dea was directly related to the *horrea*. The dedication was found close to the Emporium on the Via Marmorata, but it must remain unknown what, if any, its connection with the *horrea Galbiana* was.[6] But even if a connection with the Galbian granaries could be proven, it would not necessarily mean anything other than that the head of the whole warehouse made a dedication to the Bona Dea of a Sulpicia Galbilla at his workplace. Finally, it may not be useless to note that none of the deities that have usually been considered as tutelary spirits of these *horrea* (cf. F. Coarelli, *LTUR* III [1996], 41) has an epithet derived from a human name.

---

goddesses who are sometimes associated or identified with women on their tombstones. Then the name of both the goddess and often also the deceased is in the dative case (for the phenomenon, see above p. 5 n. 6). Concerning Bona Dea, cf. *CIL* VI 38755: *Pobliciae / Cale, / Bonae Deae / sacrum / Martialis / servos*; *CIL* X 6595 (Velitrae): *Anto/niae / Q.f. / Deae / Bonae, / Piae*.

[4] The two Sulpiciae C.f. Galbillae, sisters or half-sisters, who are mentioned in the epitaph they made for their former pedagogues must have been closely related to the emperor (*CIL* VI 9754; *PFOS* 741–42; *PIR*^{2} S 1030–31). They are often identified as the daughters of C. Galba (cos. AD 22), but this cannot be confirmed. Nuorluoto (2021, 41) does not list any other examples of the name.

[5] Cf. the dedication *CIL* XIV 2251 (Albano): *Ex visu iussu Bonae Deae / sacr(um) / Callistus Rufinae n(ostrae) act(or)*, made to the goddess both *ex visu* and *iussu*, perhaps, at least partly, in her capacity as the personal protector of Rufina, the dedicator's mistress. For this inscription, rediscovered in the antiquities market in 2012, see M. Bertinetti, in: Candilio – Bertinetti 2013, 36–38.

[6] Rodríguez Almeida (1984, 101) opted for a link with the nearby *compitum* on the Via Marmorata (for which see C. Lega, *LTUR* IV [1999], 260–61, *s.v.* Schola [via Marmorata]). John Scheid (in a private communication) also prefers assigning the dedication to the neighbouring *compitum*. Tran (2008, 297) thought of a connection with the *horrea*. Similarly, Van Haeperen 2010, 252.

6.2. Germania Superior

(93) *Livilla dea* (††)
AE 1991, 1256 (Aventicum), a second-century AD statue base, records a dedication to *Livilla dea* by Genialis, a freedman of Flavius Eros: *Livillae deae sacr(um)* / *Genialis Flavi Erotis l*. Since *Livilla*, being a name coined with the suffix *-illa*, does not function as an adjective, only two possible options seem to be available:[7] either this is a private consecration of a woman called Livilla,[8] or perhaps, rather, we are dealing with a dedication to a local goddess of Celtic origin,[9] whose name could be compared to the epithet of *Apollo Livicus*, 'the shining' (?), in Bonna (*CIL* XIII 8006; with Hofenender 2010, 97);[10] cf. OIr. *lí*, 'beauty, colour, lustre', Lat. *livor*, *Livius*, etc. (Holder 1904, 251; Delamarre 2003[2], 205; Zair 2012, 108). The (diminutive/derivative) suffix *-illo-* is quite well attested in Celtic names and in Celtic regions in general.[11]

[7] A third possibility has also been suggested, namely that this is Livilla, Caligula's sister. This option is better ignored.

[8] Thus Frei-Stolba 1990, 128. Cf. Ferlut 2011, Corpus 444, No. 807 ("Consécration à Liuilla divinisée"); Fuchs 2016, 111 (Livilla, also a manumitted slave, could have been Genialis's deified wife). For an apparently similar case, see *CIL* XIII 8706 (Millingen, Germ. Inf.; cf. Laubry 2021, 212): *Deae Dominae Rufiae* / *[M]aternae aram et* / *[l]ucum consecravit* / *Mucronia Marcia*, etc. Spickermann, forthcoming, assumes that *Livilla dea* might refer to the cult of a potential mythical ancestress (?) called Livilla, perhaps coming from a family which had funded a local cult district.

[9] A possibility discussed by Frei-Stolba (1990, 127) and taken as an alternative explanation by Nélis-Clement 2008, 97 n. 49. Admittedly, in the case of a goddess, the term *dea* would more likely come before her name than after it. On the other hand, if *Livilla* is a female personal name, one may wonder why the woman was called by the sole cognomen.

[10] Transmitted as *APOLLIN LIVICI*, perhaps in the genitive, unless to be read *Apollin(i) Livici(ano)*. Jufer – Luginbühl (2001, 49) have "*Livic[us] Apollo*".

[11] Holder 1904, 34–35; Kajanto 1965, 127; Evans 1967, *passim*. For Gaulish *Livilla*, cf. Whatmough 1970, 1130.

7. Theonym + cognomen-*ius*/-*ia*

7.1. Rome

(94) *Isis Athenodoria* (*)

This entry appears in the fourth-century AD *Regionary Catalogues* of Rome as the fourth item of *Reg. XII* (*Curios. urb*. p. 92, 13 N: *Isidem Atenodoriam*; *Reg. urb*. p. 92, 13 N: *Isidem Athenodoriam*). It is often taken to refer to a temple of Isis (Pelagia?) but may rather (or at the same time?) denote the goddess's statue made (originally?) by an artist called Athenodoros, identified by some with the famous sculptor from Rhodes.[1] In the case of a temple, it is commonly assumed that the epithet denotes the person who had built and dedicated it to Isis. In this function, however, one would rather expect the epithet *Athenodoriana*, the adjectival suffix *-ius* being used especially by antiquarian writers and grammarians in reference to earlier literature and poetic metres as well as professional groups such as artists, rhetors, and poets (e.g., *metrum Aristophanium*, *tetrametrum Diodorium*, *pastor Hesiodius*, *Venus Praxitelia*, etc.).[2] Therefore, if one had to choose between these two options, it is clearly more likely that *Athenodoria* is an independent adjective derived from the name of a sculptor, which would mean that the goddess's statue mentioned in the *Catalogues* was the work of an Athenodoros.[3] One thing that is sure is that Isis's epithet is a purely literary one that was not used in cult dedications (see Introduction pp. 4, 11–14).

On the other hand, as the form *Athenodoriana* could fittingly indicate either the builder of a temple or the sculptor of a statue, one may wonder if the *Catalogue* entries could be understood as follows: *Isidem At(h)enodori<an>am*. That *an* was dropped before *am* at some stage is technically imaginable (the earliest mss. are

---

[1] For various hypotheses, see J. Calzini Gysens, *LTUR* III (1996), 112; Versluys 2002, 364; Palma Venetucci – Cacciotti – Mangiafesta 2018, 502–503; Raffarin 2019, 252.

[2] Although *-ius* also occurs in earlier sources (Cic., etc.), they typically have *-eus* (cf. Gr. -εος, -ειος), e.g., Cic. *orat*. 190: *anapaestus … Aristophaneus* (cf. Dion. Hal. *Comp. verb*. 25: τετράμετρον ἀναπαιστικόν … Ἀριστοφάνειον); *ad Q. fr.* 3,1,19: *Aristophaneo modo*; Sen. *contr*. 2,5,13: *Moschum Apollodoreum*, i.e., the declaimer Moschos, pupil of Apollodoros; Quint. 2,11,2: *Theodoreus an Apollodoreus* (in reference to a rhetor who was asked whether he was a follower of Theodoros or Apollodoros).

[3] In his discussion of *Bellona Rufilia* (above No. **1**), Palmer (1975, 655 n. 3) stated, most confusingly, that "Isis Athenodoria … shows the formation closest to that imagined in *Rufilia* where the gentilician adjective supplanted Rufinia."

from the eighth century). In one scenario, the denomination *Isis Athenodoriana* could have been in use from the time when the name of Athenodoros began to be associated with the temple or statue (or both). However, this may be unnecessary speculation because even if *Athenodoriana* had been in earlier use, the style *Isis Athenodoria* is quite acceptable for the period and genre of the *Regionaries* and thus would not necessarily imply any textual corruption (and the epithet might have already figured in the potential third-century common proto-source from which both the *Curiosum* and the *Notitia* may have descended).[4] But if the change in onomastic use really happened (*Athenodoriana* > *Athenodoria*), it could have been made easier by the fact that cognomina ending in *-ius* were widely used in the third and fourth centuries AD.[5]

(95) *Silvanus Valentius* (††?)
CIL VI 698 (= *ILS* 3569; late 1st /early 2nd cent. AD?): *Valentio / Silvano / A. Plutius / Athenaeus / v(oto?) s(uscepto?) l(ibens) d(ono) d(edit)*.[6] Note that *Valentio* precedes *Silvano* in the inscription. This is a complex case. First, if *Valentius* is Silvanus's epithet, as is often assumed, one would expect it to be recorded after the god's name, even if the inverse order is not quite unparalleled (cf. No. **48**: *Silvanus Settianus* [inscr. *Settiano Silvano*]). What is more problematic, however, is the form ending in *-ius*. Considering that divine epithets derived from anthroponyms with the suffix *-ius* do not seem, unsurprisingly, to be otherwise documented by the epigraphic sources (see previous entry), it seems unlikely that Silvanus was named *Valentius* after someone called Valens (and certainly the god had not downright adopted the name of a Valentius).[7] In theory, one might wonder if there were two dedicators, a Valentio and an Athenaeus, but this option is both odd and complicated and is not suggested by the epigraphic diction.

A different interpretation was given by von Domaszewski. He argued that *Valentius* stands for an African god, probably Baal Addir (or Baliddir), while pointing out that *Valens* looks like an epichoric epithet of Jupiter.[8] This is the

[4] Cf. Hosie 2016 for a hypothesis that the proto-*Regionaries* date from after Septimius Severus but prior to Constantine, suggesting Aurelian to be the more likely candidate under whom they were authored.

[5] Kajanto 1963, 70–86; Id. 1965, 115–18; Solin 1984, 132–36.

[6] Carter (1898, 35) prints "Silvanus Valentinus" (*sic*). For the reading *v(oto) s(uscepto)* instead of *v(otum) s(olvit)*, see Panciera 2002, 49 n. 38.

[7] Kajanto 1965, 247 (*Valens* and its derivatives)

[8] Von Domaszewski 1902, 24–25 (cf. n. 275: "Schon die Wortform zeigt, dass hier nicht der Silvanus eines fundus gemeint sein kann.") = Id. 1909, 85 (cf. 83). Cf. Bensedddik 2010, I 175.

best explanation given so far, and there may indeed be an African connection here, although I am not sure if it is necessarily a specific African god who appears here under the name of *Valentius*. Perhaps this name is associated with Jupiter in the first place. One may note that Iuppiter Valens and Silvanus not only appear together in some inscriptions from Lambaesis in Numidia,[9] but dedications to "Iuppiter Silvanus" are known from both Rome and Numidia (and some other provinces), suggesting a close association between the two gods.[10] Since, however, it is clear in any case that *Valentius* cannot be an epithet of Silvanus, we are probably dealing with a combination of two deities, Valentius (~ Jupiter) and Silvanus, who are working together and complementing each other. The former's name is perhaps based on the African *Valens*, a title of Jupiter attested there, but for the form of the name, ending in *-ius*, it is perhaps not insignificant that an otherwise unknown goddess named Valentia is recorded for Ocriculum in southern Umbria (Tert. *apol*. 24,8, drawing on Varro).[11]

---

[9] *CIL* VIII 2579a-c (= 18089 = *ILS* 3841 = Benseddik 2010, II 121, No. 2), recording Iuppiter Valens, Aesculapius and Salus, and Silvanus. The names of the dedicatees in *CIL* VIII 2585 (= 18091 = Benseddik 2010, II 135, No. 43) are usually restored as follows (line 4): *[Iovi Valenti, Aesculapio, Silvano Pega]siano, Dis Patriis* (cf. No. **91**: *Silvanus Pegasianus*). In *CIL* VIII 2579d (= *ILS* 3034 = Benseddik 2010, II 127, No. 16), *Iuppiter Valens* appears alone.

[10] *CIL* VIII 5933 (= *ILAlg*. II 7240a): *Iovi / Silvano / sacrum*; *CIL* VIII 19199 (= *ILAlg*. II 6867): *Iovi / Silvano / Aug(usto) sac(rum)*, etc.; *AE* 1995, 184 (Rome): *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) / Silvano / sacrum*, etc.; *AE* 1946, 91 (Rome): *Iovi Silvano / sacrum et / numini domus / divinae Aug(ustae) et / Genio coriaror(um) / confectorum,* etc.; *CIL* VI 30930: *Iovi Silvan[o voto] / suscepto Seleucu[s]*. Cf. also *CIL* VI 36786: *Iovi / Silvano / Salutari sacr(um)*, etc. For the obvious association between Jupiter and Silvanus in these cases, see Panciera 1995, 357–58.

[11] I also considered another explanation related to the one just given, specifically regarding the appearance of both Iuppiter Valens and Silvanus in Africa and Rome. However, this interpretation is perhaps too complicated and therefore less likely, but since it might be possible, let it be presented briefly: if line 1 refers to *(Iuppiter) Valens O(ptimus)*, we would have, in the dative, *Valenti O(ptimo) / Silvano*, etc., even if there is no interpunct between VALENTI and O (as confirmed by a photograph), and even if *Optimus* is not followed by *Maximus*, as it very commonly was. For the rare style *Iuppiter Optimus* (without *Maximus*), see, e.g., *CIL* IX 2124 (Vitolano/ager Benev.); *EE* IX 762a (Praeneste); *Suppl. It*. 16: *Rusellae* 2 (uncertain); *CILCáceres*-04, 1308; *AE* 2018, 924 (Hisp. Cit.); *AE* 1967, 200 (Lusitania); *ILGN* 77 (Gall. Narb.); *AE* 1965, 183 (Germ. Sup.); Pfahl, *ILGI*, p. 149, No. 21 (a ring; Germ. Sup.); *CIL* III 9957 (Dalmatia). At times, *Optimus* is followed by some title other than *Maximus*.

8. Theonym + nomen/cognomen in the genitive — Adjective ~ genitive

People and their property were not only protected by personal spirits like the Genii and the Lares but also by traditional deities taking on a similar role. The best example is probably Fortuna. During the second and first centuries BC, this old goddess was transformed from a Roman national deity first to a personal guardian of Roman generals, and then to the emperor's safeguard (especially the *Fortuna Redux*). In the Imperial period, Fortuna gradually evolved into a protective deity of other people as well, thus functioning as a sort of substitute for the Genius, or the Juno of a woman. This protective aspect may be reflected in the fact that the goddess was referred to not only with an adjectival epithet derived from a man's nomen or cognomen, but also occasionally with a pendant genitive of those names.

The use of the genitival epithet, of course, does not apply to all gods without distinction. One could, for example, make a dedication to Jupiter for the safety of someone but not to the Jupiter of this same person while a dedication to someone's Genius, Lares, or Fortuna, using the person's name in the genitive, would have been quite understandable. It seems that, just as in traditional Greek religion gods did not belong to individuals or groups (with some very rare exceptions), Roman gods were seldom worshipped with epithets showing a man's name in the genitive. Much depended on the deity's activity and role as a partner and protector: the more personal and private it was perceived, and the more closely the deity was associated with a particular person or place, the more likely this relationship could be expressed in dedications by attaching the genitive of the personal name to the theonym. This is, of course, an indicative estimate, but the genitival epithet in dedications would seem to be more often associated with those deities who, according to other sources, also act as personal guardians of people and their possessions.

If, however, a deity like Fortuna was "someone's" Fortuna at one time, so that she was referred to with the genitive (e.g., *Fortuna Iuliae Rufinae*), but "related to someone" at another, being characterized with an adjectival epithet (*Fortuna Iuliana /Rufiniana*), the question arises as to the difference in meaning between the two methods. My impression is that, if there was any difference, for the ancient people it was mostly grammatical rather than semantic. But while the grammar is interesting, what is more relevant is how people perceived the

relationship between man and god in such cases. In fact, we may be dealing with a mere linguistic analogy with little or no religious significance. Probably the alternative use of the genitive in the case of Fortuna, for example, was influenced by its regular use in connection with personal deities such as the Genii. This sort of variation in grammatical categories hardly implies a change in the relationship between deities and their worshippers.[1]

However, compared to the various types of dedications made to the Lares or the Genius of individuals,[2] the evidence for sacred dedications where Fortuna's name is accompanied by the genitive of an individual's name is quite meagre. The case of "*Fortuna Flavia*" (to be interpreted as the Fortuna of a Flavia) was discussed above (see No. **2**). A similar case is sometimes alleged to be found in *CIL* VI 3679 (= 30873; early 2nd cent. AD), a statue base of the goddess inscribed *Fortunae sacrum / Claudiae Iustae*. However, this must be associated with a burial (cf. above p. 5 n. 6).[3] Instead, the Praenestan dedication to the Fortuna of Taruttenia Paulina may belong to our category (*EE* IX 888: *Fortunae Tarutteniae Paulinae*). The archaeological context suggests the dedication of an aedicula to the goddess, probably the local Primigenia. Paulina's name (despite the spelling) may point to the third-century AD senatorial Tarrutenii.[4]

In addition, I noticed two dedications from the theatre of Lepcis Magna, one of which the dedicator made to the Fortuna of his daughter, the other to that of his granddaughter, both in accordance with a public decree (*IRT* 276–77; 2nd to 3rd cent. AD). While in the former the goddess is simply Fortuna, in the latter she not only bears the epiclesis *Crescens* but receives the dedication jointly with Hora Bona.

Dedications to a person's Lares were more common. As for the dedicatory patterns, inscriptions suggest that the binomial theonym "Lares + PN-gen." is, in

---

[1] Similarly, some vacillation is visible in the denominations of Imperial deities: the theonym was most typically accompanied by the adjectival *Augustus/a*, but the genitive *Augusti* (*Augustorum*) sometimes occurs, cf. Panciera (2003, 238), observing that there was probably no substantial difference between the two styles.

[2] See, e.g., Bömer 1981[2], 47–56.

[3] See Laubry 2015, 164. Cf. Borg (2019, 218–19), taking the statue as that of Iusta's personal deity Fortuna, and thinking (*ibid.* n. 93) that the goddess could have been called either "Fortuna Claudia Iusta", which is very unlikely, or "Fortuna Claudiae Iustae", which might be possible in the case where Fortuna was a personal guardian. As for *CIL* VI 782: *Veneri Felici Sallustia Helpidus d(ono) d(edit)*, Borg (p. 220) holds it possible that "the deity is actually Venus Felix Sallustia; that is, the tutelary deity of the dedicant." While the latter claim might be substantially true, the goddess certainly did not bear the nomen *Sallustia*.

[4] Chausson 1996, 345 n. 54.

substance, an alternative option for "Lares + PN-adj.". On the one hand, there was a *coll(egium) Larum Marcellini* (*CIL* IX 2481; lost) in Saepinum; on the other hand, the institution of the *decuriones Larum Volusianorum* existed in Rome (*CIL* VI 10266–67). Thus, in principle, there would have been two ways to refer to the Lares of a person or of a family: e.g., in the case of the *gens Volusia*, either *Lares Volusiani* or *Lares Volusiorum* (the type "*Lares Volusii*", as we have seen, is not reliably documented). On the same principle, the *Lares Marcellini* in Saepinum could perhaps have been called "*Lares Marcelliniani*" (a form that, in theory, could also be derived from the rare nomen *Marcellinius*; cf. above No. **40**).

In the Severan period, just to record a different context, the *Fortuna Aeterna* of the Furian family received a dedication on behalf of one of its consular members: *Fortunae Aeternae domus Furianae pro ˹s˺(alute) C. Furi Octaviani c. v.*, etc. (*ILJug*. III 1415 = *ILS* 1170; Ulpiana). Alternatively, instead of the genitive construction, the goddess could surely have been called *Fortuna Aeterna Furiana* / *Furianensis*. Similarly, the Capuan dedication that in the earlier Principate was offered to the Hercules Tutor of the Novellian house (*CIL* X 3799: *Herculi Tutori domus Novelliana*) could well have been styled *Herculi Tutori Novelliano* / *Novellianensi*,[5] just as the *Tute[la] dom[us] Rupil[ianae]* from Verona (*CIL* V 3304, 1st cent. AD) could as well have been named *Tutela Rupiliana* (cf. No. **80**: *Tutela Candidiana*). In all these cases, of course, the protecting divinity could also have been given the epithet *Domesticus/a* (*Fortunae Aeternae Domesticae*, *Herculi Tutori Domestico*, etc.). *Silvanus Domesticus* is also well attested.

In the Greek dedications, on the other hand, there was less room to manoeuvre. The Fortune of the house of the Publii in Rome was addressed as follows: [Τύ]χῃ / οἴκου / Ποπλίων (*IGUR* I 196; late 1st cent. AD; Schraudolph 1993, 238, No. L155). An adjectival epithet would not have been a good option, while in Latin one could have said *Fortunae (domus) Publianae* (also possible, though less idiomatic, would have been *Fortunae Publiorum*).

However, the option of functional interchangeability has its limits. *CIL* XII 2677 (= *ILS* 7328 = Laubry 2012, 130, *NA 18; Alba Helvorum; 1st cent. AD?) seems to record a funerary dedication to L. Pinarius Optatus by the *cultor(es) Larum Sex. Antoni Mansueti et L. Valeri Rufini*. On an extreme formal analysis, what follows *Larum* might be taken as one single divine epithet (which probably few will do), as if the worshippers were devoted to the joint cult of the Lares of two individuals. Here the Lares of the two seemingly unrelated persons, Mansuetus

[5] Cf. Carter 1898, 35; Schraudolph 1993, 132-33, No. H4.

and Rufinus, are very untypically[6] bundled together, but what would the "Lares of Sex. Antonius Mansuetus" have been called using an adjective? Perhaps "*Lares Antoniani*", or "*Mansuetiani*", just as those of L. Valerius Rufinus could have been called "*Valeriani*" or "*Rufiniani*". Therefore, in principle, the association of these worshippers could just as well have been labelled the "*cultores Larum Antonianorum et Valerianorum*", for example, although this is not as precise an expression as the use of the *tria nomina*. However, a reference to these Lares in a direct dedication to them would obviously have been formulated more concisely than here.

Sometimes the Lares and the Fortuna of an individual are recorded together. A text from Paelignian Superaequum records an epitaph set up for a freedwoman by the *cultores Larum et Fortunae ⌜L.⌝ Caedi Cordi* (*CIL* IX 7400 = *Suppl. It.* 22: Superaequum 59; 1st cent. AD). One wonders if dedications were offered to these deities together or to the Lares and Fortuna separately and how such dedications were formulated. Several options would have been available.

In some other cases, one and the same dedication is addressed to both an individual's Genius and the Lares of a household. In Pompeii, for example, two freedmen each called Diadumenus offered a shrine to the Genius of their ex-master (probably M. Epidius Rufus) and the Lares of his house (*CIL* X 861 = *ILS* 3641): *Genio M. n(ostri) et / Laribus / duo Diadumeni / liberti*. A substantively similar, albeit syntactically different, case seems to be attested at Abdera in Baetica (*CIL* II 1980 = *ILS* 3604; latter half of the 1st cent AD): *C. C. N. / Suavis l. et / Faustus vil(icus) Lar(es) et Genium / cum aedicula primi d(e) s(uo) d(ono?) d(ederunt?)*.[7] Sometimes the Lares are accompanied by other deities such as the household's Tutela, as in a dedication from Tarraco (*CIL* II 4082 = *CIL* II^2 14, 838 = *ILS* 3605): *Laribus et [Tu]/telae, Genio L. / n(ostri), Telesphor(us) / et Plate donum / dederunt*. In these and many similar instances, the Lares and the Tutela could also have been named after the patron using an adjectival form of his name (e.g., in the Pompeian case, *Laribus Epidianis / Rufianis*), though the context was perfectly clear without such clarification.

---

[6] See Laubry 2012, 105 n. 113. As he correctly points out, the term *cultor* might also, though perhaps less likely, refer to L. Pinarius Optatus with his name in the dative (*L. Pinario Optato cultor(i)*, etc.). In that case, no dedicators would be recorded, but the context might have made their mention unnecessary. See also Tran 2021, 271.

[7] The initial letters probably have to be understood as *CC(ais duobus) n(ostris)*, as proposed by Mommsen (see also Antolini – Marengo 2016, 119 n. 15). For other, less likely solutions, see *HEp* (http://eda-bea.es/pub/record_card_2.php?rec=6).

Concerning other gods there is at least one case in which a theonym is accompanied by an anthroponym in the genitive, that is, the *Silvanus Flaviorum* to whom a freedman of an ex-slave of Titus made a dedication, together with his two sons, in AD 149 (*CIL* VI 644 = *ILS* 3537): *Silvano Flaviorum* / *Cassianus T. Flavi Aug. lib.* / *Celadi libertus fecit una* / *cum Flavis Cassiano et* / *Amando filis*, etc. The use of the genitive probably reflects the fact that, like Fortuna, Silvanus was perceived as a close companion and personal protector. He was not only associated with the Flavii but was their god and belonged to them; the plural, in turn, identifies the Flavian emperors both as a group and as individuals, incorporating the god in the worship of the entire dynasty,[8] while the adjective *Flavianus* would have referred to the Flavian family on a more general level. In another interpretation, which seems to me less likely, *Silvanus Flaviorum* would have been the Silvanus of the freedmen (and the *familia*) of the Flavian dynasty.[9]

Since Fortuna is one of the gods whose epithet is either an adjective derived from an anthroponym or, sometimes, the genitive form of that name, let us recapitulate and take this goddess as an example of the alternative onomastic methods by which the relationship of an individual and his/her family with this goddess could be expressed in dedications. The sample name is simple, *Iulius Rufus*. Other types of nomenclature would affect the table accordingly.

Dedication to the Fortuna of Iulius Rufus or his house:
Fortunae Iulii Rufi (individual)
Fortunae Rufi (individual)
Fortunae Iuliorum (family/house [possible, but must have been relatively rare])
Fortunae Iulianae (family/house [*domus Iuliana*] ~ also unrelated individual female [*Iuliana*])
Fortunae Rufianae (family/house [*domus Rufi/Rufiana*]; individual [*Rufus*] ~ also unrelated individual female [*Rufiana*], or derived from the nomen *Rufius*)
Fortunae Iulianensi (family/house [*domus Iuliana*])

[8] Dorcey 1992, 104 (however, on pp. 31–32 n. 82, *Flaviorum* is taken to refer to imperial estates).

[9] Bömer 1981[2], 83. For Palmer (1978, 226), *Silvanus Flaviorum* would be an indication of the fondness of Flavian freedmen for this god. According to Pfiffig (1975, 299), *Silvanus Flaviorum* designated an estate or its owner.

9. Derivation ~ association

In numerous dedications to gods, a connection may be observed between the name of the dedicator and the theonym (Apollonius dedicates to Apollo, Heraclida to Hercules, Isidorus to Isis, Saturninus to Saturn, etc.). However, there is probably no indication that Apollonioi were more devoted to Apollo than were those with other names, and if the god Saturn often received dedications from Saturnini in Africa where both the god and the cognomen were very popular, the conclusion is not that these dedicators worshipped this god because of the name by which they were called. The more common the theophoric names, and the more popular the respective gods, the more often the presence of both in the same dedicatory contexts is likely to be a coincidence. Sometimes, however, contextual evidence may suggest that a dedicator with a theophoric name, for one reason or another, turned to a god whose name resembled his or her own.[1] A related category is those cases where the god from which the name of the deceased is derived is somehow represented on the grave monument, like the tomb of a Heraklides from Thessalonice, decorated with symbols of the hero.[2] However, considering, again, the great popularity of Herakles/Hercules on the one hand, and the diffusion of the personal names derived from this theonym on the other, the god's appearance on this and similar monuments usually has hardly any connection with the name of the deceased.

As for the divine epithets, we have seen that they are sometimes based on personal names. Listed above are c. 100 cases where names were derived very regularly, almost always with the suffix *-ianus/a* (or *-ian-ensis*), from nomina and cognomina. In addition to these, there are some dedications where it has been argued that a divine epithet in them is derived from an anthroponym on the basis that the two resemble each other. I will highlight three such cases, each of which may shed light on the question of chance, derivation, or association between two names.

(96) *Bona Dea Agrestis Felicula* (†)
A public slave called Felix, abandoned by doctors, sacrificed to *Bona Dea Agrestis Felicula* after the goddess had restored his eyesight (*CIL* VI 68 = *ILS* 3513 = Brouwer 1989, 53–54, No. 44): *Felix publicus / Asinianus pontîfic(um) / Bonae*

[1] Cf., e.g., the evidence from the sanctuary of Kephisos at Phaleron (Parker 2000, 59–60).

[2] *IG* X 2, 1, 922 = Wrede 1981, 203, No. 23.

Deae Agresti Felicu(lae) / votum solvit iunicem alba(m) / libens animo ob luminibus / restitutis; derelictus a medicis, post / menses decem bineficio dominaes medicinis sanatus, per eam / restituta omnia ministerio Canniae Fortunatae.[3] It was commonly thought that this Bona Dea had her epithet *Felicula* from the dedicator's name until another dedication referring to the renovation of a sanctuary of the same goddess turned up (*CIL* VI 39822, ll. 2/3 = *AE* 1980, 53: *Bonae Deae / Feliculae Agresti fánum*, etc.; cf. M. G. Granino Cecere, *LTUR Suburb*. I [2001], 225), showing that the cult existed independently and thus confirming that the epithet was not derived from Felix's name.

Regarding the title *Felicula*, it was very common as a women's personal name (especially in the lower social classes), but even if the existence of a deadjectival diminutive **fēlic-ulus/a* is quite possible (cf. *feroculus*, *parvulus*, etc.),[4] the name *Felicula*, unlike *Agrestis*, is not found as an adjective, and so it probably functions here like any non-adjectival cognomen. However, since the title clearly refers to a deity that brings happiness, success, and health,[5] one wonders if this could suggest that a goddess called Felicula and associated with these qualities also existed as an independent entity in Rome and that she could sometimes be combined with other goddesses, as in this case with Bona Dea. A tutelary goddess with the name *Felicula* may also be known from Spain.[6] Divine associations and combinations of this type were common in antiquity.

Statistics show that *Felix* was the most popular human name in ancient Rome, but even if the similarity between *Felicula* and *Felix* in the dedication to Bona Dea may have been a pure coincidence, the possibility exists that the slave approached the goddess because her name resembled his own, or at least he felt that there was a connection between the two names, which might have strengthened his perception of Felicula as his personal protector.

(97) *Nymphae Geminae* (†)

CIL IX 5744 (= *ILS* 3866; Urbs Salvia [and not Ricina]): *Nymphìs Geminìs / sacrum / C. Fufius Gemini l. / Polìticus. / Ìdem aquam perduxit.* It is commonly believed that these Nymphs were named after the cognomen of the dedicator's ex-

[3] Context of the dedication: Kajava 2015, 410–11; Gatto – Gregori 2021, 145.

[4] Leumann 1977, 305–309 (esp. 308).

[5] Panciera (2016, 551) took *Felicula* as an affective diminutive with the meaning "che porta fortuna, salutare".

[6] *CIL* II 1097 (Ilipa Magna), if the new reading, *Feliculae loci*, is accepted (see Pascual 2008; some reservations in *AE* 2008, 659).

master, C. Fufius Geminus (probably the patron of the colony, and consul in AD 29).[7] This is hardly possible, because in that case the Nymphs would probably have become *Geminianae*. In fact, the attribute rather refers to two Nymphs as the protectors of two water sources.[8] This is further suggested by the fact that the dedication seems to have been made in two copies (the other one, *AE* 1982, 238, is fragmentary). In addition, the "Twin Nymphs" are perhaps known from a dedication in Noricum (*RIS* 240 = *ILLPRON* Ind. 1164; 2nd cent. AD): *Nimpis G(eminis) / sac(rum) C. Annius Iu/venalis v. s. l. m*. The existence of a double spring cannot be ruled out here either.[9]

On the other hand, it seems possible that the similarity between the divine epithet and the cognomen of the patron and his family is not quite incidental. If the works for channelling water from the double spring were carried out with the assistance of the senatorial Fufii Gemini, perhaps on their lands (the family evidently had possessions in this region), Politicus may have also deliberately given the two Nymphs an epithet with an eye to his ex-master's name.

(98) *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Purpurio* (†)
CIL VI 424 (= *ILS* 3040; with datings ranging from the late Republic to the late 2nd/3rd cent. AD: G. Lahusen, in: *Villa Albani* 1989, 117, No. 31 [early]; Schraudolph 1993, 226, No. L71 [late]) is an altar dedication to Jupiter by three women: *Licinia Quinta, Licinia Purpuris* [in the middle], *Octavia Saturnin(a) / Iovi Optimo Maximo / Purpurioni*. Considering that there is an obvious link between *Purpurio* and the name of one of the dedicators, the consensus has always

[7] E.g., Mommsen (*CIL*): "Ab eo Nymphae quoque nomen traxisse videntur"; Dessau (*ILS*): "Ab eo Nymphis nomen indidisse libertum apparet"; Gasperini 1982, *passim*; Delplace 1993, 250; Paci 2000, 152; Cancrini – Marengo 2001, 106–108 (VRB 1); Bertrand 2018, 23.

[8] As already observed by Ihm (1887, 95 n. 1): "Merkwürdig wäre es, wenn dieser Beiname von einem Menschen hergenommen wäre, wie Mommsen vermuthete." Correctly, also, Mastino 2001, 95. Cf. Šašel (1973, 902), in reference to the denomination of the Via Gemina from Aquileia to Emona: "So hat es wenig Wahrscheinlichkeit an sich, dass die Bezeichnung *Gemina* auf eine Person zu beziehen wäre", although he did not exclude a connection with C. Fufius Geminus (in fact, he mentions the uncommon use ["ungewöhnlich verwendet"] of the cognomen in the *Nymphis Geminis* dedication).

[9] As also pointed out by Weber (*RIS*, comm.). See also Mirsch (2013, 130, Ri 9), with bibliography. Let it be noted that *Geminus* is also attested as the epithet of Silvanus with probable reference to the god's double nature (*domesticus* and *silvester*) or his function as the protector of borders. Concerning *CIL* XI 2721 (Volsinii), Calapà (2022, 174–75) thinks that this epiclesis could, in theory, be compared to those derived from nomina (like the epithets of *Silvanus Naevianus* and *Silvanus Veturianus*), a possibility that must certainly be ruled out. Another *Silvanus Geminus* is known from *AE* 2019, 1256 (Dacia Porolissensis).

been that the god's epithet was derived from the cognomen of Licinia Purpuris (e.g., Dessau, *ILS*: "Cognomen Iovi inditum videtur a cognomine dedicantis").[10] However, this type of transformation of an anthroponym to a divine epithet would be unique. In the case of a derivation, one would expect either *Licinianus* or *Purpuridianus*. Moreover, to my knowledge, this would be the only case in which a human's name was given to Jupiter as an epithet.

Therefore, the epithet must be explained in a different way. Long ago (in 1914), Arthur Cook,[11] while agreeing with the derivation of the epithet from Licinia's cognomen, thought it could imply that the god wore purple garb as a mark of his kingship, an idea that Arthur Nock (in 1925) found "hard to accept".[12] I think Cook's reasoning not only deserves to be considered but can be developed further. The title of *Optimus Maximus* and the purple colour strongly suggest Jupiter's cult statue in the Capitoline temple. During the triumphal celebrations, both the purple toga and the golden laurel wreath the image was wearing were handed over to the triumphator who also had his face painted red in imitation of the red-leaded complexion of the cult statue (*Iuppiter miniatus*). It is probably this version of the Best and Greatest Jupiter that is meant here, and thus the purple-clad god was worshipped not only on the Capitol but also elsewhere in Rome (Licinia's monument reportedly comes from somewhere in the Monte Testaccio area[13]). In antiquity, cult statues were often not only painted but also dressed and otherwise decorated, so a god wearing a purple robe should come as no surprise, and indeed a similarly fashioned Saturn now seems to be attested in Africa.[14]

The existence of an independent cult of *Iuppiter O. M. Purpurio* may be confirmed by another inscription. According to *CIL* XIV 3469 (lost) from Agosta in eastern Latium, the *septemviri epulonum*, or one of them (cf. *PIR*^{2} M 347), made a dedication to the Capitoline triad with the following heading: *Iovi Opt(imo) [Max(imo) ---]/oni, Iunoni, Mine[rvae]*. According to Dessau (*CIL*,

[10] In scholarship, Jupiter's epithet in this inscription is also given as "Purpurion", "Purpuris", or "Purpurius".

[11] Cook 1914, 58 n. 1.

[12] Nock 1925, 91 n. 61.

[13] According to Domenico Giorgi, it was found "in una cava a Monte Testaccio 27 gennaio 1746" (cf. *CIL* VI, p. 834).

[14] The theonym *Saturnus Cryptensis Purpuratus* appears in an unpublished dedication from the sanctuary of this god at the northern foot of the *mons Balcaranensis* in Tunis (*Epigraphica* 81 [2019] 251–52 = *AE* 2019, 1901), suggesting a cult statue clad in purple (while *Cryptensis* looks like a topographic designation).

comm.), Mommsen suggested *Purpuri]oni* as Jupiter's epithet, an idea that has undeservedly been forgotten.[15]

In this case, therefore, we are not dealing with derivations of names but with association between them. And while in the above dedication to Felicula, Felix's name may have just coincidentally resembled the name of the goddess, the same is not possible here, as both the epithet and the cognomen are very rare. It therefore seems likely that Licinia Purpuris, who, judging by the design of the inscription, appears to have been the chief dedicator, was devoted to *Iuppiter O. M. Purpurio*, at least in part because she almost shared her name with the god.[16] One wonders if the association between the names also suggests that, besides her devotion to the god, Purpuris deliberately demonstrated her education and learning. One may note that, in their hands, from left to right, the dedicators hold an opened writing tablet, a scroll and a bowl, that is, next to the sacred device, two obvious signs of learning.

[15] Rüpke (2013, 276) thought of Anio (*Ani]oni*), as if Jupiter had been equated with the river.

[16] In principle, this circumstance could have been caused by the fact that her own name was modeled after this same god. Who knows if Licinia's parents were already devoted to *Iuppiter O. M. Purpurio*?

10. Conclusions

In the ancient world it was quite common for the gods to bear epithets that in one way or another described them and defined their fields of action. Sometimes, rarely, theonyms were accompanied by the adjectival form of a human name, which was usually coined with a suffix. While this practice was extremely rare in the Greek world, it is better known among the Romans, although even there it can be considered a relatively marginal phenomenon.

This work is an onomastic and typological investigation, the purpose of which was to explore the divine epithets that appeared in Roman context and were derived from Roman anthroponyms (e.g., *Apollo Sosianus*, *Venus Lucilliana*, *Fortuna Taurianensis*). In particular, the aim was to identify the typological patterns according to which deities were named after humans. If a coherent system and method could be distinguished in this regard, it could at best help to better analyse problematic and uncertainly transmitted cases and, in connection with them, distinguish probable from less probable alternatives.

As might be expected, epithets occur mainly in sacred dedications, and therefore the material for this analysis is largely derived from inscriptions. Some epithets also appear in literary sources. As for the different types of sources, the epithets appearing in them could differ considerably from one another. While the titles of the gods in the inscribed dedications addressed to them could have a genuine cultic meaning, the cases known from literature are mostly antiquarian mentions of builders of temples or dedicators of statues. Otherwise, it must be remembered that any references to temples in sources dating later than the time the temples and monuments were built or reconstructed may reflect subsequent naming conventions and likely follow the style of the genre in which they were recorded. This is especially true of the literary sources.

The Catalogue includes c. 100 entries, many of which are uncertain for various reasons (see Introduction pp. 3–4, 6–7). The occurrences are largely concentrated in Rome and central Italy, in addition to which a few, partly dubious, cases are known from North Africa (Nos. **8–9**, **54–58, 90–91**), and two probably non-pertinent cases from the Celto-Germanic regions (Nos. **10**, **93**). Some epithets are of Greek origin, but they represent Roman onomastic culture (*Fortuna Zmaragdiana*, *Hercules Invictus Esychianus*, *Victoria Glaucopiana*, etc.).

As is well known, in the Roman world buildings could be named after their builders using either the constructor's or restorer's plain nomen (or praenomen) as an adjective, or the genitive of that name or of the cognomen (*via Appia* / *Flaminia*,

pons Aemilius — porticus Octaviae, *theatrum Balbi*, etc.). Suffixed forms, coined from both nomina and cognomina, were also widely used (*horrea Ummidiana* and *horti Torquatiani* in Rome, etc.). The naming practice was different in the case of sanctuaries that had been built or restored by someone, especially because the type "theonym + nomen-adj." (like the undocumented "*Apollo Sosius*") was not a viable option. It would have been very strange for a building sacred to Apollo to have been called "*Apollo Sosius*" because this name would not refer unequivocally to a specific sacred area, but in general to the god Apollo who is in some respect related to the Sosian family. However, the nature of that relationship would remain completely obscure in the absence of other information. Detailed analysis shows that compared to "theonym + (cog)nomen-*ianus*", evidence for the type "theonym + nomen-adj." is extremely limited, perhaps non-existent. This is an important consideration insofar as several names of this type have been taken as linguistic evidence for the existence of family cults in Roman religion.

Sometimes, however, the divine epithet is known to have also appeared as a nomen gentilicium (e.g., *Mefitis Utiana* [No. **42**], *Diana Karena* [No. **6**], perhaps *Minerva Matusia* [No. **7**]). In such cases, however, the designation does not seem to be derived from a human name, being rather an ancient attribute of the deity, which at some point also started to function as a family name. There is also evidence that the name of the deity itself could coincide with a nomen (goddess Ancharia – *gens Ancharia*, goddess Seia – *gens Seia*, etc.). However, these are not epithets, and here it is hardly possible to show that the name of the deity was formed from that of the *gens*. Regarding the deities *dea Satriana* from Rome (No. **23**) and *(deus) Visidianus* from Narnia (No. **53**), in both cases the latter element is the actual theonym, which very much looks like a suffixed derivation from the nomina *Satrius* and *Visidius*, respectively. However, the possibility exists that these theonyms are not derived from the names of specific families, but rather are independent theonyms related to the two nomina in that they share the same linguistic root with them (it is also not impossible that this evidence suggests the existence of the nomina **Satrianus* and **Visidianus*).

From the late Republic, Roman shrines could be referred to with a double name composed of a theonym and an epithet derived from the builder's nomen with the suffix *-ianus/a* (like the senatorial eponymous temples of *Apollo Sosianus*, *Diana Cornificiana*, etc.), though the genitive was also possible, especially in the literary sources, with the theonym typically being left unnamed (e.g., *aedes Pompei Magni*, in reference to a temple of Hercules restored by Pompey, see above p. 11).

A denomination of the type "*Silvanus Lusianus*", which represents by far the most common onomastic type in our material and for which there is relatively

much evidence in rural areas (like the Beneventan region), would have typically denoted a guardian deity related to a sacred area situated on the landed property of the *gens Lusia*, where there would have been an altar, aedicula, or a similar monument serving for the god's cult. However, over time it would presumably have become more and more normal for the type "theonym + nomen-*ianus*" to refer to the relationship between a family and a deity in a more generic way, so that the divine epithet could be perceived as denoting a family and its members without an association with a particular shrine. Correspondingly, the cognomen-derived epithets in *-ianus*, which became more common from the second century AD, could emphasize the relationship of either an individual or his or her family to a given deity. In one case, the divine epithet seems to have been derived from a signum (*Victoria Glaucopiana*, No. **82**).

Epithets coined with suffixes other than *-ianus* are harder to find. In some relatively rare cases from Imperial times, the epithet in *-ianus* was extended with *-ensis*, a suffix peculiar to ethnics (e.g., *Silvanus Valerianensis* < *Valerianus*; see Ch. 4). As for other types of suffixed derivations, only those in *-illa* and *-ius/-a* are recorded in scholarship, each represented by two cases in the Catalogue (see Chs. 6-7). Of these, however, only one (*Isis Athenodoria*) may be taken as relatively certain, the others being probably non-existent (for example, the goddess *Bona Dea Galbilla*, who has always been thought to bear an epithet, may not have had one at all; see No. **92**).

As for the suffix *-inus*, close typological analysis suggests that some cases transmitted as ending in *-inus* should perhaps be reinterpreted as ones in *-ianus* (see, e.g., No. **28**: *Bona Dea Sevina*, and No. **32**: *Hercules Victor Certencinus*). In fact, there may be no credible evidence that divine epithets were ever coined from anthroponyms with the suffix *-inus/a*. This is partly because this ending was rare as a suffix of cognomina derived from nomina from which most of the divine epithets originate. More significantly, however, unlike the names in *-ianus/a* (*Aemilianus*, etc.), those formed from other names with *-inus/a* rarely appear to function as adjectives.

It seems, then, that whatever the grammatical knowledge of the ancient Romans who composed inscribed dedications to gods, the divine epithets derived from human names appearing in them were very regularly formed with the suffix *-ianus*, sometimes *-ian-ensis*. In particular, the functional and semantic distinction made between the endings *-ianus* and *-inus* proves to be very consistently reflected in the material.

Protecting companions and spirits such as the Lares were considered only insofar as their epithets are derived from human personal names with suffixes.

Regarding the Genii, their relationship to humans, or to anything, was always expressed using the genitive of the object under their protection. This means that divine entities such as "*Genius Ulpius*" (No. **8**) and "*Genius Alotianus*" (No. **84**) do not exist, their names having to be explained in a new way.

Just like the Genii and the Lares, traditional deities such as Fortuna sometimes also acted as personal protectors of people and their property. In such cases, along with the use of an adjectival epithet, it was possible, though not very common, to combine the name of a deity with the genitive indicating an individual, a group or a house especially associated with it (cf. Ch. 8). As regards the use of either the adjectival form or the genitive, there was in practice hardly any difference between them other than the grammatical one. However, the genitival epithet would seem to be more often associated in dedications with those deities who, according to other sources, also act as personal guardians of people and their possessions.

The final chapter focused on the derivation of divine epithets from human names on the one hand, and the association between them, on the other (Ch. 9). One of the cases discussed concerns a Roman dedication to *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Purpurio* by three women, one of whom was called Licinia Purpuris. The consensus has always been that the god got his epithet from Licinia's cognomen. However, a closer look shows that *Purpurio* is an independent epithet of Jupiter and therefore is not derived from the name of the dedicator, but merely resembles it. This probably means that Licinia made a dedication to this specific deity because of the assonance between her own name and that of the god (nor is it impossible that Licinia's parents were already devoted to *Iuppiter Purpurio*, which could explain the origin of her own name).

All in all, it should be noted that a considerable amount (more than 40%) of the material in the Catalogue is either uncertain for one reason or another, or at least requires further interpretation. The uncertainty most commonly concerns whether we are dealing with an epithet at all and, on the other hand, whether the epithet is derived from a human personal name or has some other origin. Five different sigla were used for different types of problematic cases (see Introduction, pp. 6–7). It goes without saying that it is frequently difficult to provide the entries with a perfectly appropriate and unequivocal siglum.

The Catalogue includes numerous new readings and interpretations. Among the more important individual observations or hypotheses are the following (indicated in brackets): (No. **1**) *Bellona Rufilia* (epithet probably *Rufiliana*), (No. **3**) *Hercules Fundanius* (epithet perhaps *Fundanus*), (No. **5**) *Lares Hostilii* (epithet non-existent), (No. **8**) *Genius Ulpius* (*Genius* followed by the genitive

Ulpio(rum)), (No. **9**) *Mercurius Silvius* (not "*Silvius*", but *Silvanus*), (No. **10**) *Deae Lucretiae* (Germanic matronal deities whose name appears to be connected with the nomen *Lucretius*, but see analysis), (No. **16**) *Fortuna Iuveniana* (epithet derived from either the nomen *Iuvenius* or the cognomen *Iuvenis*), (No. **20**) *Hercules Iulianus* (the epithet must denote a cult founded by a *Iulius/a*; further analysis of the dedication), (No. **23**) *dea Satriana* (name related to the nomen *Satrius*, but not necessarily derived from a specific Satrian family), (No. **28**) *Bona Dea Sevina* (epithet perhaps *Seviana*, derived from the nomen *S(a)evius*), (No. **29**) *Diana Pamnetiana* (epithet perhaps *Panentiana*), (No. **32**) *Hercules Victor Certencinus* (epithet perhaps *Certencianus*, derived from a nomen **Certencius*), (at No. **36**) "*Hercules Hervianus*" (perhaps non-existent), (No. **38**) *Isis Geminiana* (epithet perhaps not derived from a human name, but referring to the Dioscuri, or the *Gemini*), (No. **39**) *Lares Apic(atiani?)* (epithet perhaps, but not necessarily, derived from the nomen *Apicatus*), (No. **42**) *Mefitis Utiana* (epithet not derived from a *gens Utia*), (No. **43**) *Nymphae Domitianae* (connection with Emperor Domitian uncertain), (No. **53**) *(deus) Visidianus* (name related to, but perhaps not derived from, the nomen *Visidius*), (No. **59**) *Bona Dea Annianensis* (dedication perhaps not from Rome, but Tibur, the epithet possibly deriving from the name of the river Anio), (No. **61**) *Fortuna Taurianensis* (epithet derived from the nomen *Taurius*, not the cognomen *Taurianus*), (No. **63**) *Silvanus Publicensis* (epithet perhaps *Public(i)ensianus*, derived from a nomen **Public(i)ensius*), (No. **75**) *Hercules Romanillianus* (epithet probably derived from the female cognomen *Romanilla*; cf., similarly, [No. **81**] *Venus Lucilliana* and [No. **86**] *Liber Gratillianus*), (No. **84**) *Genius Alotianus* (to be understood as *Genius Alotiani*), (Nos. **88**–**89**) "*Mars Palladianus / Verzobianus*" (the existence of these gods may not be excluded), (No. **92**) *Bona Dea Galbilla* (*Galbilla* is not an epithet, but the cognomen of a Sulcipia), (No. **94**) *Isis Athenodoria* (epithet referring to a statue made by an Athenodoros; discussion of the possibility of *Athenodori<an>a*), (No. **95**) *Valentius Silvanus* (*Valentius* not an epithet, the nomenclature suggesting a combination of two deities, Valentius [~ Jupiter] and Silvanus), (No. **96**) *Bona Dea Agrestis Felicula* (*Felicula* perhaps suggesting the existence of an independent goddess with this name), (No. **97**) *Nymphae Geminae* (epithet not derived from the cognomen *Geminus*, but denoting a double spring), (No. **98**) *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Purpurio* (epithet *Purpurio* not derived from the dedicator's cognomen *Purpuris*, but an independent designation).

Bibliography

Abbondanza 2020 = L. Abbondanza, 'Un rilievo con Ninfe dalla Villa Celimontana', *MEFRA* 132 (2020) 463–484.

Alessandri 2021 = S. Alessandri, 'Note a margine a CIL VI, 10233', *BullIstDirRomVittorioScialoja*, IV ser., 11 (2021) 139–153.

Antolini – Marengo 2016 = S. Antolini – S. M. Marengo, 'Dediche servili al *genius* dei padroni', in: M. Dondin-Payre – N. Tran (eds.), *Esclaves et maîtres dans le monde romain. Expressions épigraphiques de leurs relations* (Coll. EFR 527), Rome 2016, 112–121.

Assenmaker 2014 = P. Assenmaker, *De la victoire au pouvoir. Développement et manifestations de l'idéologie impératoriale à l'époque de Marius et Sylla* (MAB, coll. in 8°, 4e sér., VIII, n. 2099), Bruxelles 2014.

Autran 1926 = C. Autran, *Introduction à l'étude critique du nom propre grec*, Paris 1926.

Bacci 1984–1985 = G. M. Bacci, 'Scavi e ricerche a Avola, Grammichele, Portopalo, Taormina', *Kokalos* 30-31 (1984–1985) 711–726.

Bakkum 2009 = G. C. L. M. Bakkum, *The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus*: *150 Years of Scholarship*, Parts I–II, Amsterdam 2009.

Barnabei 1893 = F. Barnabei, 'Nuove epigrafi dell'antica Interamnia', *NSc* 1893, 351–355.

Basso 2013 = P. Basso, 'Termalismo perché, termalismo per chi. I frequentatori delle *aquae salutiferae*', in: M. Bassani – M. Bressan – F. Ghedini (eds.), Aquae salutiferae. *Il termalismo tra antico e contemporaneo. Atti del convegno internazionale. Montegrotto Terme, 6–8 settembre 2012* (Antenor Quaderni 29), Padova 2013, 247–262.

Battiloro 2017 = I. Battiloro, *The Archaeology of Lucanian Cult Places. Fourth Century BC to the Early Imperial Age*, London – New York 2017.

Becker 1856 = W. A. Becker, *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer nach den Quellen bearbeitet*, begonnen von Wilhelm Adolph Becker, fortgesetzt von Joachim Marquardt, IV, Leipzig 1856.

Becker 1858 = J. Becker, 'Beiträge zur römisch-keltischen Mythologie', *Jb. des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande* 26 (1858) 76–108.

Behrwald 2009 = R. Behrwald, 'Festkalender der frühen Kaiserzeit als Medien der Erinnerung', in: H. Beck – H.-U. Wiemer (eds.), *Feiern und Erinnern. Geschichtsbilder im Spiegel antiker Feste* (Studien zur Alten Geschichte 12), Berlin 2009, 141–166.

Belfiore 2012 = V. Belfiore, 'Problemi di dialettologia etrusca: spie grafiche e questioni « dialettali » non solo perugine', *MEFRA* 124 (2012) 421–437.

Bellini 2008 = G. R. Bellini, 'Un nuovo rinvenimento da Aquinum: il letto in osso della tomba 6', in: M. Sapelli Ragni (ed.), *Tra luce e tenebre. Letti funerari in osso da Lazio e Abruzzo. Catalogo della Mostra, Tivoli 2008*, Milano 2008.

Ben Romdhane 2018 = M. Ben Romdhane, 'Aspects matériels et administratifs de la *translatio* des monuments en Afrique romaine', in: S. Séhili – L. Naddari – M. Grira – H. Abid (eds.), *Mélanges d'histoire et d'archéologie de l'Afrique antique offerts à Sadok Ben Baaziz*, Tunis 2018, 321–336.

Benseddik 2001 = N. Benseddik, 'L'incubation et le culte d'Esculape', *Encyclopédie berbère* 24 (2001) 3714.

Benseddik 2010 = N. Benseddik, *Esculape et Hygie en Afrique*. 1: *Recherches sur les cultes guérisseurs*. 2: *Textes et images* (MAI 44), Paris 2010.

Bernstein 1998 = F. Bernstein, *Ludi publici. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele im republikanischen Rom* (Historia Einzelschriften 119), Stuttgart 1998.

Bertrand 2018 = A. Bertrand, 'Scènes italiennes. Les lieux de culte des cités d'Italie comme espaces de représentation des élites locales et romaines entre République et Empire (IIe s. av. J.-C. - Ier s. apr. J.-C.)', in: S. Marcos (ed.), *Entre espace public et espace privé : les élites en représentation* (Coll. Études), Perpignan 2018, 13–24.

Bloch 1958 = H. Bloch, 'C. Cartilius Poplicola', in: M. Floriani Squarciapino, *Le necropoli*: *Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea* (Scavi di Ostia III.1), Roma 1958, 209–218.

von Blumenthal 1941 = A. von Blumenthal, 'Zur römischen Religion der archaischen Zeit II', *RhM* N.F. 90 (1941) 310–334.

Bömer 1981[2] = F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom* I. *Die wichtigsten Kulte und Religionen in Rom und im Lateinischen Westen*. 2., durchges. und von P. Herz in Verbindung mit dem Verfasser erw. Auflage (Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei 14.1), Wiesbaden 1981.

Borg 2019 = B. E. Borg, *Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration. Contextual Approaches to Funerary Customs in the Second Century CE*, Cambridge 2019.

Borghesi 1878 = B. Borghesi, *Lettres* III (Oeuvres complètes de Bartolomeo Borghesi 8), Paris 1872.

Boyd 1953 = M. J. Boyd, 'The Porticoes of Metellus and Octavia and their Two Temples', *PBSR* 21 (1953) 152–159.

Bradley 2000 = G. Bradley, *Ancient Umbria: State, Culture, and Identity in Central Italy from the Iron Age to the Augustan Era*, Oxford 2000.

Brahmi 2017 = N. Brahmi, 'A la limite de l'espace rural : la vie religieuse dans les camps militaires du territoire de *Volubilis*', in: J. Ben Nasr – M. Arar – N. Boukhchim (eds.), *Campagnes et archéologie rurale au Maghreb et en Méditerranée. Actes du sixième colloque international (Kairouan : 14, 15 et 16 avril 2016)*, Tunis 2017, 41–52.

Braund 2018 = D. Braund, *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region. Goddesses in the Bosporan Kingdom from the Archaic Period to the Byzantine Era*, Cambridge 2018.

Bricault 2008 = L. Bricault, 'Fonder un lieu de culte', in: C. Bonnet – S. Ribichini – D. Steuernagel, *Religioni in contatto nel Mediterraneo antico. Modalità di diffusione e processi di interferenza. Atti del 3° colloquio su «le religioni orientali nel mondo greco e romano», Loveno di Menaggio (Como), 26-28 maggio 2006* (Mediterranea 4), Pisa – Roma 2008, 49–64.

Bricault 2019 = L. Bricault, *Isis Pelagia: Images, Names and Cults of a Goddess of the Seas* (RGRW 190), Leiden – Boston 2019.

Brouquier-Reddé 1992 = V. Brouquier-Reddé, *Temples et cultes de Tripolitaine* (Études d'antiquités africaines), Paris 1992.

Brouwer 1989 = H. H. J. Brouwer, *Bona Dea. The Sources and a Description of the Cult* (EPRO 100), Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1989.

Bruhl 1953 = A. Bruhl, *Liber Pater. Origine et expansion du culte dionysiaque à Rome et dans le monde romain* (BEFAR 175), Paris 1953.

Bruun 1991 = C. Bruun, *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 93), Helsinki 1991.

Bruun 2019 = C. Bruun, 'Celebrazioni ad Ostia: la scelta del giorno per le dediche pubbliche, le inaugurazioni e altri eventi collettivi', in: M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni † – N. Laubry – F. Zevi (eds.), *Ricerche su Ostia e il suo territorio. Atti del Terzo Seminario Ostiense, Roma, École française de Rome, 21-22 ottobre 2015* (Coll. EFR 553), Rome 2019, 369–384.

Buchmann 2020 = H. Buchmann, 'Die Kulte der Ubier im Kölner Raum – der epigraphische Befund', *AKB* 50 (2020) 249–264.

Bullo 1994 = S. Bullo, 'Le indicazioni di Vitruvio sulla localizzazione dei templi urbani (de Arch., I, 7, 1): il caso africano', in: A. Mastino – P. Ruggeri (eds.), *L'Africa romana. Atti del X convegno di studio, Oristano, 11–13 dicembre 1992*, Sassari 1994, 515–558.

Buonocore 2009 = M. Buonocore, 'La *res sacra* nell'Italia centro-appenninica', in: J. Bodel – M. Kajava (eds.), *Dediche sacre nel mondo greco-romano.*

Diffusione, funzioni, tipologie – Religious Dedications in the Greco-Roman World. Distribution, Typology, Use. Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, American Academy in Rome, 19–20 aprile 2006 (Acta IRF 35), Roma 2009, 245–305.

Buonocore 2011 = M. Buonocore, 'Spigolature epigrafiche. V', *Epigraphica* 73 (2011) 299–336.

Buonopane – Petraccia 2014 = A. Buonopane – M. F. Petraccia, 'Termalismo e divinità', in: M. Annibaletto – M. Bassani – F. Ghedini (eds.), *Cura, preghiera e benessere. Le stazioni curative termominerali nell'Italia romana* (Antenor Quaderni 31), Padova 2014, 217–245.

Cadotte 2007 = A. Cadotte, *La romanisation des dieux. Interpretatio romana en Afrique du Nord sous le Haut-Empire* (RGRW 158), Leiden 2007.

Calapà 2022 = A. Calapà, *Sacra civitatium Etruriae. Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte des römischen Etrurien* (Forum historische Forschung: Antike), Stuttgart 2022.

Caldelli 2004 = M. L. Caldelli, 'Studi preliminari su Tor Marancia. II: Contributi dell'epigrafia ad una migliore comprensione del complesso di Tor Marancia', *Daidalos* 6 (2004) 229–251.

Caldelli 2018 = M. L. Caldelli & al., *Epigrafia ostiense dopo il CIL. 2000 iscrizioni funerarie* (Antichistica 15; Storia ed epigrafia 5), Venezia 2018.

Caldelli 2019 = M. L. Caldelli, 'La raccolta epigrafica di Strawberry-Hill tra passato e presente', in: F. Paolucci (ed.), *Epigrafia tra erudizione antiquaria e scienza storica. Ad honorem Detlef Heikamp* (Studi e saggi 195), Firenze 2019, 69–88.

Calisti 2006 = F. Calisti, *Mefitis: dalle madri alla madre. Un tema religioso italico e la sua interpretazione romana e cristiana* (Chi siamo 41), Roma 2006.

Camodeca 2017 = G. Camodeca, 'Note sull'*Hirpinia* in età romana', in: V. Franciosi – A. Visconti – A. Avagliano – V. Saldutti (eds.), *Appellati nomine lupi. Giornata internazionale di Studi sull'Hirpinia e gli Hirpini, Napoli, 28 febbraio 2014*, Napoli 2017, 97–128.

Camodeca 2018 = G. Camodeca, Puteoli *romana: Istituzioni e società*. *Saggi*, Napoli 2018.

Camodeca 2021 = G. Camodeca, 'Note sull'Irpinia in età romana', in: A. Visconti – M. Lanzillo (eds.), *Studi sull'Irpinia antica*, Napoli 2021, 89–130.

Campbell 2000 = B. Campbell, *The Writings of the Roman Land Surveyors. Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary* (JRS Monograph No. 9), London 2000.

Cancrini – Marengo 2001 = F. Cancrini – S. M. Marengo, 'Le iscrizioni', in: F. Cancrini – Chr. Delplace – S. M. Marengo, *L'evergetismo nella regio V (Picenum)* (Picus Suppl. 8), Tivoli 2001, 49–194.

Candilio – Bertinetti 2013 = D. Candilio – M. Bertinetti, 'Bona Dea: una statuetta ritrovata', *BollArch* on line 4 (2013) 30–40.

Capini 1999 = S. Capini, *Venafrum* (Molise. Repertorio delle iscrizioni latine 7), Campobasso 1999.

Capini – Curci – Picuti 2014 = S. Capini – P. Curci – M. R. Picuti, *Fana, templa, delubra* 3. *Regio IV*: *Alife, Bojano, Sepino*, Roma 2014.

Caridad Arias 2006 = J. Caridad Arias, 'Topónimos madrileños de origen celta: Aluche, Arganda, La Arganzuela, Argüelles, Tres Cantos, Cantoblanco', *AIEM* 46 (2006) 351–361.

Carlsen 1995 = J. Carlsen, *Vilici and Roman Estate Managers until AD 284* (ARID Suppl. 24), Rome 1995.

Carter 1898 = J. B. Carter, *De deorum Romanorum cognominibus quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Halle 1898.

Ceccarelli – Marroni 2011 = L. Ceccarelli – E. Marroni, *Repertorio dei santuari del Lazio* (Archaeologica 164; Archaeologia Perusina 19), Roma 2011.

Cecconi 1756 = L. Cecconi, *Storia di Palestrina, città del prisco Lazio*, Ascoli 1756.

Cesari 1998 = P. Cesari, '*In memoriam* ... *in honorem*: iscrizioni funerarie consacrate a divinità', *SCO* 46 (1998) 959–972.

Champlin 1981 = E. Champlin, 'Owners and Neighbours at Ligures Baebiani', *Chiron* 11 (1981) 239–264.

Chausson 1996 = F. Chausson, 'Un portrait de groupe avec dame : autour de Cornelia Praetextata', *CCG* 7 (1996) 319–368.

Cinaglia 2018 = T. Cinaglia, 'Le *Quinquatrus* ed il numero 5, ovvero la correlazione tra Anna Perenna e Minerva nei rituali d'iniziazione femminile', *MH* 75 (2018) 56–84.

Clark 2007 = A. J. Clark, *Divine Qualities. Cult and Community in Republican Rome*, Oxford 2007.

Coarelli 1995 = F. Coarelli, 'Vie e mercati del Lazio antico', in: *Atti del Convegno Internazionale "Nomen Latinum". Latini e Romani prima di Annibale.* II. *Genesi e struttura del Lazio antico. Accademia di S. Luca, 24-26 ottobre 1995* (Eutopia 4.2), Roma 1995, 199–211.

Coarelli 2014 = F. Coarelli, *Collis. Il Quirinale e il Viminale nell'antichità*, Roma 2014.

Colini 1944 = A. M. Colini, *Storia e topografia del Celio nell'antichità* (MPAA 7), Roma 1944.

Cook 1914 = A. B. Cook, *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. I, Cambridge 1914.

Cook 1925 = A. B. Cook, *Zeus*. *A Study in Ancient Religion*, vol. II, Cambridge 1925.

Cresci Marrone 2012 = G. Cresci Marrone – A. Marinetti, 'Le iscrizioni', in: E. Gilli (ed.), *Carta geomorfologica e archeologica del Comune di Montebelluna. Il Progetto Archeogeo*, Montebelluna 2012, 225-232.

Criniti 1993 = N. Criniti, 'Granio Liciniano', *ANRW* II:34.1, Berlin 1993, 119–205.

Daniels 2022 = M. Daniels, '*Heros invictus* and *pacator orbis*: Hercules as a War God for Roman Emperors', in: M. Dillon – C. Matthew (eds.), *Religion & Classical Warfare: The Roman Empire*, Yorkshire – Philadelphia 2022, 94–126.

D'Arms 1974 = J. D'Arms, 'Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study', *JRS* 64 (1974) 104–124.

De Carlo 2010 = A. De Carlo, 'Novità sul cavaliere beneventano di III sec. *C. Caelius C.f. St. Bassaeus Donatus Verzobius*. Rilettura di CIL IX 1640 + 1599', *ZPE* 174 (2010) 243–247.

De Carlo 2013 = A. De Carlo, 'Il ceto equestre di *Beneventum* romana', in: P. Caruso (ed.), *Antiqua Beneventana. La storia della città romana attraverso la documentazione epigrafica* (La Provincia Sannita, Suppl. al n. 1/2013), Benevento 2013, 263–315.

de Cazanove 2011 = O. de Cazanove, 'Sanctuaries and Ritual Practices in Lucania from the 3rd c. B.C. to the Early Empire', in: F. Colivicchi (ed.), *Local Cultures of South Italy and Sicily in the Late Republican Period: Between Hellenism and Rome* (JRA Suppl. 83), Portsmouth (R.I.) 2011, 30–44.

de Cazanove 2017 = O. de Cazanove, 'L'apparition d'une architecture religieuse dans le monde italique. Le cas de la Lucanie', in: S. Agusta-Boularot – S. Hubert – W. Van Andringa (eds.), *Quand naissent les dieux. Fondation des sanctuaires antiques : motivations, agents, lieux* (Coll. EFR 534), Rome 2017, 201–218.

De Fino 2014 = M. De Fino, 'Un *regionarius*, *servus* del *c.v*. Claudius Severus: a proposito di *CIL*, IX 947', in: M. L. Caldelli – G. L. Gregori (eds.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, 30 anni dopo* (Tituli 10), Roma 2014, 621–640.

De Franzoni 2012–2013 = A. De Franzoni, *Culti gentilizi a Roma tra III e II secolo a.C.*, tesi di dottorato, Università degli Studi di Trieste 2012–2103. (https://www.openstarts.units.it/bitstream/10077/11119/1/culti_gentilizi.pdf)

Degrassi 1949 = A. Degrassi, 'Epigrafia romana – I. Roma (1937–46)', *Doxa* 2 (1949) 47–135 [= *Scritti vari di antichità* I, Roma 1962, 315–413].

Delamarre 2003[2] = X. Delamarre, *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*. *Une approche linguistique du vieux-celtique continental*. 2e éd. revue et augmentée, Paris 2003.

Delplace 1993 = Chr. Delplace, *La Romanisation du Picenum. L'exemple d'Urbs Salvia* (Coll. EFR 177), Rome 1993.

De Marchi 1896 = A. De Marchi, *Il culto privato di Roma antica*. I: *La religione nella vita domestica. Iscrizioni e offerte votive*, Milano 1896.

De Martino, forthcoming = G. De Martino, *The Cult of Poseidoniate Hera and the Lucanians in Poseidonia/Paistom. An Ancient Story of Religion and Multiculturalism*, Diss. Helsinki 2022 [forthcoming in Comm. Hum. Litt., Helsinki 2023].

Demougin 1992 = S. Demougin, *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens (43 av. J.-C. – 70 ap. J.-C.)* (Coll. EFR 153), Rome 1992.

Deniaux 2007 = E. Deniaux, 'Recherches sur les activités du port de Dyrrachium à l'époque romaine : *Fabri tignuarii et saccarii*', in: D. Barranger-Auserve (ed.), Épire, Illyrie, Macédoine… Mélanges offerts au Professor Pierre Cabanes (Coll. Erga 10), Clermont-Ferrand 2007, 71–79.

De Simone 1999 = C. De Simone, '*Lat*. Mercurius < *Mercu-sio-s *e gli aggettivi di classificazione in* -(ā)rius < (ā)sio-s', *RFIC* 127 (1999) 385–425.

Di Michele, forthcoming = P. Di Michele, 'Divine Epithets derived from anthroponyms in Rome and Italy', article presented at the international Workshop "*My Name is Your Name. Anthroponyms as Divine Attributes in the Greco-Roman World*"*, 3 June 2021*, forthcoming.

von Domaszewski 1902 = A. von Domaszewski, 'Silvanus auf lateinischen Inschriften', *Philologus* 61 (1902) 1–25.

von Domaszewski 1909 = A. von Domaszewski, *Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion*, Leipzig – Berlin 1909.

Domenici 2009 = I. Domenici, *Etruscae fabulae. Mito e rappresentazione* (Archaeologica 156), Roma 2009.

Donati 1765 = Seb. Donati, *Ad novum thesaurum veterum inscriptionum cl. v. Ludovici Antonii Muratorii supplementum* I, Lucae 1765.

Donderer 2008 = M. Donderer, 'Bildliche Darstellungen von Sklaven im Götterkostüm? Die *consecratio in formam deorum* auf Abwegen', in: C. Franek – S. Lamm – T. Neuhauser – B. Porod – K. Zöhrer (eds.), *Thiasos. Festschrift für Erwin Pochmarski zum 65. Geburtstag* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Archäologie der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz 10), Wien 2008, 185–196.

Dorcey 1988 = P. F. Dorcey, 'Saldaecaputenus: God or Toponym?', *ZPE* 72 (1988) 294–296.

Dorcey 1989 = P. F. Dorcey, 'The Role of Women in the Cult of Silvanus', *Numen* 36 (1989) 143–155.

Dorcey 1992 = P. F. Dorcey, *The Cult of Silvanus. A Study in Roman Folk Religion* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 20), Leiden – New York – Köln 1992.

Dunning 2020 = B. S. Dunning, 'The Republican *Ludi Saeculares* as a Cult of the Valerian *Gens*', *Historia* 69 (2020) 208–236.

Eckhardt 2021 = B. Eckhardt, *Romanisierung und Verbrüderung. Das Vereinswesen im römischen Reich* (Klio Beihefte N. F. 34), Berlin – Boston 2021.

EDCS = *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby* (https://db.edcs.eu/).

EDR = *Epigraphic Database Roma* (http://www.edr-edr.it/).

Ehmig 2017 = U. Ehmig, *Donum dedit. Charakteristika einer Widmungsformel in lateinischer Sakralinschriften* (Pietas 9), Gutenberg 2017.

Eisler 1910 = R. Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Urgeschichte des antiken Weltbildes* I, München 1910.

Ellis 1846 = H. Ellis, *The Townley Gallery of Classic Sculpture, in the British Museum*, Vol. I, London 1846.

Engfer 2017 = K. Engfer, *Die private Munifizenz der römischen Oberschicht in Mittel- und Süditalien. Eine Untersuchung lateinischer Inschriften unter dem Aspekt der Fürsorge* (Philippika. Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen 110), Wiesbaden 2017.

Étienne 1958 = R. Étienne, *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (BEFAR 191), Paris 1958.

Euzennat 1989 = M. Euzennat, *Le limes de Tingitane. La frontière méridionale* (Études d'antiquités africaines), Paris 1989.

Evans 1967 = D. E. Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names. A Study of some Continental Celtic Formations*, Oxford 1967.

Fabretti 1683 = R. Fabretti, *De Columna Traiani syntagma. Accesserunt explicatio veteris tabellae anaglyphae Homeri Iliadem atque ex Stesichoro Arctino et Lesche Ilii excidium continentis & emissarii lacus Fucini descriptio*, Romae 1683.

Fabretti 1699 = *Raphaelis Fabretti Gasparis f. Urbinatis inscriptionum antiquarum quae in aedibus paternis asservantur explicatio et additamentum una cum aliquot emendationibus Gruterianis & indice rerum, & verborum memorabilium*, Romae 1699.

Falcone 2016 = M. J. Falcone, *Medea sulla scena tragica repubblicana. Commento a Ennio,* Medea exul*; Pacuvius,* Medus*; Accio,* Medea sive Argonautae (Drama 18), Tübingen 2016.

Faunus 1549 = L. Faunus, *De antiquitatibus urbis Romae ab antiquis novisque auctoribus exceptis, et summa brevitate ordineque dispositis per Lucium Faunum*, Venetiis 1549.

Fears 1981 = J. Rufus Fears, 'The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology', *ANRW* II:17.2, Berlin – New York 1981, 827–948.

Ferlut 2011 = A. Ferlut, *Le culte des divinités féminines en Gaule Belgique et dans les Germanies sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Thèse Univ. de Lyon 2011.

Ferlut 2017 = A. Ferlut, 'Celtic Goddesses from Gallia Belgica and the Germaniae: characteristics, dedicants, and ritual practices', in: R. Haeussler – A. C. King (eds.), *Celtic Religion in the Roman Period: Personal, Local, and Global* (Celtic Studies Publications 20), Aberystwyth 2017, 363–386.

Ferrante – Lacam – Quadrino 2015 = C. Ferrante – J.-C. Lacam – D. Quadrino (eds.), *Fana, templa, delubra* 4: *Regio I*: *Fondi, Formia, Minturno, Ponza*, Roma 2015, 123.

Fiorentini 1988 = M. Fiorentini, *Ricerche sui culti gentilizi* (Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano e dei Diritti dell'Oriente Mediterraneo 69), Roma 1988.

Fiorentini 2007–2008 = M. Fiorentini, 'Culti gentilizi, culti degli antenati', in: G. Bartoloni – M. G. Benedettini (eds.), *Sepolti tra i vivi – Buried among the Living. Evidenza ed interpretazione di contesti funerari in abitato. Roma, 26-29 Aprile 2006* (Scienze dell'Antichità 14.2), Roma 2007–2008, 987–1046.

Fishwick 1978 = D. Fishwick, '*Augustus deus* and *deus Augustus*', in: M. B. de Boer – T. A. Edridge (eds.), *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren* I (EPRO 68), Leiden 1978, 375–380.

Fishwick 1991 = D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* II.1 (EPRO 108), Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1991.

Fittschen 2011 = K. Fittschen, 'Rilievo votivo a Jupiter Caelius', in: E. La Rocca – C. Parisi Presicce (eds.), *Le tante facce del potere. Catalogo della Mostra (Roma, Musei Capitolini, 10 marzo – 25 settembre)*, Roma 2011, 293.

Fittschen – Zanker 2014 = K. Fittschen – P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom* IV (Beiträge zur Erschließung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur 6), Mainz am Rhein 2014.

Floriani Squarciapino 1958 = M. Floriani Squarciapino, *Le necropoli*: *Le tombe di età repubblicana e augustea* (Scavi di Ostia III.1), Roma 1958.

Floriani Squarciapino 1962 = M. Floriani Squarciapino, *Culti orientali ad Ostia* (EPRO 3), Leiden 1962.

Fortson IV 2007 = B. W. Fortson IV, 'The Origin of the Latin Future Active Participle', in: A. J. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues, and friends*, Ann Arbor – New York 2007, 83–95.

Frei-Stolba 1990 = R. Frei-Stolba, 'Livilla dea', *JSGU* 73 (1990) 125–132.

Fuchs 2016 = M. E. Fuchs, 'Témoignages du culte domestique en Suisse romaine', in: F. Fontana – E. Murgia (eds.), *Sacrum facere. Atti del III Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro. Lo spazio del 'sacro': ambienti e gesti del rito, Trieste, 3–4 ottobre 2014* (Polymnia. Studi di archeologia 7), Trieste 2016, 99–131.

Gagé 1961 = J. Gagé, 'Énée, Faunus et le culte de Silvain « pélasge ». A propos de quelques traditions de l'Étrurie méridionale', *MEFR* 73 (1961) 69–138.

Gagé 1976 = J. Gagé, *La chute des Tarquins et les débuts de la République romaine*, Paris 1976.

Galli – Ippoliti 2020 = M. Galli – M. Ippoliti, in: R. Bianco – M. Galli – M. Ippoliti, 'Roman *praedia* as places of ritual practices', *BullCom* 121 (2020) 187–205.

Gartrell 2021 = A. Gartrell, *The Cult of Castor and Pollux in Ancient Rome: Myth, Ritul, and Society*, Cambridge – New York 2021.

Gasparini 2020 = V. Gasparini, 'Chiamami col tuo nome. Una nuova proposta di analisi dell'impiego dei gentilizi come epiteti divini nell'epigrafia dell'Africa romana', in: S. Aounallah – A. Mastino (eds.), *L'epigrafia del Nord Africa: novità, riletture, nuove sintesi* (Epigrafia e antichità 45), Faenza 2020, 385–394.

Gasparini, forthcoming = V. Gasparini, 'Divine Epithets derived from Anthroponyms in North Africa', article presented at the international Workshop "*My Name is Your Name. Anthroponyms as Divine Attributes in the Greco-Roman World*", *3 June 2021*, forthcoming.

Gasperini 1982 = L. Gasperini, 'Sulla carriera di Gaio Fufio Gemino console del 29 d.C.', *MGR* 8 (1982) 285–302 [= L. Bacchielli – Chr. Delplace – W. Eck – L. Gasperini – G. Paci (eds.), *Studi su Urbisaglia romana* (Picus Suppl. 5), Tivoli 1995, 1–21].

Gatti 1887 = G. Gatti, 'Trovamenti riguardanti la topografia e la epigrafia urbana', *BullCom* 15 (1887) 314–324.

Gatto – Gregori 2021 = F. Gatto – G. L. Gregori, 'Some Remarks on the Entry of *Bona Dea* into the African Provinces, with a Glance at the Italic Documentation', *AntAfr* 57 (2021) 139–147.

Gebhardt-Jaekel 2007 = E. Gebhardt-Jaekel, *Mors omnibus instat – der Tod steht allen bevor. Die Vorstellungen von Tod, Jenseits und Vergänglichkeit in lateinischen paganischen Grabinschriften des Westens*, Diss. Frankfurt am Main 2007. (https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/14501687.pdf)

Girardi 2019 = C. Girardi, *Le divinità plurali nell'Occidente romano. Analisi delle fonti epigrafiche epicorie e latine, archeologiche, iconografiche e letterarie*, Tesis Doctoral, Univ. Zaragoza 2019. (https://zaguan.unizar.es/record/101478/files/TESIS-2021-143.pdf)

González Salgado 2006 = J. A. González Salgado, 'Orígenes y clasificación de la toponimia mayor extremeña', in: J. L. Girón Alconchel – J. J. de Bustos Tovar (eds.), *Actas del VI Congreso internacional de historia de la lengua española*, Madrid 2006, 1443–1454.

Gori 1727 = A. F. Gori, *Inscriptiones antiquae in Etruriae urbibus exstantes* I, Florentiae 1727.

Gorostidi Pi 2020 = D. Gorostidi Pi, *Tusculum* V: *Las inscripciones latinas de procedencia urbana* (Serie arqueológica 15), Madrid 2020.

Graf 2011 = M. H. Graf, 'Sprachkontakt, Kulturkontakt und die niedergermanischen Matronen-Gottheiten', in: W. Haubrichs – H. Tiefenbach (eds.), *Interferenz-Onomastik. Namen in Grenz- und Begegnungsräumen in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Saarbrücker Kolloquium des Arbeitskreises für Namenforschung vom 5.-7. Oktober 2006* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Saarländische Landesgeschichte und Volksforschung 43), Saarbrücken 2011, 399–424.

Granino Cecere 1992 = M. G. Granino Cecere, 'Epigrafia dei santuari rurali del *Latium Vetus*', *MEFRA* 104 (1992) 125–143.

Granino Cecere 2012 = M. G. Granino Cecere, 'La crisi e i grandi santuari del Latium vetus: qualche riflessione dalla documentazione epigrafica', in: L. Lamoine – C. Berrendonner – M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni (eds.), *Gérer les territoires, les patrimoines et les crises. Le Quotidien municipal* II (Coll. Histoires croisées), Clermont-Ferrand 2012, 489–504.

Gregori 2000 = G. L. Gregori, 'Iscrizioni e topografia religiosa di Roma: il sacello di Hercules Invictus Hesychianus', in: G. Paci (ed.), Ἐπιγραφαί. *Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini* I (Ichnia 5), Tivoli 2000, 445–454.

Gregori 2009 = G. L. Gregori, 'Il culto delle divinità auguste in Italia: un'indagine preliminare', in: J. Bodel – M. Kajava (eds.), *Dediche sacre nel mondo greco-romano. Diffusione, funzioni, tipologie – Religious Dedications in the Greco-Roman World. Distribution, Typology, Use* (Acta IRF 35), Rome 2009, 307–330.

Gregori 2020 = G. L. Gregori, in: G. Bianchini – D. Bovet – G. L. Gregori, '*CIL*, VI 21521 = 34137 (*CLE* 1109): un sogno in forma poetica', *Espacio, tiempo y forma (ser. II: Historia antigua)* 33 (2020) 213–232.

Gregori – Narducci – Rustico 2018 = G. L. Gregori – R. Narducci – L. Rustico, 'Nuovi *fasti* dei *magistri fontani* in un frustulo epigrafico opistografico dal piccolo Aventino', *AnuFilolAntiqMediaev* 8 (2018) 364–373.

Gros 1976 = P. Gros, *Aurea Templa. Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste* (BEFAR 231), Rome 1976.

Gruchalski 2020 = J. Gruchalski, 'Varro, LL 5.52: Collis Latiaris or Catialis?', *ArchClass* 71 (2020) 585–602.

Gruter 1707[2] = I. Gruterus, *Inscriptiones antiquae totius orbis Romani in corpus absolutiss(imum) redactae,* Heidelbergae 1603; ed. 2 vol. 1-2 cura P. Burmanni, Amstelaedami 1707.

Guarducci 1936 = M. Guarducci, 'Il culto di Anna e delle Paides nelle iscrizioni sicule di Buscemi, e il culto latino di Anna Perenna', *SMSR* 12 (1936) 25–50.

Guarducci 1942–1943 = M. Guarducci, 'Le impronte del *Quo Vadis* e monumenti affini figurati ed epigrafici', *RPAA* 19 (1942–1943) 305–344.

Guidobaldi 1995 = M. P. Guidobaldi, *La romanizzazione dell'ager Praetutianus (secoli III-I a.C.)* (Aucnus 3), Napoli 1995.

Haeussler 2013 = R. Haeussler, *Becoming Roman? Diverging Identities and Experiences in Ancient Northwest Italy* (Institute of Archaeology Publications 57), London – New York 2013.

Haeussler 2015 = R. Haeussler, 'A Landscape of Resistance? Cults and Sacred Landscapes in Western Cisalpine Gaul', in: G. Cresci Marrone (ed.), *Trans Padum ... usque ad Alpes. Roma tra il Po e le Alpi: dalla romanizzazione alla romanità. Atti del Convegno, Venezia 13–15 maggio 2014* (Studi e ricerche sulla Gallia Cisalpina 26), Roma 2015, 261–286.

Hangartner 2018 = J. Hangartner, *Der Asklepiuskult im römischen Nordafrika*, Masterarbeit Univ. Wien 2018.

Hänninen 2019 = M.-L. Hänninen, 'Religious Agency and Civic Identity of Women in Ancient Ostia', in: J. Rantala (ed.), *Gender, Memory, and Identity in the Roman World* (Social Worlds of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages), Amsterdam 2019, 63–88.

Hartswick 2004 = K. J. Hartswick, *The Gardens of Sallust: A Changing Landscape*, Austin 2004.

Hawkins 1845 = E. Hawkins, *A Description of the Collection of Ancient Marbles in the British Museum*; *with Engravings*. Part X, London 1845.

Hekster 2002 = O. Hekster, *Commodus: An Emperor at the Crossroads* (Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 23), Amsterdam 2002.

Hekster 2015 = O. Hekster, *Emperors and Ancestors. Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition*, Oxford 2015.

Hekster – Rich 2006 = O. Hekster – J. Rich, 'Octavian and the thunderbolt: The temple of Apollo Palatinus and Roman traditions of temple building', *CQ* 56 (2006) 149–168.

Helbig 1966[4] = W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*. II: *Die städtischen Sammlungen: Kapitolinische Museen und*

Museo Barracco. – Die staatlichen Sammlungen: Ara Pacis, Galleria Borghese, Galleria Spada, Museo Pigorini, Antiquarien auf Forum und Palatin, 4. Aufl., hrsg. H. Speier, Tübingen 1966.

Heurgon 1950 = J. Heurgon, 'D'Apollon Smintheus à P. Decius Mus : la survivance du dieu au rat, *Sminth-*, dans le monde étrusco-italique', in: *Atti del I° congresso internazionale di preistoria e protostoria mediterranea, Firenze – Napoli – Roma 1950*, Firenze 1952, 483–488.

Hofenender 2010 = A. Hofenender, 'Vestiges of Sun Worship among the Celts', in: A. J. Gail (ed.), *Sun Worship in the Civilizations of the World* (Pandanus '10: Nature in Literature, Art, Myth and Ritual 4.2), Prague 2010, 85–107.

Holder 1904 = A. Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz* II, Leipzig 1904.

Holder 1980 = P. A. Holder, *Studies in the* Auxilia *of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan* (BAR Intern. Ser. 70), Oxford 1980.

Hölscher 2017 = T. Hölscher, 'Ubiquitär – totalitär? Die Präsenz des Augustus im Stadtbild Roms', in: M. Flecker – J. Lipps – R. Posamentir – Th. Schäfer (eds.), *Augustus ist tot – Lang lebe der Kaiser* (Tübinger Archäologische Forschungen 24), Tübingen 2017, 15–37.

Hosie 2016 = S. Hosie, *"Cataloguing the Empire": The Regionary Catalogues and the Role and Purpose of Bureaucratic Inventories*, MPhil thesis, University of Sheffield 2016. (https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/15917/)

Houston 1987 = G. W. Houston, 'Lucian's *Navigium* and the Dimensions of the *Isis*', *AJPh* 108 (1987) 444–450.

Iasiello 2007 = I. M. Iasiello, *Samnium. Assetti e trasformazioni di una provincia dell'Italia tardoantica* (Pragmateiai 11), Bari 2007.

Ibba – Mastino 2017 = A. Ibba – A. Mastino, 'Le Aquae Flavianae fra passato e presente', in: M. Sechi Nuvole – D. Vidal Casellas (eds.), *Sistema integrat del paisatge entre antropització, geo-economia, medi ambient i desenvolupament econòmic — sistema integrato del paesaggio tra antropizzazione, geo-economia, ambiente e sviluppo. Actes dels congressos / Atti dei convegni*, Girona 2017, 197–224.

Ihm 1887 = M. Ihm, 'Der Mütter- oder Matronenkultus und seine Denkmäler', *BJb* 83 (1887) 1–200.

Ippoliti 2020 = M. Ippoliti, *Tra il Tevere e la via Appia. Caratteri e sviluppo di un paesaggio suburbano di Roma antica tra IX secolo a.C. e VI secolo d.C.*, Roma 2020.

Johnson 1935 = J. Johnson, *Excavations at Minturnae* I: *Monuments of the Republican Forum*, Philadelphia 1935.

Jones 1976 = C. P. Jones, 'The Plancii of Perge and Diana Planciana', *HSCP* 80 (1976) 231–237.

Jufer – Luginbühl 2001 = N. Jufer – T. Luginbühl, *Répertoire des dieux gaulois. Les noms des divinités celtiques connus par l'épigraphie, les textes antiques et la toponymie* (Coll. Archéologie aujourd'hui), Paris 2001.

Kahane – Kahane 1979 = H. Kahane – R. Kahane, *Graeca et Romanica. Scripta selecta* I: *Romance and Mediterranean Lexicology*, Amsterdam 1979.

Kajanto 1963 = I. Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies in the early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage* (Acta IRF 2.1), Helsinki 1963.

Kajanto 1965 = I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 36.2), Helsinki 1965.

Kajanto 1966 = I. Kajanto, *Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 40.1), Helsinki 1966.

Kajanto 1981 = I. Kajanto, 'Fortuna', *ANRW* II:17.1, Berlin – New York 1981, 502–558.

Kajanto 1983 = I. Kajanto, 'Notes on the Cult of Fortuna', *Arctos* 17 (1983) 13–20.

Kajava 1987 = M. Kajava, 'A Dedication to Bona Dea Reconsidered (EE VIII 624)', *ZPE* 70 (1987) 210–216.

Kajava 1990 = M. Kajava, 'Roman Senatorial Women and the Greek East. Epigraphic Evidence from the Republican and Augustan Period', in: H. Solin – M. Kajava (eds.), *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 91), Helsinki 1990, 59–124.

Kajava 2015 = M. Kajava, 'Religion in Rome and Italy', in: C. Bruun – J. Edmondson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*, Oxford 2015, 397–419.

Kakoschke 2017 = A. Kakoschke, 'Annotationes Epigraphicae VII: Zu einigen Inschriften aus den römischen Provinzen Germania inferior und Germania superior', *FeRA* 32 (2017) 1–29.

Keppie 1984 = L. Keppie, *The Making of the Roman Army*: *From Republic to Empire*, London 1984.

Kolb 2015 = A. Kolb, 'Epigraphy as a Source on Ancient Technology', in: P. Erdkamp – K. Verboven (eds.), *Structure and Performance in the Roman Economy Models, Methods and Case Studies* (Coll. Latomus 350), Bruxelles 2015, 223–238.

Krawzcyk 2021 = M. Krawzcyk, 'The Role of Bacchus/Liber Pater in the Severan Religious Policy: the numismatic and epigraphic evidence', in: F. Doroszewski – D. Karłowicz (eds.), *Dionysus and Politics. Constructing Authority in the Graeco-Roman World*, London – New York 2021, 142–158.

Laforge 2009 = M.-O. Laforge, *La religion privée à Pompéi* (Publications du Centre Jean Bérard, Études 7), Naples 2009.

Lanciani 1907 = R. Lanciani, *Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno le collezioni romane di antichità* III, Roma 1907.

La Rocca 1998 = E. La Rocca, 'Artisti rodii negli *horti* romani', in: M. Cima – E. La Rocca (eds.), Horti romani. *Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Roma, 4–6 maggio 1995* (BullCom Suppl. 6), Roma 1998, 203–274.

Lassère 1977 = J.-M. Lassère, *Ubique populus. Peuplement et mouvements de population dans l'Afrique romaine de la chute de Carthage à la fin de la dynastie des Sévères (146 a. C. - 235 p. C.)* (Études d'antiquités africaines), Paris 1977.

Latte 1960 = K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (HbAW V:4), München 1960.

Laubry 2012 = N. Laubry, '*Ob sepulturam* : associations et funérailles en Narbonnaise et dans les Trois Gaules sous le Haut-Empire', in: M. Dondin-Payre – N. Tran (eds.), *Collegia. Le phénomène associatif dans l'Occident romain* (Scripta antiqua 41), Bordeaux 2012, 103–133.

Laubry 2015 = N. Laubry, '*Sepulcrum*, *signa* et *tituli* : quelques observations sur la « *consecratio in formam deorum* » et sur l'expression du statut des morts dans la Rome impériale', in: S. Agusta-Boularot – E. Rosso (eds.), *Signa et tituli* : *Monuments et espaces de représentation en Gaule méridionale sous le regard croisé de la sculpture et de l'épigraphie* (Bibliothèque d'archéologie méditerranéenne et africaine 18), Aix-en-Provence 2015, 159–173.

Laubry 2021 = N. Laubry, *Tombeaux et épitaphes de Lyonnaise. Recherches sur le paysage funéraire d'une province de Gaule romaine (Ier-IIIe siècle apr. J.-C.)* (Coll. Histoire et archéologie), Paris 2021.

Le Glay 1975 = M. Le Glay, 'Les syncrétismes dans l'Afrique ancienne', in: F. Dunand – P. Lévêque (eds.), *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité. Colloque de Besançon, 22–23 octobre 1973* (EPRO 46), Leiden 1975, 123–151.

Lejeune 1986 = M. Lejeune, 'Méfitis, déesse osque', *CRAI* 1986, 202–213.

Lejeune 1990 = M. Lejeune, *Méfitis d'après les dédicaces de Rossano di Vaglio* (Bibliothèque des Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain 51), Louvain-la-Neuve 1990.

Letta 2012 = C. Letta, 'Il *Collegium ararum Luciarum* di Alba Fucens: un'eco della morte di Lucio Cesare?', in: H. Solin (ed.), *Le epigrafi della Valle di Comino. Atti dell'ottavo convegno epigrafico cominese. Atina, Palazzo Ducale, 28–29 maggio 2011*, S. Donato Val di Comino 2012, 89–103.

Leumann 1977 = M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (HbAW II:2,1), München 1977.

Lipka 2009 = M. Lipka, *Roman Gods. A Conceptual Approach* (RGRW 167), Leiden – Boston 2009.

Liu 2009 = J. Liu, Collegia centonariorum: *The Guilds of Textile Dealers in the Roman West* (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 34), Leiden – Boston 2009.

Luci 2019 = F. Luci, *Monuments and Inscriptions in Republican Rome: Linguistic Framework for Interpreting Art and Text*, Diss. Durham 2019. (http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/13047/)

Luján 2011 = E. R. Luján, '*Briga* and *castellum* in North-Western Hispania', in: E. R. Luján – J. L. García Alonso (eds.), *A Greek Man in the Iberian Street. Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz* (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 140), Innsbruck 2011.

Luke 2014 = T. S. Luke, *Ushering in a New Republic. Theologies of Arrival at Rome in the First Century BCE*, Ann Arbor 2014.

Mackay 2000 = C. H. Mackay, 'Sulla and the Monuments: Studies in His Public Persona', *Historia* 49 (2000) 161–210.

Maio 1976 = L. Maio, 'L'ara di Silvanus Curtianus presso Benevento', *RAL* 31 (1976) 291-295.

Maiuro 2012 = M. Maiuro, *Res Caesaris. Ricerche sulla proprietà imperiale nel Principato* (Pragmateiai 23), Bari 2012.

Manco 2012 = A. Manco, '*Mefitis Utiana*', *RILD* 14 (2012) 197–208.

Manco 2016 = A. Manco, 'Mefitis Utiana', in A. Ancillotti – A. Calderini – R. Massarelli (eds.), *Forme e strutture della religione nell'Italia mediana antica* (Studia Archaeologica 215), Roma 2016, 445–452.

Marcos Macedo 2017 = J. Marcos Macedo, 'Noun Apposition in Greek Religious Language: A Linguistic Account', in: F. Logozzo – P. Poccetti (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, Berlin – Boston 2017, 565-579.

Marquardt 1878 = J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* III (Hb. der römischen Alterthümer 6), Leipzig 1878.

Marroni 2010 = E. Marroni, *I culti dell'Esquilino* (Archaeologica 158; Archaeologia Perusina 17), Roma 2010.

Mastino 2001 = A. Mastino, 'Tempio Pausania: Gemellae oppure Heraeum?', in: *Dal mondo antico all'età contemporanea: studi in onore di Manlio Brigaglia offerti dal Dipartimento di Storia dell'Università di Sassari* (Collana del Dipartimento di Storia dell'Università degli Studi di Sassari, n.s. 7), Roma 2001, 79–117.

Matijašič – Tassaux 2000 = R. Matijašič – F. Tassaux, 'Liber et Silvanus', in: Chr.

Delplace – F. Tassaux (eds.), *Les cultes polythéistes dans l'Adriatique romaine* (Ausonius, Études 4), Bordeaux 2000, 65–118.

Meiggs 1973[2] = R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*. Second edition, Oxford 1973.

Miano 2018 = D. Miano, *Fortuna. Deity and Concept in Archaic and Republican Italy*, Oxford 2018.

Miatto 2017 = M. Miatto, *Costruzione e percezione dello spazio rituale nel Mediterraneo Antico. L'esempio dell'Africa romana*, tesi di dottorato, Università Ca' Foscari Venezia 2017. (http://dspace.unive.it/bitstream/handle/10579/11966/824904-1175792.pdf)

Mirsch 2013 = I. Mirsch, 'Die Archäologie des mittleren Ennstales und steirischen Salzkammergutes', in: W. Suppan (ed.), *An der Wiege des Landes Steiermark. Die Chronik Pürgg-Trautenfels*, Gnas 2013, 55–194.

Molle 2004 = C. Molle, 'Di nuovo sul graffito ostiense della Fortuna Taurianensis', *Epigraphica* 66 (2004) 81–94.

Molle 2009 = C. Molle, 'Ancora sulla «patria» di Giovenale', in: H. Solin (ed.), *Le epigrafi della Valle di Comino. Atti del quinto convegno epigrafico cominese, Atina, Palazzo Ducale, 1 giugno 2008*, S. Donato Val di Comino 2009, 83–131.

Molle 2015 = C. Molle, 'Un'iscrizione inedita e i *Dentrii* di *Aquinum*', *Epigraphica* 77 (2015) 483–492.

de Montfaucon 1719 = B. de Montfaucon, *L'antiquité expliquée et representée en figures* I, 2, Paris 1719.

Murray 2001 = W. M. Murray, 'A trireme named *Isis*: the *sgraffito* from Nymphaion', *IJNA* 30 (2001) 250–256.

Nelis-Clément 2008 = J. Nelis-Clément, 'Les dédicaces religieuses d'Avenches', in: D. Castella – M.-F. Meylan Krause (eds.), *Topographie sacrée et rituels. Le cas d'*Aventicum*, capitale des Helvètes. Actes du colloque international d'Avenches, 2–4 novembre 2006* (Antiqua 43), Bâle 2008, 81–101.

Nilsson 1906 = M. P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der attischen*, Leipzig 1906.

Nock 1925 = A. D. Nock, 'Studies in the Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire', *JHS* 45 (1925) 84–101.

Nuorluoto 2021 = T. Nuorluoto, *Roman Female Cognomina*, Diss. Uppsala 2021 [forthcoming in Comm. Hum. Litt., Helsinki 2023].

Oakley 2005 = S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X. Volume IV: Book X*, Oxford 2005.

Ogilvie 1965 = R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*, Oxford 1965.

Olivares Pedreño 2008 = J. C. Olivares Pedreño, '*Interpretatio* epigráfica y

fenómenos de sincretismo religioso en el área céltica de Hispania', *HispAntiq* 32 (2008) 213–248.

Orelli 1828 = Io. Casp. Orellius, *Inscriptionum Latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio ad illustrandam Romanae antiquitatis disciplinam accommodata ac magnarum collectionum supplementa complura emendationesque exhibens*, vol. I, Turici 1828.

Orlandi 2016 = S. Orlandi, 'Una nuova dedica a Ercole da Roma', in: F. Mainardis (ed.), *Voce concordi. Scritti per Claudio Zaccaria* (AAAd 85), Trieste 2016, 531–536.

Orlin 2010 = E. M. Orlin, *Foreign Cults in Rome. Creating a Roman Empire*, Oxford 2010.

Otto 1908 = W. Otto, 'Mania und Lares', *ALL* 15 (1908) 113–120.

Otto 1909 = W. Otto, 'Römische Sondergötter', *RhM* 64 (1909) 449–468.

Paci 1990 = G. Paci, 'Da Colfiorito al Catria. Per la storia di alcune comunità dell'Appennino marchigiano in età romana con particolare riguardo alla documentazione epigrafica', in: *Problemi archeologici dell'area Esino-Sentinate. Atti del Convegno, Arcevia ottobre 1990* (Le Marche. Archeologia, storia, territorio 2), Fano 1990, 15–27.

Paci 2000 = G. Paci, 'I culti pagani sulle sponde dell'Adriatico centrale', in: Chr. Delplace – F. Tassaux (eds.), *Les cultes polythéistes dans l'Adriatique romaine* (Ausonius, Études 4), Bordeaux 2000, 155–169.

Padilla Peralta 2017 = Dan-El Padilla Peralta, 'Slave Religiosity in the Roman Middle Republic', *ClAnt* 36 (2017) 317–369.

Palagia 1980 = O. Palagia, *Euphranor* (Monumenta Graeca et Romana 3), Leiden 1980.

Palma Venetucci – Cacciotti – Mangiafesta 2018 = B. Palma Venetucci – B. Cacciotti – M. Mangiafesta, 'The Importance of Oriental Cults in Antium', *AAntHung* 58 (2018) 501–527.

Palmer 1975 = R. E. A. Palmer, 'The Neighborhood of Sullan Bellona at the Colline Gate', *MEFRA* 87 (1975) 653–665.

Palmer 1976 = R. E. A. Palmer, 'Jupiter Blaze, Gods of the Hills, and the Roman Topography of *CIL* VI 377', *AJA* 80 (1976) 43–56.

Palmer 1978 = R. E. A. Palmer, 'Silvanus, Sylvester, and the Chair of St. Peter', *PAPhS* 122 (1978) 222–247.

Palmer 1980 = R. E. A. Palmer, *The Archaic Community of the Romans*, Cambridge 1970.

Palmer 1990 = R. E. A. Palmer, 'Cults of Hercules, Apollo Caelispex and Fortuna in and around the Roman Cattle Market', *JRA* 3 (1990) 234–244 [= review

of F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Boario dalle origini alla fine della repubblica*, Roma 1988].

Panciera 1969 = S. Panciera, 'Herculi Saxinati', *StudRomagn* 20 (1969) 359–364 [= Panciera 2006, 683–687].

Panciera 1987 = S. Panciera, 'Ancora tra epigrafia e topografia. IV. Chi costruì il tempio di *Diana Planciana*?', in: *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes du colloque international de Rome, 8–12 mai 1985* (Coll. EFR 98), Rome 1987, 80–84 [= Panciera 2006, 359–361].

Panciera 1995 = S. Panciera, 'Silvano a Roma', in: *Studia in honorem Georgii Mihailov*, Sofia 1995, 347–362 [= Panciera 2006, 421–437].

Panciera 2002 = S. Panciera, 'Sulle vicende di un *sacrarium* di *Liber Pater* nel suburbio di Roma in età tardoantica', in: J.-M. Carrié – R. Lizzi Testa (eds.), *"Humana sapit". Études d'Antiquité tardive offerts à Lellia Cracco Ruggini* (Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité Tardive 3), Turnhout 2002, 43–54 [= Panciera 2006, 505–520].

Panciera 2003 = S. Panciera, 'Umano, sovrumano o divino? Le divinità auguste e l'imperatore a Roma', in: P. Erdkamp – O. Hekster – G. de Kleijn – S. T. A. M. Mols – L. de Blois (eds.), *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power. Proceedings of the III International Network 'Impact of Empire', Rome, March 20–23, 2002* (Impact of Empire 3), Amsterdam 2003, 215–239 [= Panciera 2006, 521–540].

Panciera 2006 = S. Panciera, *Epigrafi, epigrafia, epigrafisti. Scritti vari editi e inediti (1956-2005) con note complementari e indici* (Vetera 16), Roma 2006.

Panciera 2016 = S. Panciera, 'Bona Dea Romana', in: F. Mainardis (ed.), *Voce concordi. Scritti per Claudio Zaccaria* (AAAd 85), Trieste 2016, 549–554.

Parker 2000 = R. Parker, 'Theophoric Names and the History of Greek Religion', *PBA* 104 (2000) 53–79.

Parker 2005 = R. Parker, 'Artémis Ilithye et autres: le problème du nom divin utilisé comme épiclèse', in: N. Belayche – P. Brulé – G. Freyburger – Y. Lehmann – L. Pernot – F. Prost (eds.), *Nommer les Dieux: Théonymes, épithètes, épiclèses dans l'Antiquité* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 5), Rennes 2005, 219–226.

Parker 2017 = R. Parker, *Greek Gods Abroad. Names, Natures, and Transformations*, Oakland (CA) 2017.

Parker 2019 = R. Parker, 'Introduction', in: R. Parker (ed.), *Changing Names. Tradition and Innovation in Ancient Greek Onomastics* (Proceedings of the British Academy 222), Oxford 2019, 1–20.

Parma 2016 = A. Parma, '12 – Misenum (ma Roma)', in: G. Camodeca – M.

Giglio (eds.), *Puteoli. Studi di storia ed archeologia dei Campi Flegrei*, Napoli 2016, 351–354.

Pascual 2008 = H. G. Pascual, '¿*(Dea) Felicula* en Ilipa?', *SEBarc* 6 (2008) 93–95.

Passionei 1763 = B. Passionei, *Iscrizioni antiche disposte per ordine di varie classi ed illustrate da Benedetto Passionei*, Lucca 1763.

Perretti 2004 = T. Perretti, 'La dea Mefite tra *Potentia* e *Grumentum* (Italia, *III Regio*)', in: F. Beltrán Lloris (ed.), *Antiqua iuniora: en torno al Mediterráneo en la Antigüedad* (Ciencias sociales 50), Zaragoza 2004, 53–65.

Perrin 1994 = Y. Perrin, 'Néron, Fortuna, Hercule (Deux notes à propos de CIL, VI. 8470, et CIL, Vl, 8706)', in: Y. Le Bohec (ed.), *L'Afrique, la Gaule, la religion à l'époque romaine. Mélanges à la mémoire de Marcel Le Glay* (Coll. Latomus 266), Bruxelles 1994, 710–715.

Pesando 1996 = F. Pesando, 'Autocelebrazione aristocratica e propaganda politica in ambienti privati: la Casa del Fauno a Pompei', *CCG* 7 (1996) 189–228.

Peterson 1919 = R. M. Peterson, *The Cults of Campania* (PMAAR 1), Rome 1919.

Petraccia – Tramunto 2013 = M. F. Petraccia – M. Tramunto, 'Il termalismo curativo nei testi epigrafici: il caso delle Ninfe / Linfe', in: M. Bassani – M. Bressan – F. Ghedini (eds.), Aquae salutiferae*. Il termalismo tra antico e contemporaneo. Atti del convegno internazionale. Montegrotto Terme, 6–8 settembre 2012* (Antenor Quaderni 29), Padova 2013, 175–191.

Petracco Sicardi – Caprini 1981 = G. Petracco Sicardi – R. Caprini, *Toponomastica storica della Liguria*, Genova 1981.

Pfiffig 1975 = A. J. Pfiffig, *Religio Etrusca*, Graz 1975.

Pietilä-Castrén 1987 = L. Pietilä-Castrén, *Magnificentia publica. The Victory Monuments of the Roman Generals in the Era of the Punic Wars* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 84), Helsinki 1987.

Pighius 1599 = S. V. Pighius, *Annales Romanorum; qui Commentarii vicem supplent in omnes veteres Historiae Romanae scriptores*, etc., Antverpiae 1599.

Piranomonte 2010 = M. Piranomonte, 'Religion and Magic at Rome: The Fountain of Anna Perenna', in: R. L. Gordon – F. Marco Simón (eds.), *Magical Practice in the Latin West. Papers from the International Conference held at the University of Zaragoza, 30 Sept. – 1 Oct. 2005* (RGRW 168), Leiden – Boston 2010, 191–213.

Platner – Ashby 1929 = S. B. Platner – Th. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1929.

Poccetti 2008 = P. Poccetti, '*Mefitis* rivisitata (vent'anni dopo... e oltre, con prolegomeni e epilegomeni minimi)', in: A. Mele (ed.), "*Il culto della dea Mefite e la Valle d'Ansanto". Ricerche sul giacimento archeologico e culturale dei Samnites Hirpini*, Avellino 2008, 139–179.

Poccetti 2009 = P. Poccetti, 'Problemi antichi e dati nuovi: coincidenze di teonimi e di antroponimi nell'Italia antica', in: P. Poccetti (ed.), *L'onomastica dell'Italia antica. Aspetti linguistici, storici, culturali, tipologici e classificatori* (Coll. EFR 413), Roma 2009, 219–248.

Pollini 1990 = J. Pollini, 'Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate', in: K. A. Raaflaub – M. Toher (eds.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1990, 334–363.

Preller 1858 = L. Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, Berlin 1858.

Prim 2021 = J. Prim, *Aventinus mons. Limites, fonctions urbaines et représentations politiques d'une colline de la Rome antique* (Coll. EFR 571), Rome 2021.

Priuli 1985 = S. Priuli, 'Il tesoro di Arcisate. I dati epigrafici', *ArchClass* 37 (1985) 217–237.

Quaranta 2004 = P. Quaranta, in: P. Armellin – P. Quaranta, 'Il Tempio di Diana sull'Aventino', *BullCom* 105 (2004) 279–298.

Radke 1979[2] = G. Radke, *Die Götter Altitaliens*. 2., durchgesehene und ergänzte Auflage (Fontes et Commentationes. Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Epigraphik an der Universität Münster 3), Münster 1979.

Raffarin 2019 = A. Raffarin, 'Fortune de l'inscription du temple d'Isis des manuscrits épigraphiques du Quattrocento aux *Antiquités de la Ville* d'Andrea Fulvio (1527)', in: L. Calvelli – G. Cresci Marrone – A. Buonopane (eds.), *Altera pars laboris. Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta delle iscrizioni antiche* (Antichistica 24; Storia ed epigrafia 7), Venezia 2019, 239–251.

Ramsby 2019 = T. Ramsby, 'Ovid's Anna Perenna and the Coin of Gaius Annius', in: G. McIntyre – S. McCallum (eds.), *Uncovering Anna Perenna. A Focused Study of Roman Myth and Culture*, London – New York 2019, 113–124.

Rawson 1974 = E. Rawson, 'Religion and Politics in the Late Second Century B.C. at Rome', *Phoenix* 28 (1974) 193-212.

Rebuffat 1987 = R. Rebuffat, 'L'implantation militaire romaine en Maurétanie Tingitane', in: A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa romana. Atti del IV convegno di studio su «L'Africa romana», Sassari, 12–14 dicembre 1986*, Sassari 1987, 31–78.

Rebuffat 1992 = R. Rebuffat, 'Compléments au recueil des *Inscriptions Antiques du Maroc*', in: A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa romana. Atti del IX convegno di studio su «L'Africa romana», Nuoro, 13–15 dicembre 1991*, Sassari 1992, 439–501.

Reid 1916 = J. S. Reid, 'Roman Ideas of Deity', *JRS* 6 (1916) 170–184.
Richard 1965 = J.-Cl. Richard, 'La victoire de Marius', *MEFR* 77 (1965) 69–86.
Rickman 1971 = G. Rickman, *Roman Granaries and Store Buildings*, Cambridge 1971.
Rigato 2016 = D. Rigato, 'Le iscrizioni a matrice religiosa dei *vilici*: la documentazione di Roma e Ostia', *RSA* 46 (2016) 197–223.
Rives 1992 = J. Rives, 'The *Iuno Feminae* in Roman Society', *EMC* 36 (1992) 33–49.
Rizzello 1994 = M. Rizzello, 'La religione dei Volsci: le divinità', *Latium* 11 (1994) 5–111.
Rodríguez Almeida 1984 = E. Rodríguez Almeida, *Monte Testaccio. Ambiente, storia, materiali*, Roma 1984.
Roscher 1884–1890 = W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* I, Leipzig 1884–1890.
Rowan 2012 = C. Rowan, *Under Divine Auspices: Divine Ideology and the Visualisation of Imperial Power in the Severan Period*, Cambridge 2012.
Rüpke 1995 = J. Rüpke, *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit. Die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom* (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten 40), Berlin – New York 1995.
Rüpke 2013 = J. Rüpke, 'Individuals and Networks', in: L. Bricault – C. Bonnet (eds.), *Panthée: Religious Transformations in the Graeco-Roman Empire* (RGRW 177), Leiden – Boston 2013, 262–277.
Russell 2016 = A. Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, Cambridge 2016.
Sabbatini Tumolesi 1988 = P. Sabbatini Tumolesi, *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano* I: *Roma* (Vetera 2), Roma 1988.
Saint-Amans 2004 = S. Saint-Amans, *Topographie religieuse de* Thugga *(Dougga). Ville romaine d'Afrique proconsulaire (Tunisie)* (Scripta antiqua 9), Bordeaux 2004.
Salomies 1984 = O. Salomies, 'Beiträge zur römischen Namenkunde', *Arctos* 18 (1984) 93–104.
Salomies 1992 = O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 97), Helsinki 1992.
Salomies 1998 = O. Salomies, 'Three Notes on Roman Nomina', *Arctos* 32 (1998) 197–224.
Salomies 2010 = O. Salomies, 'Roman *nomina* in the Peloponnese: some observations', in: A. D. Rizakis – Cl. E. Lepenioti (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese*

III. *Society, Economy and Culture under the Roman Empire: Continuity and Innovation* (Meletemata 63), Athens 2010, 193–203.

Salomies 2012 = O. Salomies, 'The Nomina of the Samnites. A Checklist', *Arctos* 46 (2012) 137–185.

Salomies 2019 = O. Salomies, 'Latin Cognomina Ending in *-illianus*', *Arctos* 53 (2019) 185–209.

Salzman 1990 = M. R. Salzman, *On Roman Time. The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 17), Berkeley – Los Angeles – Oxford 1991.

Samperi 2011 = R. Samperi, 'La città delle vigne, dei giardini e delle ville (fine XV-XVI secolo)', in: G. Simoncini (ed.), *Roma. Le trasformazioni urbane nel Cinquecento.* II. *Dalla città al territorio* (L'ambiente storico. Studi di storia urbana e del territorio 13), Firenze 2011, 105–157.

Sandberg 2018 = K. Sandberg, 'Monumenta, Documenta, Memoria. Remembering and imagining the past in Late Republican Rome', in: K. Sandberg – C. Smith (eds.), *Omnium Annalium Monumenta. Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome* (Historiography of Rome and Its Empire 2), Leiden – Boston 2017, 351–389.

Sansone 2021 = A. Sansone, *Lucania romana. Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale* (Vetera 23), Roma 2021.

Santangelo 2007 = F. Santangelo, *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire. A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East* (Impact of Empire 8), Leiden – Boston 2007.

Santangelo 2012 = F. Santangelo, '*Sullanus* and *Sullani*', *Arctos* 46 (2012) 187–191.

Santolini Giordani 1989 = R. Santolini Giordani, *Antichità Casali: la collezione di Villa Casali a Roma* (Studi Miscellanei 27), Roma 1989.

Šašel 1973 = J. Šašel, 'Via Gemina', *ArhVest* 24 (1973) 901–902.

Šašel Kos 2002 = M. Šašel Kos, 'The Festival of Carna at Emona', *Tyche* 17 (2002) 129–144.

Scheid 1999 = J. Scheid, 'Auguste et le grand pontificat. Politique et droit sacré au début du Principat', *RD* 77 (1999) 1–19.

Schmidt Heidenreich 2013 = C. Schmidt Heidenreich, *Le glaive et l'autel. Camps et piété militaires sous le Haut-Empire romain* (Histoire. Série Histoire ancienne), Rennes 2013.

Schraudolph 1993 = E. Schraudolph, *Römische Götterweihungen mit Reliefschmuck aus Italien* (Archäologie und Geschichte 2), Heidelberg 1993.

Schultz 2000 = C. E. Schultz, 'Modern Prejudice and Ancient Praxis: Female Worship of Hercules at Rome', *ZPE* 133 (2000) 291–297.

Schultz 2006 = C. E. Schultz, *Women's Religious Activity in the Roman Republic*, Chapel Hill 2006.

Schulze 1904 = W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (AKWG, Phil.-hist. Kl., N.F. V, Heft 5), Berlin 1904.

Senatore 2004 = F. Senatore, 'Note sulle origini di *Potentia*: le premesse indigene e l'istituzione del *municipium*', *SCO* 50 (2004) 308–328.

Siwicki 2021 = C. Siwicki, 'The Roman Cult of Hercules', in: D. Ogden (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Heracles*, Oxford 2021, 489–506.

Skutsch 1970 = O. Skutsch, 'On Three Fragments of Porcius Licinus and on the Tutiline Gate', *BICS* 17 (1970) 120–123.

Smith 2006 = C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan*: *The Gens from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology*, Cambridge 2006.

Solin 1981 = H. Solin, *Zu lukanischen Inschriften* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 69), Helsinki 1981.

Solin 1984 = H. Solin, 'Analecta epigraphica', *Arctos* 18 (1984) 113–148 [= H. Solin, *Analecta epigraphica 1970–1997*, Roma 1998, 195–219].

Solin 1990 = H. Solin, *Namenpaare. Eine Studie zur römischen Namengebung* (Comm. Hum. Litt. 90), Helsinki 1990.

Solin 1993 = H. Solin, 'L'epigrafia dei villaggi del Cassinate ed Aquinate', in: A. Calbi – A. Donati – G. Poma (eds.), *L'epigrafia del villaggio. Atti del Colloquio Borghesi, Forlì 1990* (Epigrafia e antichità 12), Faenza 1993, 363–406.

Solin 1995 = H. Solin, 'Silvius', *SCO* 43 (1995) 359–371.

Solin 2019 = H. Solin, *Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico* II (Comm. Hum. Litt. 137), Helsinki 2019.

Solin – Kajava 1992 = H. Solin – M. Kajava, 'Le iscrizioni del *Latium Adiectum*', in: L. Gasperini (ed.), *Rupes loquentes. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studio sulle iscrizioni rupestri di età romana in Italia. Roma – Bomarzo 13–15. X. 1989* (Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto italiano per la storia antica 53), Roma 1992, 335–383.

Solin – Salomies 1994^2 = H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*. Ed. nova addendis corrigendisque augmentata (Alpha – Omega Reihe A, LXXX), Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1994.

Solin – Tuomisto 2005 = H. Solin – P. Tuomisto, 'Iscrizioni di Torre S. Gregorio ad Aquino', *Epigraphica* 67 (2005) 371–377.

Solodow 1979 = J. B. Solodow, 'Livy and the Story of Horatius, 1.24–26', *TAPhA* 109 (1979) 251–268.

Spevak 2016 = O. Spevak, '*Ex Anniana Milonis domo* : les syntagmes nominaux avec deux compléments de possession', *Pallas* 102 (2016) 35–43.

Spickermann, forthcoming = W. Spickermann, 'My Name is Your Name – the situation in Central Europe', article presented at the international Workshop "*My Name is Your Name. Anthroponyms as Divine Attributes in the Greco-Roman World*", *3 June 2021*, forthcoming.

Stefanile 2017 = M. Stefanile, *Dalla Campania alle Hispaniae. L'emigrazione dalla Campania romana alle coste mediterranee della Penisola Iberica in età tardo-repubblicana e proto-imperiale*, Napoli 2017.

Stoll 1998 = O. Stoll, 'Silvanus im Steinbruch. Kulttransfer durch Soldaten der legio III Scythica in Syrien', in: L. Schumacher (ed.), *Religion – Wirtschaft – Technik. Althistorische Beiträge zur Entstehung neuer kultureller Strukturmuster im historischen Raum Nordafrika/Kleinasien/Syrien* (Mainzer althistorische Studien 1), St. Katharinen 1998, 99–145 [= O. Stoll, *Römisches Heer und Gesellschaft: gesammelte Beiträge 1991–1999*, Stuttgart 2001, 222–268].

Syme 1939 = R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939.

Syme 2016 = Sir Ronald Syme, *Approaching the Roman Revolution. Papers on Republican History*, edited by Federico Santangelo, Oxford 2016.

Szaivert 1986 = W. Szaivert, *Die Münzprägung der Kaiser Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus und Commodus* (Denkschr. Akad. Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl. 187; Moneta Imperii Romani 18), Wien 1986.

Tantimonaco 2020 = S. Tantimonaco, '*Piissimus* and *pientissimus*: two nonexistent superlatives of *pius*?', *JoLL* 19 (2020) 281–307.

Tarpin 2002 = M. Tarpin, Vici *et* pagi *dans l'Occident romain* (Coll. EFR 299), Rome 2002.

Tedeschi Grisanti – Solin 2011 = G. Tedeschi Grisanti – H. Solin, '"*Dis Manibus, pili, epitaffi et altre cose antiche" di Giovannantonio Dosio. Il codice N.A. 618 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze*, Pisa 2011.

Thomasson 1996 = B. E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani. Senatorische und ritterliche Amtsträger in den römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diokletian* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Rom, 4º, 53), Stockholm 1996.

Torelli 1990 = M. R. Torelli, 'I culti di Rossano di Vaglio', in: M. R. Salvatore (ed.), *Basilicata. L'espansionismo romano nel sud-est d'Italia. Il quadro archeologico* (Leukania 2), Venosa 1990, 83–93.

Torelli 2002 = M. R. Torelli, *Benevento romana* (Saggi di storia antica 18), Roma 2002.

Torelli 2011 = M(ario) Torelli, in: I. Battiloro – M. Osanna (eds.), *Brateís datas. Pratiche rituali, votivi e strumenti del culto dai santuari della Lucania antica.*

Atti delle giornate di studio sui Santuari Lucani, Matera, 19–20 febbraio 2010 (Coll. Archeologia), Venosa 2011, 321–338.

Toscano 2015–2016 = F. Toscano, *Il commento di Antonio Costanzi da Fano ai Fasti di Ovidio. Edizione critica del commento a* Fast. *I-III*, tesi di dottorato, Università di Salerno 2015–2016. (http://elea.unisa.it/bitstream/handle/10556/2404/tesi%20F.%20Toscano.pdf)

Tramunto 2006 = M. Tramunto, in: C. Cervetti – M. F. Petraccia – M. Tramunto – M. Traverso, 'Il Lapidario Roccamadoro-Ramelli', in: M. F. Petraccia (ed.), *Camillo Ramelli e la cultura antiquaria dell'Ottocento* (Studia Archaeologica 149; Sentinum 2), Roma 2006, 103–148.

Tran 2008 = N. Tran, 'Les collèges d'*horrearii* et de *mensores*, à Rome et à Ostie, sous le Haut-Empire', *MEFRA* 120 (2008) 295–306.

Tran 2021 = N. Tran, 'Les cultes des associations privées en Gaule narbonnaise et dans les Alpes maritimes', in: F. Fontana – E. Murgia (eds.), *Sacra facere. Atti del VI Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro. Forme associative e pratiche rituali nel mondo antico, Trieste, 24-25 maggio 2019* (Polymnia. Studi di Archeologia 11), Trieste 2021, 265–280.

Trinquier 2008 = J. Trinquier, 'La hantise de l'invasion pestilentielle : le rôle de la faune des marais dans l'étiologie des maladies épidémiques d'après les sources latines', in: *Le médecin initié par l'animal. Animaux et médecine dans l'Antiquité grecque et latine. Actes du colloque international tenu à Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, les 26 et 27 octobre 2006* (Coll. de la Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen ancien. Série littéraire et philosophique 39), Lyon 2008, 149–195.

Untermann 2000 = J. Untermann, *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen* (Handbuch der italischen Dialekte 3), Heidelberg 2000.

van der Meer – Stevens 2000 = L. B. van der Meer – N. L. C. Stevens, '*Tiburtinus lapis*. The use of travertine in Ostia', *BaBesch* 75 (2000) 169–195.

van der Ploeg 2018 = G. van der Ploeg, *The Impact of the Roman Empire on the Cult of Asclepius* (Impact of Empire 30), Leiden 2018.

Van Haeperen 2010 = F. Van Haeperen, 'Vie religieuse et *horrea* : exemples de Rome et d'Ostie', *ARG* 12 (2010) 243–259.

Van Haeperen 2019 = F. Van Haeperen, *Fana, templa, delubra* 6. *Regio I*: *Ostie, Porto*, Roma 2019.

Van Haeperen 2019-2020 = F. Van Haeperen, 'Séquences onomastiques divines à Ostie-Portus', *ARG* 21-22 (2019-2020) 277–308.

Van Haeperen 2021 = F. Van Haeperen, 'I culti associati di *Portus*', in: F. Fontana – E. Murgia (eds.), *Sacra facere. Atti del VI Seminario di Archeologia del Sacro.*

Forme associative e pratiche rituali nel mondo antico, Trieste, 24-25 maggio 2019 (Polymnia. Studi di Archeologia 11), Trieste 2021, 197–210.

Várhelyi 2010 = Z. Várhelyi, *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire. Power and the Beyond*, Cambridge 2010.

Vennemann 1995 = T. Vennemann gen. Nierfeld, 'Morphologie der niederrheinischen Matronennamen', in: E. Marold – C. Zimmermann (eds.), *Nordwestgermanisch* (Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 13), Berlin – New York 1995, 271–299.

Versluys 2002 = M. J. Versluys, *Aegyptiaca Romana. Nilotic Scenes and the Roman Views of Egypt* (RGRW 144), Leiden – Boston 2002.

Versnel 2011 = H. S. Versnel, *Coping with the Gods. Wayward Readings in Greek Theology* (RGRW 173), Leiden – Boston 2011.

Veyne 1964 = P. Veyne, 'Epigraphica', *Latomus* 23 (1964) 30–41.

Vidman 1969 = L. Vidman, *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*, Berlin 1969.

Villa Albani 1989 = P. C. Bol – A. Allrogen-Bedel (eds.), *Forschungen zur Villa Albani. Katalog der antiken Bildwerke* I. *Bildwerke im Treppenaufgang und im Piano nobile des Casino* (Schriften des Liebighauses – Museum alter Plastik, Frankfurt am Main), Berlin 1989.

Villaret 2019 = A. Villaret, *Les dieux augustes dans l'Occident romain – Un phénomène d'acculturation* (Scripta antiqua 126), Bordeaux 2019.

Visit 1838 = *A Visit to the British Museum containing a Familiar Description of Every Object of Interest in the Various Departments of that Establishment*, London 1838.

Vout 2012 = C. Vout, *The Hills of Rome: Signature of an Eternal City*, Cambridge 2012.

Weinstock 1957 = S. Weinstock, 'Victor and Invictus', *HThR* 50 (1957) 211–247.

Weinstock 1971 = S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, Oxford 1971.

Whatmough 1970 = J. Whatmough, *The Dialects of Ancient Gaul*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1970.

Wiseman 1987 = T. P. Wiseman, '*Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo*: the public image of aristocratic and imperial houses in the late Republic and early Empire', in: *L'Urbs : espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes du colloque international de Rome, 8–12 mai 1985* (Coll. EFR 98), Rome 1987, 393–413.

Wiseman 1996 = T. P. Wiseman, 'The Minucii and Their Monument', in: J. Linderski (ed.), Imperium sine fine*: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic* (Historia Einzelschriften 105), Stuttgart 1996, 57–74.

Wiseman 2019 = T. P. Wiseman, 'Anna and the *Plebs*: A Synthesis of Primary Evidence', in: G. McIntyre – S. McCallum (eds.), *Uncovering Anna Perenna. A Focused Study of Roman Myth and Culture*, London – New York 2019, 1–16.

Wissowa 1904 = G. Wissowa, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte*, München 1904.

Wissowa 1912[2] = G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Zweite Auflage (HbAW V:4), München 1912.

Wodtko 2009 = D. S. Wodtko, 'Language Contact in Lusitania', *IJDL* 6 (2009) 1–48.

Wojciechowski 2013 = P. Wojciechowski, 'Cult Appellations and Hercules Worship in Rome', *The Roman Empire in the Light of Epigraphical and Normative Studies* 4 (2013) 97–117.

Wojciechowski 2021 = P. Wojciechowski, *Roman Religious Associations in Italy (1st–3rd century)*, Toruń 2021.

Wrede 1981 = H. Wrede, *Consecratio in formam deorum. Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz am Rhein 1981.

Zaccagnino 2004 = C. Zaccagnino, '*Hercules Invictus*, l'*excubitorium* della *VII cohors vigilum*, il Meleagro Pighini. Note sulla topografia di Trastevere', *Ostraka* 13 (2004) 101–124.

Zaccagnino 2019 = C. Zaccagnino, 'The Aedes Aemiliana Herculis in the Forum Boarium: New Considerations', *Mouseion* 16 (2019) 197–225.

Zair 2012 = N. Zair, *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic* (Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 7), Leiden – Boston 2012.

Zair 2016 = N. Zair, *Oscan in the Greek Alphabet*, Cambridge 2016.

Zimmermann 2012 = M. Zimmermann, 'Bemerkungen zur Verbreitung und Bedeutung der Inschriftenformel *in suo (posuit)*', *ZPE* 182 (2012) 278–286.

Ziolkowski 1988 = A. Ziolkowski, 'Mummius' Temple of Hercules Victor and the Round Temple on the Tiber', *Phoenix* 42 (1988) 309–333.

Indices

1. Literary sources

Alc. fr. 34: 51
Arnob. 4,9: 29
Aug. *civ*. 4,8: 17, 22 n. 18
CGL V 15,36: 21 n. 16
- 53,5: 21 n. 16
Cic. *ad Q. fr.* 3,1,19: 87 n. 2
Cic. *orat*. 190: 87 n. 2
Cic. *Phil*. 7,24: 18, 60
Curios. urb. p. 80, 5 N: 74
- p. 92, 13 N: 87
Dio 77,16,3: 75 n. 13
Dion. Hal. *Ant*. 5,14–16: 44 n. 50
Dion. Hal. *Comp. verb*. 25: 87 n. 2
Eur. *Ba*. 1147: 75 n. 12
- 1161: 75 n. 12
Fest. 90 L: 22
- 109 L: 18 n. 6
- 131 L: 18 n. 6
- 164 L: 34
- 282 L: 13
- 464 L: 45 n. 53
- 465 L: 45 n. 53
- 496 L: 14
Frontin. *aq*. 1,5: 36
Grom. p. 302, 13–19: 32–33
HA *Tac*. 17,2: 20
HA *trig. tyr*. 25: 11
Isid. *diff*. 1,523: 22
Iuv. 3,320: 24
Liv. 1,48,6: 11 n. 19
Lucil. 1130: 45 n. 55
Mart. 2,29,5: 36 n. 16
- 3,68,8: 41 n. 39
- 6,64,13: 34
- 9,103: 73
Obseq. 70: 59
Ov. *fast*. 1,336: 22
- 3,397: 53 n. 89
- 3,673–74: 41 n. 41
Paus. 4,23,10: 7 n. 10
- 5,14,6: 82 n. 39
- 6,21,4: 7 n. 10
- 8,47,4: 78 n. 24
Petron. 114: 50 n. 76
Plin. *nat*. 2,211: 12 n. 23
- 3,108: 45 n. 53
- 7,97: 13 n. 24
- 13,53: 10, 33
- 34,57: 42
- 34,77: 36 n. 17, 76 n. 18
- 35,94: 41 n. 43
- 36,26: 12
- 36,28: 10, 33
- 36,40: 14 n. 29
- 36,163: 38 n. 26
Plut. *Caes*. 6: 59 n. 116
Porph. Hor. *ep*. 1,1,4: 20
Prop. 4,8,29: 34
Quint. 2,11,2: 87 n. 2
Reg. urb. p. 80, 4 N: 74
- p. 92, 13 N: 87
Sen. *contr*. 2,5,13: 87 n. 2
Serv. *Aen*. 1,334: 22
Suet. *Aug*. 29,5: 34
Suet. *Iul*. 11: 59 n. 116
Suet. *Vesp*. 19,1: 36 n. 16
Tac. *hist*. 3,69: 21 n. 16
Tert. *apol*. 24,8: 60 n. 117, 89

Tert. *nat*. 2,8,6: 60 n. 117
Val. Max. 1,7,5: 14
- 6,9,14: 59 n. 116
- 7,3,1: 34
Varro *ling*. 5,72: 17
Varro *Men*. fr. 506: 41 n. 40
Varro *rust*. 3,5,12: 11
Vell. 2,27,6: 77
Vitr. 3,2,5: 13
- 3,3,5: 11
- 7, praef. 17: 13

2. Inscriptions, papyri, coins

AE 1924, 15: 73
- 1924, 109: 79
- 1925, 118: 57
- 1926, 41: 38
- 1946, 91: 89 n. 10
- 1952, 65: 25 n. 31
- 1956, 62: 25
- 1965, 183: 89 n. 11
- 1967, 200: 89 n. 11
- 1967, 571: 82
- 1971, 31: 35
- 1975, 158: 71
- 1977, 533: 26 n. 35
- 1978, 40: 73
- 1978, 97: 23
- 1978, 99: 23
- 1980, 53: 98
- 1981, 240: 58
- 1987, 366: 54 n. 91
- 1989, 915: 25
- 1991, 1256: 85
- 1994, 560: 58
- 1995, 184: 89 n. 10
- 1998, 759: 25 n. 31
- 1998, 1572: 26 n. 35
- 2000, 153: 73
- 2004, 367: 68
- 2005, 763c: 79
- 2007, 251: 52 n. 83
- 2008, 503: 57
- 2008, 659: 98 n. 6
- 2010, 1804: 4 n. 4
- 2012, 430: 8 n. 14
- 2013, 336: 48 n. 66
- 2013, 550b: 28 n. 41
- 2015, 314: 23
- 2016, 336: 70
- 2018, 260: 68 n. 14
- 2018, 924: 89 n. 11
- 2019, 1256: 99 n. 9
- 2019, 1901: 100 n. 14
Bacci 1984–85, 722–25, tav. 159: 17 n. 3
BCTH 1893, 162, No. 43: 25 n. 31
- 1936–37, 110–11: 63
Bloch 1958, 213: 49–50GG
CAG-66 (Eastern Pyrenees), p. 505: 27 n. 37
- 80-01 (Amiens), p. 261: 27 n. 37
Capini 1999, 210: 56
CBI 53: 40 n. 32
- 86: 40 n. 32
CERom-4, 294: 40 n. 32
CFA No. 27, 16, 31: 5 n. 6
CIE 10840: 53
CIL I^2 10: 53 n. 88
- 32–33: 8
- 721: 21 n. 16
- 1124: 36 n. 19
- 1761: 56
- 2435–36: 8
- 2696: 27 n. 37
- 3163a: 55

- 3473: 55 n. 94
- 3610: 48
CIL II 1097: 98 n. 6
- 1980: 94
- 2405: 25 n. 31
- 4082: 94
- 4970, 183e-g: 27 n. 37
- 4970, 309: 24 n. 27
CIL II^2 14, 838: 94
CIL III 6382: 61 n. 119
- 9957: 89 n. 11
- 11542: 26 n. 35
CIL V 761: 52 n. 84
- 796: 52 n. 84
- 3304: 93
- 4757: 30
- 6575: 24 n. 27
CIL VI 9: 4 n. 5
- 68: 97
- 69: 65–67
- 70: 67 n. 9
- 114: 43
- 131: 71
- 135: 36
- 162: 37
- 164–65: 71
- 186: 72
- 187: 19 n. 9, 20
- 189: 37
- 204: 72
- 280: 73
- 311: 20–21
- 322: 73
- 334: 39–42
- 377: 40 n. 31
- 424: 4 n. 3, 99–101
- 463: 74–75
- 466: 76
- 644: 38, 95
- 645: 44, 73–74
- 646: 33 n. 7
- 649: 44
- 657: 75 n. 11
- 698: 88–89
- 776: 76
- 782: 92 n. 3
- 783: 4 n. 4
- 792: 77
- 825: 6 n. 8
- 975: 45, 65
- 1288: 53 n. 88
- 1424: 77
- 2210: 34–35
- 2233: 19 n. 10
- 2234: 19
- 2343: 67
- 2344–45: 67
- 2506: 4 n. 5
- 3679: 92
- 3687: 38
- 4305: 9–10, 34
- 8455: 44
- 8706: 38
- 9673: 35 n. 13
- 9716: 70
- 9754: 84 n. 4
- 9854: 21 n. 16
- 10006: 11 n. 19
- 10023: 35 n. 13
- 10233: 75 n. 13
- 10266–67: 42, 93
- 14005: 6 n. 8
- 15593: 4–5
- 15594: 5 n. 6
- 28668: 26 n. 35
- 29771: 35–36

- 29844: 34
- 30689: 65–67
- 30695: 43
- 30713: 72
- 30728: 73
- 30736: 73
- 30739: 39–42
- 30829: 76
- 30836: 6 n. 8
- 30855: 83–84
- 30873: 92
- 30874: 72
- 30884: 26 n. 35
- 30902: 38
- 30930: 89 n. 10
- 31218: 45, 65
- 31896: 21 n. 16
- 33838a: 35
- 33922: 11 n. 19
- 36467: 66 n. 6
- 36619: 34
- 36753: 72
- 36778: 79 n. 27
- 36786: 89 n. 10
- 36833: 77
- 38755: 84 n. 3
- 39819: 52 n. 83
- 39822: 98
- 39845: 34
- 39860: 38
- 39862: 73
- 40414–15: 26 n. 35
- 41329: 65

CIL VIII 2579a-c: 82 n. 37, 89 n. 9
- 2579d: 89 n. 9
- 2579e: 82
- 2585: 82, 89 n. 9
- 5933: 89 n. 10
- 17977: 82
- 18089: 82 n. 37
- 18089e: 82
- 18091: 82, 89 n. 9
- 19199: 89 n. 10
- 26486: 27–28

CIL IX 338: 70
- 1095: 46
- 1455: 31–32, 58, 69
- 1546: 32
- 1552: 59
- 1681: 81
- 1682: 81
- 1683: 81
- 1684: 80–81
- 1686: 80–81
- 1971: 58
- 2000: 48 n. 66
- 2113: 69
- 2123: 67–68
- 2124: 89 n. 11
- 2125: 32, 58
- 2126: 69–70
- 2322: 48 n. 64
- 2481: 53, 93
- 2631: 31, 80
- 2655: 56
- 2673: 56
- 2679: 48
- 2691: 56
- 2975: 56
- 5744: 98–99
- 6763: 56
- 7400: 94
- 7994: 8 n. 14
- 8154: 60
- 8193: 52–53
- 8273–74:

- 8955: 58
CIL X 131–33: 55
- 442: 56
- 861: 94
- 1560: 78–79
- 1584: 40–41 n. 36
- 1693–94: 79 n. 28
- 3667: 56 n. 99
- 3799: 93
- 3811: 55 n. 94
- 4850: 49
- 4851: 49
- 4880: 49 n. 70
- 5386: 32 n. 5
- 5406: 23
- 5960: 46
- 6595: 84 n. 3
CIL XI 250*, 2c: 78
- 356: 26 n. 35
- 1616: 54 n. 91
- 2721: 99 n. 9
- 3076: 15 n. 32
- 3082: 31, 59
- 3286: 57
- 3287–88: 57 n. 104
- 3289: 57 n. 104
- 3290: 57 n. 104
- 3294: 57 n. 104
- 3778: 12 n. 23
- 4669a-b: 47–48
- 5165: 52 n. 84
- 5740: 24–25
- 5750: 23
- 5805: 52 n. 84
- 7265: 29 n. 42
- 7535: 59 n. 112
CIL XII 594: 29 n. 42
- 1283: 26 n. 35
- 1326: 23 n. 25
- 2677: 93–94
CIL XIII 1462: 26 n. 35
- 7794: 40 n. 32
- 7882: 30 n. 45
- 7976: 30 n. 45
- 8006: 85
- 8171: 28–30
- 8220: 30
- 8254: 28
- 8706: 5 n. 6, 85 n. 8
- 10009, 262b: 27 n. 37
- 12066: 30 n. 45
CIL XIV 1: 51 n. 81
- 30: 80
- 279: 5 n. 6
- 353: 80
- 2028: 50–52
- 2251: 84 n. 5
- 2579: 36–37 n. 19
- 3380: 45–46
- 3437: 45–46
- 3469: 100–101
- 3530: 67
- 3553: 47
- 3777: 67
- 4287: 79–80
- 4328: 52 n. 83
- 4642: 80
CIL XV 990: 27 n. 37
- 992a: 27 n. 37
- 993: 27 n. 37
- 8236: 48 n. 66
CILCáceres-04, 1308: 89 n. 11
CLE 251: 51 n. 81
Conimbri 11: 40 n. 32
EDCS-10300580: 81
- 11900009: 81 n. 30

- 12401624: 69 n. 15
- 18100948: 19
- 25601193: 28
EDR-016192: 24
- 072970: 57
- 100054: 52
- 113323: 49 n. 71
- 121737: 42
- 124736: 18 n. 7
- 127756: 47
- 137110: 19 n. 12
- 161434: 6 n. 8
EE VIII 94: 58
- IX 762a: 89 n. 11
- IX 888: 92
ERC 35: 70
Fabretti 1699, 692, No. 131: 20 n. 14
FUR pl. 22: 34
IAM II 814: 25–27
I.Ephesos 4112: 26 n. 35
IG II^2 1039, 56–58: 77 n. 22
IG II/III^2 4239: 36 n. 18
IG X 2, 1, 922: 97 n. 2
IGUR I 196: 93
I.Köln^2 110: 28–30
- 111: 28–30
ILA-Arve 3: 26 n. 35
ILAfr. 238: 81 n. 35
- 253: 81
- 280: 81 n. 35
- 345: 61–62
- 347: 65 n. 2
ILAlg. II 804: 62
- 807: 62
- 6867: 89 n. 10
- 7240a: 89 n. 10
ILGN 77: 89 n. 11
ILJug. III 1415: 93
ILLPRON Ind. 827: 26 n. 35
- 1164: 99
ILN III 202: 26 n. 35
- 270: 26 n. 35
ILS 116: 15 n. 32
- 392: 80
- 1170: 93
- 1470: 44
- 1621: 83–84
- 1732: 34
- 1930: 76
- 3034: 89 n. 9
- 3040: 99–101
- 3066: 36–37 n. 19
- 3080: 39–42
- 3133: 24–25
- 3151: 52 n. 84
- 3167: 4 n. 4
- 3253: 71
- 3254: 36
- 3357: 80
- 3358: 74–75
- 3365: 40–41 n. 36
- 3418: 47
- 3444: 46
- 3449: 20–21
- 3468: 44, 73–74
- 3499: 52 n. 84
- 3511: 65–67
- 3513: 97–98
- 3537: 95
- 3538: 69
- 3539: 82
- 3569: 88–89
- 3570: 33 n. 7
- 3604: 94
- 3605: 94
- 3606: 42

- 3641: 94
- 3659: 78–79
- 3714: 72
- 3715: 37–38
- 3716: 72
- 3717: 38
- 3718: 67–68
- 3727: 76
- 3841: 82 n. 37
- 3866: 98–99
- 3876: 57
- 3889: 71
- 3989: 43
- 4101: 52 n. 84
- 4181a: 19
- 4999: 34–35
- 5449: 5 n. 6
- 6073: 45
- 6596: 30 n. 42
- 6675: 28
- 6988: 30 n. 42
- 7037: 26 n. 35
- 7071: 28
- 7318: 49
- 7318a: 49
- 7323: 48
- 7324: 32 n. 5
- 7328: 93–94
- 7570: 11 n. 19
- 7605: 35 n. 13
- 8045: 26 n. 35
- 8061: 77
- 8063b: 5 n. 6
- 8063c: 4–5
- 8184: 66 n. 6
- 9297: 25 n. 31

ILTun. 723: 81 n. 35

Imag. It. 450–52: Capua 36–37: 54 n. 91
- 504: Cumae 8: 56
- 592: Acerrae 1: 10 n. 18
- 1391–93: Potentia 17–18: 55
- 1399: Potentia 22: 55 n. 97
- 1431–32: Potentia 44: 8

Inscr. It. III 1, 113: 56
- IV 4, 1, 30, No. 57: 47 n. 62
- IV 4, 1, 611: 67
- X 5, 574: 30
- XIII 1/2 (*Ant. min., Vall., Allif., Amit*.): 34
- XIII 2, 2, p. 39: 77
- XIII 2, 5, p. 53: 77
- XIII 2, 10, p. 81: 77 n. 22
- XIII 2, 24, p. 181: 42 n. 45
- XIII 2, 25, p. 191: 11, 42
- XIII 2, 42, pp. 249, 472: 41 n. 38

IRPLeon 20: 79 n. 27

IRT 276–77: 92
- 317A–B: 62–63

Johnson 1935, 116 n. 2: 46

Nesselhauf 159: 40 n. 32
- 166: 40 n. 32

NSc 1914, 429: 71

Orelli 1828, No. 1255: 3 n. 3
- No. 1516: 66 n. 5
- No. 1520: 45 n. 53

Pais 844: 18 n. 7

Pfahl, *ILGI*, p. 149, No. 21: 89 n. 11

RAP 206: 25 n. 31
- 207: 25 n. 31
- 210: 40 n. 32

RIB I 2044: 24 n. 27

RIC 3, 581: 73
- 586: 73
- 591: 73

RICIS 501/0104: 19
- 501/0213: 76
- 503/1132: 50

- 510/0101: 52 n. 84
RIS 240: 99
Rix, *ET* Vs S. 14: 54–55
Roman Peloponnese II, Me 202: 48 n. 66
RRC 366/1: 41 n. 41
RV-04[bis]: 55 n. 96
- 22: 55
- 32: 55
- 45: 55
SB VI 9571, 5: 51
SEG XXXVII 135: 77 n. 22
ST Cm 7: 10 n. 18
- Lu 31: 55 n. 97
Suppl. It. 9: Amiternum 5: 52–53
- Amiternum 76–77: 53
Suppl. It. 16: Rusellae 2: 89 n. 11
Suppl. It. 18: Ameria 1: 52 n. 84
Suppl. It. 22: Superaequum 59: 94
Suppl. It. – *Imagines. Latium vetus* 1, 636–37, No. 856: 47
Suppl. It. – *Imagines. Roma* 1: *Musei Capitolini*, 574–75, No. 2196: 39–42
Szaivert Nos. 813–14: 73
- Nos. 1144–45: 73

3. Personal Names

(†† = divine epithet non-existent;
††? = existence of divine epithet doubtful, uncertain, or hypothetical)

3.1. Gods

A(d)corus (*genius* ~ 'god'): 26 n. 35
Aesculapius/Asklepios: 4, 7, 89 n. 9
- *Demainetos*: 7 n. 10
- *Repentinus*: 4 n. 4
Amnesa[henae?] (*matronae*): 30 n. 45
Ancharia: 17, 29, 43 n. 48, 60 n. 117, 61, 104
Anna Perenna: 41
Aphrodite:
- *Glykeia*: 4 n. 4
Apollo: 9–10, 52 n. 83, 57, 60, 97, 104
- *Ismenios*: 54
- *Livicus*: 85
- *Medicus*: 52 n. 83
- *Smintheus*: 54
- "*Sminthianus*" (††):
- *Sosianus*: 3, 9–10, 14, 33–35, 52 n. 83, 103–104
Arvernus (*genius* ~ 'god'): 26 n. 35
Astarte: 63 n. 126
Athena: 36, 51, 76
- *Areia*: 51
- *Hephaistia*: 51
Baal Addir: 27–28, 88
Bacchus: 75 nn. 12–13
Bellona: 19, 87 n. 3
- *Pulvinensis*: 19 n. 10
- *Rufiliana* (?): 18–19, 106
Bona Dea: 4, 45–46, 52 n. 83, 65–67, 83–84, 97–98
- *Agrestis Felicula*: 15, 97–98, 107
- *Annianensis*: 65–67, 107
- *Apollinaris*: 52 n. 83, 75
- *Cereria*: 52 n. 84
- *Galbilla* (††?): 11, 83–84, 105, 107
- *Isiaca*: 52 n. 84
- *S(a)eviana* (?): 12 n. 23, 45–46, 105, 107
Caelestis: 61–62
- *Augusta Graniana*: 50, 61–62
- *Sittiana*: 62
Carna: 23 n. 22
Castor: 51 nn. 80–81

Ceres: 42
Concordia: 5 n. 6
Cupra: 52 n. 84
Delventinus: 60 n. 117
Diana: 4, 6 n. 8, 23–25, 33–36
- *Aricina*: 21, 71
- *Aventinensis*: 34
- *Cariciana*: 6 n. 8, 37 n. 21, 62, 71, 77
- *Cornificiana*: 9–10, 14, 33–34, 104
- *Karena*: 18, 23–24, 29, 104
- *Panentiana* (?): 46, 107
- *Planciana*: 8, 10, 14, 33–36
- *Valeriana*: 36
Dionysus: 7 n. 9, 75 nn. 12–13
Dioscuri: 50–52, 107
- *Didymoi*: 51
- *Gemini*: 51 n. 81
Dis Pater: 26 n. 35
- ~ *Genius Infernus*: 26 n. 35
- ~ *Sanctus Infernus deus*: 26 n. 35
Faunus: 44 n. 50
Felicula (?): 83, 98, 107
Fons: 37
- *Lollianus*: 37
- *Scaurianus*: 71
Fortuna: 3–4, 15, 37–38, 67–68, 72–73, 77, 84, 91–95, 106
- *Aeterna*: 93
- *Crassiana*: 72
- *Crescens*: 92
- *Flavia* (††): 18, 19 nn. 8–9, 20, 92
- *Folianensis*: 67–68
- *Huiusce Diei*: 11–12
- *Iuveniana*: 37, 62, 77, 107
- *Lampadiana*: 37, 62, 77
- *Pientiana*: 72
- *Plotiana*: 38
- *Primigenia*: 21, 92
- *Redux*: 68 n. 12
- *Taurianensis*: 68, 103, 107
- *Torquatiana*: 72
- *Tulliana*: 38
- *Zmaragdiana*: 6, 20, 73, 103
Genius: 15, 25–27, 42, 62 n. 124, 78–79, 92, 94, 106
- *Alotiani*: 26, 78–79, 107
- *Alotianus* (††): 15, 26, 78–79, 106–107
- *Caeli montis*: 26, 39
- *Domesticus Augustus*: 26 n. 35
- *Dom(i)nicus* (?): 26 n. 35
- *Forensis* (?, *-i*?, *-ium*?): 26 n. 35
- *Infernus* (~ Dis Pater/Pluto): 26 n. 35
- *Ulpiorum*: 27
- *Ulpius* (††): 15, 18, 25–27, 78 n. 26, 106–107
Hercules/Herakles: 4, 11, 13–14, 17–18, 20–21, 31–32, 38–42, 44, 46–50, 55, 73–75, 79–80, 93, 97, 104
- *Aelianus*: 46
- *Aniketos*: 75
- *Cefr(ianus)*: 46
- *Victor Certencianus* (?) 7, 12 n. 23, 45 n. 52, 47, 105, 107
- *Cocce[ianus?]*: 38, 44
- *Commodianus*: 44, 73, 80
- *Diamedonteios*: 7 n. 10
- *Front(---)*: 47–48
- *Fundanius* (?): 18, 19 n. 8, 20–21, 106
- *Fundanus*: 20–21, 106
- *Gagilianus*: 48
- *Gallicus*: 48 n. 64
- *Hermogenianus*: 79–80
- *Hervianus* (††?): 49, 107
- *Invictus Hesychianus*: 6, 73, 103
- *Invictus*: 6, 11, 73, 75, 103
- *Iulianus*: 39–42, 107

- *Kallinikos*: 75
- *Mantiklos*: 7 n. 10
- *Musinus*: 12 n. 23
- *Nel(---)* (††?): 48–49
- *Nerianus*: 8, 49, 81
- *Pompeianus*: 11, 14, 42
- *Romanillianus*: 44, 73–74, 77, 80, 107
- *Salutaris*: 4
- *Sullanus*: 5 n. 7, 14, 74
- *Augustus Turranianus*: 49–50
- *Tutor*: 93
- *Victor*: 4, 7, 12 n. 23, 21, 45 n. 52, 47, 75, 105, 107
Honos: 13–14
Hora Bona: 92
Hostia: 17–18, 43 n. 48, 60 n. 117
Hostilina: 22 n. 18
Ianus:
- *Curiatius* (?): 18, 21
Isis: 12, 50–52, 76, 97
- *Athenodoria*: 4, 11, 14, 19, 87–88, 105, 107
- *Geminiana*: 50–52, 75, 107
Iulineihiae (*matronae*): 30 n. 45
Iuno: 4, 15, 62–63, 100
- *Cassiana*: 37 n. 21, 62–63, 77
- *Martialis*: 52 n. 83
Iuppiter: 39–40, 99–101
- *Caelius*: 39
- *Fulgerator/Fulgur*: 40 n. 31
- *Libertas*: 36 n. 19–20
- *Optimus*: 89 n. 11
- *Optimus Maximus Purpurio*: 4 n. 3, 15, 99–101, 106–107
- *Salutaris*: 4 n. 4
- *Stator*: 14
- *Valens*: 89
- ~ *Valentius* (?): 89
- *Victor*: 4
Karena (?): 23–24
Lanehiae (*matronae*): 30 n. 45
Laquinie(n)sis (*genius* ~ 'god'): 25 n. 31
Lares: 14–15, 20, 42–43, 52–53, 84, 91–94, 105–106
- *Apic(atiani?)*: 52–53, 107
- *Domestici*: 26 n. 35
- *Domnici*: 26 n. 35
- *Hostilii* (††?): 18, 21–22, 106
- *Marcellini(ani)* (††?): 53
- *Militares*: 22
- *Volusiani*: 42
Liber: 41 n. 36, 52 n. 83, 74–75
- *Callinicianus*: 52 n. 84, 74–75
- *Pater Commodianus*: 73, 80
- *Gratillianus*: 31, 74, 77, 80, 107
- *Pater Proclianus*: 76
Livilla (*dea*) (††?): 5 n. 6, 85
Lubiciae (*matronae*): 30
Lucretiae (*deae*) (††?): 18, 28–30, 107
Magna Mater:
- *Cereria*: 3 n. 2, 52 n. 84
Mamurius Veturius: 8
Mars: 8, 52 n. 83, 54–55, 68
- *Cyprius*: 52 n. 84
- *Gradivus*: 4 n. 5
- *Palladianus* (††?): 80–81, 107
- "*Sminthianus*": 53–54
- *Verzobianus* (††?): 68, 80–81, 107
Mater Matuta: 25
Matusia (?): 24–25, 104
Mefitis: 54–57
- *Aravina*: 56
- *Caporoinna*: 56
- *Fisica*: 55 n. 97
- *Utiana*: 23, 25, 29, 54–57, 61, 104, 107
Mercurius: 27–28, 43

- *Silvius* (††): 18, 27–28, 107
Minerva: 13 n. 24, 17, 24–25, 41 n. 42, 43, 60
- *Catuliana*: 12, 14, 36, 76
- *Matusia*: 18, 19 n. 8, 23–25, 29, 104
Minucius: 18
Numisius Martius: 8
Nymphae:
- *Domitianae*: 57, 107
- *Flavianae Septimianae Augustae*: 63
- *Geminae*: 15, 98–99, 107
Ovanius (?): 18 n. 7
Pegasus: 82
Pluto: 26 n. 35
- ~ *Genius Infernus*: 26 n. 35
- ~ *Sanctus Infernus deus*: 26 n. 35
Pollux: 51 nn. 80–81
- *Extricatianus*: 81
Salus: 82 n. 36
Satriana (*dea*) (††?): 7, 28, 43, 60, 104, 107
Saturnus: 98
- *Cryptensis Purpuratus*: 100 n. 14
- *Privatensis*: 65 n. 2, 69
Seia: 17, 43 n. 48, 104
Silvanus: 27–28, 31–33, 43–44, 57–60, 65, 69–70, 73–74, 82, 88–89, 95, 99 n. 9, 107
- *Agrestis*: 32–33
- *Aurelianus*: 14–15, 43–44
- *Caeserianensis*: 69
- *Cornelianus*: 57
- *Curtianus*: 32, 58
- *Deus Bonus*: 57
- *Domesticus*: 32–33, 93
- *Flaviorum*: 15, 27, 38, 95
- *Geminus*: 99 n. 9
- *Lusianus*: 3, 5, 10, 31–32, 58, 104
- *Naevianus*: 44, 73–74, 99 n. 9
- *[N?]ervaianus* (Silvanus?): 60
- *Nervinianus*: 58
- *Orientalis*: 32–33
- *Pegasianus*: 52 n. 84, 75, 82, 89 n. 9
- *Praestantissimus*: 69 n. 17
- *Public(i)ensianus* (?): 69–70, 107
- *Settianus*: 58, 88
- *Silvester*: 99 n. 9
- *Staianus*: 59
- *Valentius* (††?): 58 n. 109, 88–89, 107
- *Valerianensis*: 11, 65, 70, 105
- *Veturianus*: 54, 59, 99 n. 9
- *[---]rilianus*: 44–45
Stata Mater:
- *Secciana* (?): 45
Statilina: 22 n. 18
Tanit: 62 n. 124
Thamogadensis (*genius* ~ 'god'): 25 n. 31
Tiaurauceaicus (*genius* ~ 'god'): 25 n. 31
Tutela: 76, 93–94
- *Candidiana*: 76
Tutilina: 22 n. 18
Τύχη: 93
Valentia: 60 n. 117, 89
Valentius (?): 88–89, 107
Vediovis: 17
Venelia/Venilia: 17
Venus: 4, 50, 52 n. 84, 55–56, 62–63, 77
- *Cassiana*: 37 n. 21, 62, 77
- *Erycina*: 63 n. 126
- *Felix*: 4, 92 n. 3
- *Felix Gabina*: 5 n. 6
- *Fisica*: 55 n. 97
- *Lucilliana*: 37 n. 21, 62, 74, 77, 80, 84, 103, 107
- *Martialis*: 52 n. 84
- *Placida*: 4

- *Praxitelia*: 87
- *Utiana* (?): 55 n. 96
Victoria: 14, 59, 77–78
- *Glaucopiana*: 6, 77, 103, 105
- *Mariana*: 14, 59
- *Sullana*: 5 n. 7, 14, 59 n. 115, 74, 77–78
Viriocelensis (*genius* ~ 'god'): 25 n. 31
Virtus: 13–14
Visidianus (*deus*) (††?): 7, 18, 43 n. 48, 60–61, 104, 107
Zeus:
- *Areios*: 82 n. 39
- *Damatrios*: 51
- *Heraios*: 51
- *Philios*: 4 n. 4

3.2. Humans

Aemilii Scauri: 71
L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. 182 BC): 13 n. 26
Agrippina (Nero's mother): 5 n. 6
Anna (dedicator? in Rome): 39–42
Trebis Arronties (Potentia): 8
Athenodoros (sculptor): 87–88
P. Attius Annianus Iulianus P.f. Arn. (eq.): 81 n. 35
P. Attius P.f. Arn. Extricatianus (eq.): 81 n. 35
M. Aurelius Caricus (*aquarius*): 71
Aurelius Zoticus (chamberlord of Elagabalus): 47 n. 61
C. Avillius C.f. Romilia Ligurius Lucanus (priest of Isis): 76
C. Betitius Pius (patron of Canusium in AD 223): 70
Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius (cos. 80 BC): 11
Caracalla: 75 n. 13
Q. Cassius Gratus (Claudian legate of Africa): 62–63
Claudia Semne (commemorated in Rome): 4–5
M. Claudius Esychus (dedicator in Rome): 73
Tib. Claudius Livianus (pretorian prefect): 73
Commodus: 43–44, 73, 80
P. Cornelius Rufinus (Sulla's ancestor): 19
P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus (cens. 142 BC): 13
L. Cornificius (cos. 35 BC): 9, 34
Curiatii: 21
L. Decianus M.f. Arn. Extricatus (prominent Carthaginian): 81 n. 35
Didius Iulianus: 39
Dolabella (land surveyor): 32
Domitian: 57, 107
Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 32 BC): 11–12
C. Domitius L.f. Pal. Fabius Hermogenes (eq.): 79–80
Elagabalus: 47 n. 61, 72
Euphranor (sculptor): 76
Flavii: 15, 27, 38, 63, 95
C. Fufius Geminus (cos. AD 29): 98–99
Galba: 83–84
Gellia Agrippiana (*c. p.*): 77
Geta: 75 n. 13
Granii (of Puteoli): 61–62
Hadrian: 46
Hostilii: 21–22
Iunii Torquati: 72
Iulia Bassilia (in Thuburbo Maius): 81 n. 35
Iulii Candidi: 76 n. 19
Lampadii: 37

Licinia Purpuris (dedicator in Rome): 99–101, 106–107
Livilla (Caligula's sister): 85 n. 7
Lucius Caesar: 8 n. 14
Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102 BC): 11
Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 78 BC): 12, 14, 76
Marciana (Trajan's sister): 27
Marcus Aurelius: 40 n. 34, 44 n. 49
C. Marius: 14, 59, 74
Munatia Plancina (died in AD 33): 35
L. Munatius Plancus (cos. 42 BC): 35–36
Nautii: 17
Nero: 5 n. 6, 38 n. 26
Nerva: 27, 38
Pinarii: 17
Plancii (of Perge): 35 n. 15
Cn. Plancius (aed. cur. 55/54 BC): 35
Plutia Vera (associated with Venus Felix Gabina): 5 n. 6
A. Plutius Epaphroditus (Gabii): 5 n. 6
Pompey: 11, 13 n. 24, 14, 42, 104
Potitii: 17
T. Quinctius Flamininus (cos. 198 BC): 13 n. 26
Rufia Materna (consecration of?): 5 n. 6, 85 n. 8
Septimius Severus: 63, 75 n. 13, 88 n. 4
Servius Tullius: 38
P. Sittius (founder of Roman colony at Cirta): 62
C. Sosius (cos. 32 BC): 10, 33
Statilii Tauri: 35–36, 68
T. Statilius Taurianus (Ostia): 68, 107
Sulla: 5 n. 7, 14, 19, 74, 77–78
Sulpiciae C.f. Galbillae: 84 n. 4
C. Sulpicius Galba (cos. AD 22): 84 n. 4
Taruttenia Paulina (in Praeneste): 92
Trajan: 26–27
Trajan, the Elder: 27 n. 36
Umbrii (Beneventum): 67–68, 80–81
P. Valerius Bassus (eq.): 36–37
Vespasian: 63
L. Visidius (eq.): 18, 60
Volusii Saturnini: 42, 93
L. Volusius Saturninus (cos. suff. 12 BC): 42

3.3. Nomina, cognomina, signa; individual names

Abianius: 30 n. 47
Aelius: 46
Albius: 30 n. 47
Alotianus: 15, 26, 78–79, 106–107
**Alotius* (?): 79
Ancharius: 17, 29, 43 n. 48, 61, 104
Annius: 40 n. 34, 65–67, 79
Apicatus: 52–53
Apollonius: 98
Atisius: 24 n. 27
Atusius: 24 n. 27
Aurelius: 43–44
Brittius: 30 n. 47
Caeserius: 69
Callinicus: 74–75
Candidius: 76
Candidus: 76
Carenus: 23–24
Caricus: 72
Cassius: 62–63
Catula: 36 n. 18
Catuliana: 36 n. 18
Catulina: 36 n. 18
Cefrius: 46
Cerciens(ius?): 70

Cercius: 70
**Certencius* (?): 47, 107
Cis(s)onius: 30 n. 47
Cocceius: 38
Cornelius: 57
Cornificius: 9–10, 34
Crassus: 72
Curiatius: 18, 21
Curtius: 32, 58
Didymus: 51 n. 81
Diokles: 7
Dionysos: 7 n. 9
Domitius: 32, 57, 107
Egrilius: 44
Ervius: 49 n. 70
Esychus: see *Hesychus*
Extricatianus: 81
Extricatus: 81
Felicula: 15, 98, 84, 107
Felix: 98, 101
Flavius: 63
Folius: 67–68
Fore(n)sius/-us: 26 n. 35
Frontinius: 47–48
Frontinus: 47–48
Fronto: 47–48
Frontonius: 47–48
Fundanius: 20–21
Gabius: 30 n. 47
Gaegilius: 48 n. 66
Gagilius: 48
Galba: 83–84
Galbilla: 11, 83–84, 105, 107
Gemellus: 51 n. 81
Geminius: 50–51
Geminus: 50–51
Glaucopius: 77
Glykeia: 4 n. 4
Gradivus: 4 n. 5
Granius: 61–62
Gratidius: 6 n. 8
Gratilla: 80
Gratil(l)ius: 80, 107
Halotus: 78–79
Heraclida: 97
Herakles: 7, 97
**Hervius* (?): see *Ervius*
Hesychus: 73
Hortensius: 70
Hortius: 70
Hostilius: 21–22
Hostius: 17–18, 43 n. 48
Isidorus: 97
Iulius: 39, 107
Iuvenis: 37, 107
Iuvenius: 37, 107
Kallinicus: see *Callinicus*
Karenus: see *Carenus*
Lampadius: 37
Livilla: 85
Livius: 85
Lollius: 37
Lubicius: 30
Lucilla: 77, 84
Lucretius: 28–30, 107
Lusius: 5, 10, 31–32, 58, 104
**Mamertius*: 10 n. 18
Marcellinius: 53, 93
Marcellinus: 53, 93
mariś: 53–54
Martinus: 12
Matusius (?): 24–25, 29, 43, 104
Mintius: see *Smintius*
Naevius: 44, 73–74
Narius: 30 n. 47
Natalianus: 37

Natalis: 37
**Neleius* (?): 48 n. 68
Nellius: 48
Nelpius: 48
Nerius: 49
**Nervaius* (?): 60
Nervinius: 58
Νικέτι(ο)ς: 58
Nobilianus: 37
Nobilis: 37
Numisius: 8
Ovanius (?): 18 n. 7
Palladius: 81
Pamnetius: see *Panentius*
Panentius: 46, 107
**Panneius* (?): 46 n. 57
Pegasius: 82
Pegasus: 82
Perikles: 7
Philios: 4 n. 4
Pientianus: 72
Pientinus: 72
Pientius: 72
Plancina: 35
Plancius: 34–36
Plancus: 34–36
Plotius: 38
Pompeius: 11, 42
Praestantius: 69 n. 17
Proc(u)lus: 76
**Public(i)ensius* (?): 69–70, 107
Publius: 69
Repentinus: 4
Romanilla: 44, 73–74, 107
Romanillus: 74
Rufilius: 19, 87 n. 3, 106
sad(i)riis: 43
sadries: 43
Sadrius: 43
S(a)evius: 45–46, 107
**Satrianus* (?): 43, 104
Satrienus: 43
Satrius: 43, 104, 107
Saturninus: 12, 97
Σάτυρος: 43 n. 47
Scaurus: 71
Seccius: 45
Seius: 17, 43 n. 48, 104
Settius: 58
Sevius: see *S(a)evius*
Siccius: 45
Silvius: 18, 27–28, 107
Sittius: 62
Smintius: 54
Sosius: 9–10, 14, 33–34, 104
Staius: 58
Sulla: 5 n. 7, 14, 74, 77–78
Sullinus: 5 n. 7
Sullius: 5 n. 7
Taurianus: 68, 107
Taurius: 68, 107
Taurus: 35–36, 68
Torquatus: 72
Tullius: 38
Turranianus: 49–50
Turranius: 49–50
Ulpius: 25–27, 106–107
Utianus: 56–57
utiis: 56
Utius: 54, 56
Valens: 88–89
Valerius: 36–37, 65, 70
Venelius/Venilius: 17
Venerius: 77
Verzobius: 67–68, 80–81
Veturius: 59

Vintius: 30 n. 47
**Visidianus* (?): 60–61, 104
Visidienus: 61 n. 119
Visidius: 18, 60–61, 104, 107
Zmaragdus: 73

4. Divine epithets

Aelianus (Hercules): 46
Agrestis (Bona Dea A. Felicula, Silvanus): 32–33, 97–98
Alotianus (††) (Genius): 15, 26, 78–79, 106–107
Aniketos (Herakles): 75
Annianensis (Bona Dea): 65–67, 107
Apic(atiani?) (Lares): 52–53, 107
Apollinaris (Bona Dea): 3 n. 2, 52 n. 83, 75
Areia (Athena): 51
Athenodoria (Isis): 4, 11, 14, 87–88, 105, 107
Athenodoriana (?): see *Athenodoria*
Aurelianus (Silvanus): 14–15, 43–44
Caelius (Iuppiter): 26, 39
Caeserianensis (Silvanus): 69
Callinicianus (Liber): 52 n. 84, 74–75
Candidiana (Tutela): 76
Cariciana (Diana): 6 n. 8, 37 n. 21, 62, 71, 77
Cassiana (Iuno, Venus): 37 n. 21, 62, 77
Catuliana (Minerva): 12, 14, 36, 76
Cefr(ianus) (Hercules): 46
Cereria (Bona Dea, Magna Mater): 3 n. 2, 52 n. 84
Certencianus (?) (Hercules Victor C.): 12 n. 23, 45 n. 52, 47, 107
Certencinus: see *Certencianus*
Cocce[ianus?] (Hercules): 38, 44
Commodianus (Hercules, Liber Pater): 44, 73, 80
Cornelianus (Silvanus): 57
Cornificiana (Diana): 9–10, 14, 33–35, 104
Crassiana (Fortuna): 72
Cryptensis (Saturnus C. Purpuratus): 100 n. 14
Curiatius: see *Curiatus*
Curiatus (?) (Ianus): 18, 21
Curtianus (Silvanus): 32, 58
Cyprius (Mars): 52 n. 84
Damatrios (Zeus): 51
Demainetos (Asklepios): 7 n. 10
Diamedonteios (Herakles): 7 n. 10
Domesticus (Genius, Silvanus): 26 n. 35, 32–33, 93, 99 n. 9
Dom(i)nicus/-i (Genius?, Lares): 26 n. 35
Domitianae (Nymphae): 57, 107
Esychianus: see *Hesychianus*
Extricatianus (Pollux): 81
Felicula (Bona Dea Agrestis F.): 15, 83, 97–98, 101, 107
Felix (Venus): 4, 5 n. 6, 92 n. 3
Flavia (††) (Fortuna): 18, 19 nn. 8–9, 20, 92
Flavianae (Nymphae F. Septimianae Augustae): 63
Folianensis (Fortuna): 67–68
Forensis (?) (*genius* ~ 'god'): 26 n. 35
Front(---) (Hercules): 47–48
Fundanius (?) (Hercules): see *Fundanus*
Fundanus (Hercules): 19 n. 8, 20–21, 106
Gabina (Venus Felix G.): 5 n. 6
Gagilianus (Hercules): 48
Galbilla (††?) (Bona Dea): 11, 83–84, 105, 107
Geminae (Nymphae): 15, 98–99, 107

Gemini (Dioscuri): 50–52, 107
Geminiana (Isis): 50–52, 75, 107
Geminus (Silvanus): 99 n. 9
Glaucopiana (Victoria): 6, 77, 103, 105
Glykeia (Aphrodite): 4 n. 4
Graniana (Caelestis Augusta G.): 50, 61–62
Gratillianus (Liber): 74, 77, 80, 107
Hephaistia (Athena): 51
Heraios (Zeus): 51
Hermogenianus (Hercules): 79–80
Hervianus (††?): see *Nerianus*
Hesychianus (Hercules Invictus H.): 6, 73, 103
Hostilii (††?) (Lares): 18, 21–22, 106
Infernus (*genius*; ~ Dis Pater/Pluto): 26 n. 35
Invictus (Hercules): 6, 11, 73, 75, 103
Isiaca (Bona Dea): 3 n. 2, 52 n. 84
Iulianus (Hercules): 39–40, 107
Iuveniana (Fortuna): 37–38, 62, 77, 107
Kallinicianus: see *Callinicianus*
Kallinikos (Herakles): 75
Karena (Diana): 18, 23–25, 29, 43 n. 48, 104
Lampadiana (Fortuna): 37, 62, 77
Livicus (Apollo): 85
Livilla (dea) (††?): 5 n. 6, 85
Lollianus (Fons): 37
Lucilliana (Venus): 37 n. 21, 62, 74, 77, 80, 84, 103, 107
(deae) Lucretiae (††?): 18, 28–30, 107
Lusianus (Silvanus): 5, 10, 31–32, 58, 104
Mantiklos (Herakles): 7 n. 10
Marcellini(ani) (††?) (Lares): 53, 93
Mariana (Victoria): 14, 59
Martialis (Iuno, Venus): 3 n. 2, 52 nn. 83–84
Matusia (Minerva): 18, 19 n. 8, 23–25, 29, 43 n. 48, 104
Medicus (Apollo): 10, 33, 52 n. 83
Militares (Lares): 22
Musinus (Hercules): 12 n. 23
Naevianus (Silvanus): 44, 73–74, 99 n. 9
Nel(---) (††?) (Hercules): 48
Nerianus (Hercules): 8, 49, 81
[N?]ervaianus (Silvanus?): 60
Nervinianus (Silvanus): 58
Orientalis (Silvanus): 32–33
Palladianus (††?) (Mars): 80–81, 107
Pamnetiana: see *Panentiana*
Panentiana (?) (Diana): 46, 107
Pegasianus (Silvanus): 52 n. 84, 75, 82, 89 n. 9
Philios (Zeus): 4 n. 4
Pientiana (Fortuna): 72
Placida (Venus): 4
Planciana (Diana): 8, 10, 14, 33–36
Plotiana (Fortuna): 38
Pompeianus (Hercules): 11, 14, 42
Praestans: 69 n. 17
Praestantissimus (Silvanus): 69 n. 17
Proclianus (Liber Pater): 76
Publicensis: see *Public(i)ensianus*
Public(i)ensianus (?) (Silvanus): 69–70, 107
Purpuratus (Saturnus Cryptensis P.): 100 n. 14
Purpurio (Iuppiter Optimus Maximus P.): 4 n. 3, 15, 99–101, 106–107
Redux (Fortuna): 68 n. 12, 91
Repentinus (Aesculapius): 4
Romanillianus (Hercules): 44, 73–74, 77, 80, 107
Rufilia: see *Rufiliana*
Rufiliana (?) (Bellona): 19, 106
S(a)eviana (?) (Bona Dea): 45–46, 107

Salutaris (Hercules, Iuppiter): 4
Sanctus/-a (~ Dis Pater/Pluto; Venus): 26 n. 35, 77
(dea) Satriana (††?): 7, 28, 43, 60, 104, 107
Scaurianus (Fons): 71
Secciana (?) (Stata): 45
Septimianae (Nymphae Flavianae S. Augustae): 63
Settianus (Silvanus): 58, 88
Sevina: see *S(a)eviana*
Sicciana: see *Secciana*
Silvester (Silvanus): 99 n. 9
Silvius (††) (Mercurius): 18, 27–28, 107
Sittiana (Caelestis): 62
Smintheus (Apollo): 54
"Sminthianus" (††) (Mars): 53–54
Sosianus (Apollo): 9–10, 14, 33–35, 52 n. 83, 103–104
Staianus (Silvanus): 59
Sullana (Victoria): 5 n. 7, 14, 59 n. 115, 74, 77–78
Sullanus (Hercules): 5 n. 7, 14, 74
Taurianensis (Fortuna): 68, 103, 107
Torquatiana (Fortuna): 72
Tulliana (Fortuna): 38
Turranianus (Hercules Augustus T.): 49–50
Ulpius (††) (Genius): 15, 18, 25–27, 78 n. 26, 106–107
Utiana (Mefitis, Venus?): 23, 25, 29, 43 n. 48, 54–57, 61, 104, 107
Valens (Iuppiter): 88–89
Valentius (††?) (~ Iuppiter?): 88–89, 107
Valeriana (Diana): 36
Valerianensis (Silvanus): 11, 65, 70, 105
Verzobianus (††?) (Mars): 68, 81, 107
Veturianus (Silvanus): 54, 59, 99 n. 9
Victor (Hercules): 4, 7, 12 n. 23, 21, 45 n. 52, 47, 75, 105, 107
(deus) Visidianus (††?): 7, 18, 43 n. 48, 60–61, 104, 107
Volusiani (Lares): 42, 93
Zmaragdiana (Fortuna): 6, 20, 73, 103
[---]rilianus (Silvanus): 44

5. Places and localities

Abdera (Baetica): 94
Aeclanum: 46
ager Aequiculanus: 60
Aesernia: 31, 48, 56, 80
Africa: 4 n. 4, 7, 25–28, 50, 61–63, 65 n. 2, 81–82, 89, 97, 100 n. 14, 103
Agosta (eastern Latium): 100–101
Alba Fucens:
- *arae Luciae*: 8 n. 14
Alba Helvorum: 93–94
Albano Laziale: 71, 84 n. 5
Amiternum: 11, 52–53
Anio: 66–67, 101 n. 15, 107
Aquae Flavianae (Numidia): 63
Aquinum: 18, 23–24, 32
- *fundus Domitianus*: 32
Arelate:
- *pagus Lucretius* (or *-ianus*?): 29 n. 42
Ariminum: 26 n. 35
Asculum Picenum: 17
Athens: 36 n. 18, 77 n. 22
Aventicum: 85
Balcaranensis (*mons*): 100 n. 14
Beneventum: 3, 31–32, 48, 57–59, 67–70, 80–81, 105
- *fundus Curtianus*: 32, 58
- *fundus Lusianus*: 31–32, 58
- Tabula Baebiana: 31–32

Caere:
- *basilica Sulpiciana*: 9
- *prata Naevia*: 44 n. 50
Capua: 55 n. 94, 93
Celtic (Celto-Germanic/Iberian) regions: 6, 18 n. 7, 25 n. 31, 26 n. 35, 28–30, 78 n. 26, 79, 85, 103
Cirta: 62
Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippiensium: 28–30
- *vicus Lucretius*: 28–29
Cryptensis: 100 n. 14
Cures Sabini: 58
Falerii Novi: 15 n. 32, 31, 59
ager Faliscus: 8
Fundi: 20–21
- *Fundanus lacus*: 21 n. 16
Gabii: 5 n. 6
Gemellae: 82
Germania Inferior: 18, 28–30
Germania Superior: 85
Hispania: 25 n. 31, 29 n. 42, 56 n. 99
Ilipa Magna: 98 n. 6
Interamnia Praetuttiorum: 48–49
Kephisos: 97 n. 1
Kos: 7 n. 10
Lambaesis: 82, 89
Lepcis Magna: 62–63, 75 n. 13, 92
Ligures Baebiani: 31–32
Lucania: 54–57
Lusitania: 25 n. 31
Malta: 52 n. 85
Minturnae: 46
Monte Musino: 12 n. 23
Mutina: 59
Naples: 79
Narnia: 18, 60–61, 104
Noricum: 99
Novaria: 24 n. 27
Nymphaeum (in the Crimea): 52
Ocriculum: 89
Ostia: 3, 49–52, 68, 79–80
Pompeii: 94
Portus: 9, 50, 51 n. 81, 52 n. 83, 80
- *porticus Placidiana*: 9
- *vicus Bonadiensium*: 52 n. 83
Potentia: 8, 54–55
Praeneste: 21, 45–46, 66, 92
Puteoli: 61–62, 78–79
- *basilica Alexandriana*: 79 n. 28
- *basilica Augusti Anniana*: 79
- *porticus* (?) *Alotiana*: 79
Rome: 3–15, 17–22, 33–45, 65–67, 71–78, 83–84, 87–89, 93, 97–98, 99–101, 103–104, 107
- "*aedes Aemiliana*": 13
- *aedes Catuli*: 11
- *aedes Honoris et Virtutis*: 13–14
- *aedes Iovis Metellinae* (*porticus*?): 14
- *aedes Pompeii Magni*: 11, 42, 104
- *Apollo Sosianus*: 9–10, 14, 33–35, 103–104
- *aqua Claudia*: 67
- *ara Maxima Herculis*: 42, 47 n. 60
- *area Candidi*: 76 n. 19
- Aventine: 9, 33–34, 37 n. 20, 71
- Basilica Aemilia: 13 n. 26
- Caelius: 26, 37, 39–41
- Campus Martius: 33, 40 n. 31, 52 n. 83, 68 n. 12
- Capitolium: 36, 100
- *compitum* (Via Marmorata): 84 n. 6
- Crypta Balbi: 52 n. 83
- *delubrum Cn. Domitii*: 12
- *delubrum Minervae*: 13 n. 24
- *Diana Cornificiana*: 9–10, 14, 33–35, 104
- *Diana Planciana*: 10, 14, 33–36
- *Dianium*: 11 n. 19

- *domus Aurea*: 38 n. 26
- *fons Cati*: 37
- *fons Lollianus*: 37
- *fons Scaurianus*: 71
- *forum Boarium*: 13 n. 26
- *Hercules Invictus ad Circum Maximum*: 11, 42
- *Hercules Pompeianus*: 11, 14, 42
- *horrea Galb(i)ana*: 83–84
- *horrea Ummidiana*: 9, 104
- *horti Sallustiani*: 13 n. 24
- *horti Silii/Siliani*: 9
- *horti Tauriani*: 35, 68
- *horti Torquatiani*: 9, 72, 104
- *Iseum Metellinum*: 11–12
- *lacus Fundani*: 21
- *lucus deae Satrianae*: 43
- *ad Malum Punicum*: 39–40
- Monte Testaccio: 100
- *pons Aemilius*: 8, 104
- *porta Minucia*: 18
- *porticus Octaviae*: 8, 104
- *praedia Amaranthiana*: 79
- *praedia Sulpicia*: 83
- Quirinal: 21, 33–36, 39–40 n. 31
- *Salinae*: 47 n. 60
- *theatrum Balbi*: 8, 104
- *theatrum Marcelli/Marcellianum*: 9
- *theatrum Pompeii/Pompeianum*: 9, 11
- *Tigillum Sororium*: 21
- *via Appia*: 8, 103
- *via Flaminia*: 8, 103
- *vicus laci Fundani*: 21 n. 16
- *vicus Longus*: 35
- *vicus statuae Valerianae*: 65
- *vicus Sulpicius*: 28

Rossano di Vaglio: 54–56
Saepinum: 53, 93
Saturnia:
- *pagus Lucretius* (or *-ianus*?): 29 n. 42

Sentinum: 18, 23–25
Sidi Moussa Bou Fri (Maur. Ting.): 25–27
Signia: 46
Superaequum: 94
Sutrium: 17
Tarraco: 24 n. 27, 94
Tegea: 78 n. 24
Thamugadi: 25 n. 31
Thessalonice: 97
Thuburbo Maius: 81
Thugga: 27–28
Tibur: 21, 47, 66–67, 107
Tuder: 47–48
Tusculum: 36–37 n. 19
Ulpiana: 93
Umbria: 23–25, 60–61, 89
Urbs Salvia: 61 n. 119, 98–99
Veii:
- *arae Muciae*: 12 n. 23
- Monte Musino: 12 n. 23

Venafrum: 49, 56
Verona: 93
Via Gemina: 99 n. 8
Vicarello (baths): 57
Virunum: 26 n. 35
Volsinii: 53–54, 99 n. 9
Volubilis: 25
Zaouïa Mornag, Tunis (Africa Procons.): 61–62

6. Subject index

abbreviations, epigraphic: 27, 41, 48, 53, 57, 62
adoption: 13, 27, 56 n. 100, 81 n. 35

Africa:
- gods popular in: 4, 27–28, 61–62, 65 n. 2, 81, 88–89, 97, 100
Alotia (Tegea): 78 n. 24
amicitia Herculaniorum Neriani(orum) (?): 49
annale sacrum: 40–41
apex/apicatus: 53
aqua Claudia: 67
Augustalia: 77
Augustus/-a: 14, 46, 49–50, 52 n. 84, 61–63, 92 n. 1
Bona Dea: 4, 45–46, 52 nn. 83–84, 65–67, 83–84, 97–98
- followed by human name in genitive: 83–84
buildings, names of: 8–11, 33–35, 42, 57, 62–63, 69, 79, 103–104
Caesarianus: 69 n. 15
candidus/-a: 76 n. 19
Celtic (Celto-Germanic/Iberic): 18 n. 7, 25 n. 31, 26 n. 35, 28–30, 78 n. 26, 79 n. 29, 85
Cocceiani: 38 n. 27
collegium:
- *ararum Luciarum*: 8 n. 14
- *centonariorum*: 23
- *cultorum Herculis Gagiliani*: 48
- *forensium*: 26 n. 35
- *Martense Verzobianum*: 80–81
- *Silvani Aureliani*: 43–44
consecratio in formam deorum: 4–5, 39, 85
cultores Herculis: 32 n. 5
cultores Larum: 93–94
curiatus: 21
dedications, joint: 27, 39, 43–44, 75, 82, 92
dedicatory formulas: 10, 40, 79, 84, 92–93
deus/dea:
- preceding theonym: 26, 28, 43, 60, 85 n. 9
diminutives: 83, 85, 98
Dioscuri: 50, 107
- associated with Isis: 51–52
- protectors of ships and sailors: 51–52
epithets, divine:
- as adjectival determiners of theonyms: 3–14, 43, 56, 91–95, 103, 106
- adjectival vs. genitival: 15, 20, 26, 38, 53, 78–79, 83–84, 91–95, 103–104, 106
- associated with sacred areas: 3, 8–10, 31–33
- chronology of: 9, 14, 17, 21, 24, 33, 35, 55–57, 78 n. 23, 83, 104
- coinciding with nomina: 17–18, 25 n. 29, 29–30, 56, 60–61, 104
- cultic significance of: 4, 12, 36, 103
- denoting builders of temples: 4, 9–14, 31–37, 42, 62, 87, 103–105
- denoting sculptors of statues: 4, 13, 87–88
- derivation uncertain: 6–7, 103, 106
- derived from cognomina: 3, 9–11, 35, 71–89, 97
- derived from female names in *-illa*: 73–74, 77, 80
- derived from names of emperors: 26, 38–39, 43–44, 46, 57, 73, 80, 95
- derived from names of other deities: 51–52, 75, 82
- derived from nomina: 9–14, 17–70, 79, 97, 104–105
- derived from signa: 58, 68, 77, 80–81, 105
- ending in *-ian-ensis*: 11, 65–70, 97, 105
- ending in *-ianus*: 3, 5 n. 7, 9–14, 18–19,

21, 23–24, 26, 28, 31–63, 71–83, 97, 104–105
- ending in *-illa* (?): 11, 83–85, 105, 107
- ending in *-ius*: 11, 87–89, 105
- existence uncertain: 6, 9, 11, 23, 104
- fictitious: 3
- function of: 3–5, 7–14, 31, 103–105
- in Greece: 7
- of Greek origin: 6
- literary-antiquarian: 4, 11–14
- plain nomina (probably not) adopted as: 9, 17–30, 104
- preceding theonym: 58, 88
- referring to families: 9–11, 17–18
- referring to individuals: 9–11, 31
- relation to gentilician cults: 17–18, 21–24, 31
- resembling names of dedicators: 15, 97–101, 106
- scholarship on: 3, 7–8
- shared with humans: 4
- syntactic relation to theonym: 13–14
- topographic: 9, 31, 37, 68, 100 n. 14
- typologies of: 3–11
- used as cognomina: 4 n. 5
Etruscan(s): 8, 17 n. 3, 43 n. 47, 44 n. 50, 53–54
**fēlic-ulus/-a*: 98
Festus, Sex. Pompeius: 13, 22, 45 n. 53
forenses: 26 n. 35
Forma Urbis: 34
Fortuna: 15, 20, 37–38, 67–68, 72–73, 84, 91–95
- followed by human name in genitive: 15, 20, 84, 91–95, 106
Genius: 15, 25–27, 78–79, 84, 91–92, 94
- followed by human name in genitive: 15, 26–27, 38, 53, 78–79, 91–94, 106
- meaning 'god': 26, 78
Hercules: 4, 20–21, 31–32, 38–40, 42, 44, 46–50, 73–75, 79–80, 97
- appearing with other gods: 39, 44, 55, 75
- Commodus as: 73
- worshipped by women: 39 n. 28, 74
- worshipped in rural areas: 31–32
hostia: 22
Illyrian: 61 n. 120, 80
(ex) imperio: 78–79
in suo (fundo): 32
interpretatio Romana: 4 n. 4, 28 n. 40, 88
Iuno, guardian spirit: 15
Iuppiter: 4, 89, 99–101
- associated with Silvanus: 88–89
- of the Capitol: 100
- *miniatus*: 100
- worshipped in Africa: 88–89
(ex) iussu: 79 n. 27, 84 n. 5
iuvenii Lampadii: 37 n. 22
lararium: 58
Lares: 14–15, 21–22, 26 n. 35, 42, 52–53, 91–94, 106
- followed by human name(s) in genitive: 15, 20, 92–94, 106
legio II/III Augusta: 82
lucrii (*dii*): 29
ludi Victoriae: 77
ludi Victoriae Sullanae: 77–78
magistri fontis: 37
Marte(n)ses Palladiani: 81
Marte(n)ses Verzobiani: 81
Martius: 8
mātu-: 25
memoria: 5 n. 6, 9
Mercurius, associated with Silvanus: 27–28
mother goddesses (of the Lower Rhine region): 28–30

navis caudicaria: 50
nominative, theonyms and epithets appearing in: 37, 62, 77
Oscan: 8, 10 n. 18, 17 n. 3, 54 n. 91, 54–57
Passionei, Cardinal Domenico (collection of antiquities): 66
Pegasus, legionary emblem: 82
piens: 72
pientissimus: 72
pondera, votive: 48–49
privatum/-a, followed by genitive: 65 n. 2
Regionary Catalogues, chronology of: 87–88
Sadoleto, Cardinal Jacopo: 40 n. 31
servitor deorum: 78
ships, names of: 50–52
Silvanus: 10, 27–28, 31–33, 43–44, 57–60, 69–70, 73–74, 82, 88–89, 93, 95, 99 n. 9
- associated with Iuppiter: 88–89
- associated with Mercurius: 27–28
- followed by human name in genitive: 95
- worshipped by women: 59
- worshipped in Africa: 89
- worshipped in rural areas: 31–32
Statuavalerianenses: 65
statues: 4, 8, 11–13, 20, 33, 35–38, 41, 45–46, 50, 59, 62, 65, 71–74, 76–77, 85, 87–88, 92, 100, 103, 107
studium Palladianum: 81
suffixes:
- *anus*: 5 n. 7
- *ensis*: 11, 65, 105
- *ian-ensis*: 11, 65–70, 97, 105
- *ianus*: 3, 5 n. 7, 9, 14, 18, 28, 35, 48, 55–56, 97, 104–105
- *illa*: 11, 73–74, 83, 85
- *illiana*: 73–74, 84
- *illo-*: 73–74, 85, 105
- *inus*: 12, 36, 45, 105
- *ius*: 11, 87–89, 105
- *ulus*: 98
Sullanus: 5 n. 7, 14, 74, 78 n. 22
Sylleia (Athens): 77 n. 22
Tabula Baebiana (alimentary tablet): 31–32
**touto utianom*: 54
Ulpius, use by Trajan: 27
vilicus horreorum Galbianorum cohortium trium: 83–84
(ex) viso/visu: 77, 84 n. 5
v(oto) s(uscepto): 88 n. 6

Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum

Vol. 90 (1990)
Solin, Heikki: *Namenpaare. Eine Studie zur römischen Namengebung*. 1990. 92 p.

Vol. 91 (1990)
Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History, edited by Heikki Solin and Mika Kajava. 1990. 174 p.

Vol. 93 (1991)
Bruun, Christer: *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration*. 1991. 468 p.

Vol. 94 (1991)
Koskenniemi, Erkki: *Der philostrateische Apollonios*. 1991. 101 p.

Vol. 95 (1992)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): *Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique*. Vol. I: *Distinctiones*. 1992. 213 p.

Vol. 96 (1991)
Forsén, Björn: *Lex Licinia Sextia de modo agrorum – fiction or reality?* 1991. 88 p.

Vol. 97 (1992)
Salomies, Olli: *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*. 1992. 179 p.

Vol. 99 (1993)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): *Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique*. Vol. II: *Causae 1–14*. 1993. 276 p.

Vol. 102 (1994)
Leiwo, Martti: *Neapolitana. A Study of Population and Language in Graeco-Roman Naples*. 1994. 232 p.

Vol. 103 (1995)
Chydenius, Johan: *The Spirituality of Fénelon in his Latin Writings 1700–1712*. 1995. 60 p.

Vol. 104 (1995)
Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. sept. 1991 habiti, ediderunt Heikki Solin, Olli Salomies, Uta-Maria Liertz. 1995. 425 p.

Vol. 105 (1996)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): *Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique*. Vol. III: *Causae 15–29*. 1996. 275 p.

Vol. 108 (1996)
Mehtonen, Päivi: *Old Concepts and New Poetics. Historia, Argumentum, and Fabula in the Twelfth- and Early Thirteenth-Century Latin Poetics of Fiction*. 1996. 173 p.

Vol. 109 (1996)
Kuisma, Oiva: *Proclus' Defence of Homer*. 1996. 157 p.

Vol. 110 (1997)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): *Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique*. Vol. IV: *Causae 30–36 et De Consecratione*. 1997. 224 p.

Vol. 111 (1998)
Lampela, Anssi: *Rome and the Ptolemies of Egypt. The Development of their Political Relations 273–80 B.C.* 1998. 301 p.

Vol. 112 (1998)
Nummenmaa, Tapio: *Divine Motions and Human Emotions in the Philebus and in the Laws. Plato's Theory of Physic Powers*. 1998. 151 p.

Vol. 113 (1999)
Thesleff, Holger: *Studies in Plato's Two-Level Model*. 1999. 143 p.

Vol. 114 (1999)
Dimitropoulos, Panagiotis: *Untersuchungen zum finalen Genetiv des substantivierten Infinitivs bei Thukydides*. 1999. 117 p.

Vol. 115 (2000)
Heinonen, Sirkka: *Prometheus Revisited. Human Interaction with Nature through Technology in Seneca*, 2000. 232 p.

Vol. 116 (2000)
Lehtonen, Tuomas M. S. & Mehtonen, Päivi (eds.): *Historia. The Concept and Genres in the Middle Ages*. 2000. 142 p.

Vol. 117 (2001)
Löfstedt, Leena (ed.): *Gratiani Decretum. La traduction en ancient français du Décret de Gratien. Edition critique*. Vol. V: *Observations et explications*. 2001. 482 p.

Vol. 118 (2002)
Kivistö, Sari: *Creating Anti-eloquence. Epistolae obscurorum virorum and the Humanist Polemics on Style*. 2002. 256 p.

Vol. 119 (2002)
Salmenkivi, Erja: *Cartonnage Papyri in Context. New Ptolemaic Documents from Abū Sir al Malaq*. 2002. 182 p.

Vol. 120 (2003)
Kuisma, Oiva: *Art or Experience. A Study on Plotinus' Aesthetics*. 2003. 207 p.

Vol. 121 (2004)
Korhonen, Kalle: *Le iscrizioni del Museo civico di Catania*. 2004. 418 p.

Vol. 122: 1–2 (2007)
Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology. Helsinki, 1–7 August, 2004, edited by Jaakko Frösén, Tiina Purola and Erja Salmenkivi. 2007. 1075 p.

Vol. 123 (2007)
Steinby, Christa: *The Roman Republican Navy*. 2007. 236 p.

Vol. 124 (2009)
Halla-aho, Hilla: *The non-literary Latin letters. A study of their syntax and pragmatics*. 2009. 190 p.

Vol. 125 (2008)
The Konikovo Gospel (Bibl. Patr. Alex. 268), edited by Jouko Lindstedt, Ljudmil Spasov and Juhani Nuorluoto. 2008. 439 p.

Vol. 126 (2009)
Sipilä, Joonas: *The Reorganisation of Provincial Territories in Light of the Imperial Decision-making Process. Later Roman Arabia and Tres Palaestinae as Case Studies*. 2009. 328 p.

Vol. 127 (2010)
Saastamoinen, Ari: *The Phraseology of Latin Building Inscriptions in Roman North-Africa*. 2010. 646 p.

Vol. 128 (2011)
Building Roma Aeterna. Current Research on Roman Mortar and Concrete. Proceedings of the conference, March 27–29, 2008. Editors Åsa Ringbom and Robert L. Hohlfelder, assistant editors Pia Sjöberg and Pia Sonck-Koota. 2011. 260 p.

Vol. 129 (2011)
Eikonopoiia. Digital Imaging of Ancient Textual Heritage. Proceedings of the international conference, Helsinki, 28–29 November, 2010, edited by Vesa Vahtikari, Mika Hakkarainen, Antti Nurminen. 2011. 267 p.

Vol. 130 (2013)
Maurizi, Luca: *Il cursus honorum senatorio da Augusto a Traiano. Sviluppi formali e stilistici nell'epigrafia latina e greca*. 2013. 324 p.

Vol. 131 (2014)
Papyri Turkuenses (P. Turku). Die Papyri im Besitz der Universitätsbibliothek Turku, herausgegeben von Heikki Koskenniemi unter Mitwirkung von Erkki Koskenniemi und Johannes Koskenniemi. 2014. 135 p.

Vol. 132 (2015)
Second Sailing: Alternative Perspectives on Plato. Edited by Debra Nails and Harold Tarrant in Collaboration with Mika Kajava and Eero Salmenkivi. 2015. 366 p.

Vol. 133 (2016)
Korkiakangas, Timo: *Subject Case in the Latin of Tuscan Charters of the 8th and 9th Centuries*. 2016. 276 p.

Vol. 134 (2018)
Kivistö, Sari: *Lucubrationes Neolatinae. Readings of Neo-Latin Dissertations and Satires*. 2018. 244 p.

Vol. 135 (2018)
Buchholz, Matias: *Römisches Recht auf Griechisch. Prolegomena zu einer linguistischen Untersuchung der Zusammensetzung und Semantik des byzantinischen prozessrechtlichen Wortschatzes*. 2018. 236 p.

Vol. 136 (2019)
Domus Pompeiana M. Lucretii IX 3, 5.24. The Inscriptions, Works of Art and Finds from the Old and New Excavations. Edited by Ria Berg and Ilkka Kuivalainen. 2019. 323 p.

Vol. 137 (2019)
Studi storico-epigrafici sul Lazio antico II. A cura di Heikki Solin. 2019. 168 p.

Vol. 138 (2020)
Meilicha Dôra. Poems and Prose in Greek from Renaissance and Early Modern Europe. Edited by Mika Kajava, Tua Korhonen and Jamie Vesterinen. 2020. 356 p.

Vol. 139 (2020)
Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICACL 9), 30 August – 1 September 2018, Helsinki. Edited by Martti Leiwo, Marja Vierros & Sonja Dahlgren. 2020. 578 p.

Vol. 140 (2021)
Kuivalainen, Ilkka: *The Portrayal of Pompeian Bacchus*. 2021. 285 p.

Vol. 141 (2021)
Solin, Heikki: *Da Rodolfo Pio ai Farnese. Storia di due collezioni epigrafiche*. 2021. 432 p.

Vol. 142 (2022)
Kivistö, Sari: *Neo-Latin Verse Satire, ca. 1500–1800. An Ethical Approach*. 2022. 293 p.

Vol. 143 (2022)
Korhonen, Tua: To the Glory that was Greece. *Ideas, Ideals and Practices in Composing Humanist Greek during the Seventeenth Century*. 2022.