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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
Naming Gods
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 1912², 214; Reid 1916, 183; Nock 1925, 91; Latte 1960, 333–34; Fishwick 1978, 377; Reid 1916, 183; 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 Fabretil 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 Jupiter). Similarly, *Zues 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 / Claudiae Semnes / sacrum* (in this specific case, as John Scheid suggests to me, the “*Memoria Claudiae Sennes*” 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 ipius 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 epicleses discussed are of Greek origin, but they represent Roman onomastic culture (e.g., Fortuna Zmaragdiana, Hercules Invictus Eyschianus, 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:

\(\uparrow\uparrow\) epithet non-existent

\(\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\) existence of epithet doubtful, uncertain, or hypothetical

\(\uparrow\) epithet not derived from anthroponym

\(\uparrow\downarrow\) 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 Dafnildianae 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 Giorindi 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 unadjoined before the Roman Imperial period, and there are only a handful of instances of a god being accompanied by an adjectival form of a human’s name. 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). In the Roman world, on the other hand, in addition to theonyms as such being commonly found as personal names, 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).


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. 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 I2 32–33 [Rome], cf. I2 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). Suffixed forms derived from

---

13 Poccetti 2009 is seminal for this discussion.

14 A quite specific case is that of the araæ 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: Pyralidi M. / Ocrati Fronto/nis anc(illae) collegium 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 Sulpicia 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 Siliii/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.\textsuperscript{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 -ianusla (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,\textsuperscript{16} but it must have often served as a toponographic 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

\textsuperscript{15} Salomies 1998, 205–207.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. Wiseman 1987, 396.
Dianae Cornificianae (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. mamertiui pettiannui (< Pettiano-, cf. Pettius, Pettius; ST Cm 7 = Imag. It. 592: Acerre 1, perhaps mistakenly spelled with <ui> instead of <i>: Zair 2016, 56), if the first component may be taken to function as a theonym (as if standing for mamerteli); 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, 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 Metellinum” in some other later source. However, the title Metellinum itself is hardly anything but an antiquarian note. 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 Dianio?, the second to a vestiarium 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.”
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by a Cn. Ahenobarbus (probably the consul of 32 BC) appears as delubrum Cn. Domitii in Pliny (nat. 36.26). 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. 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).

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 ara 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).  

(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). 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 (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”.


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”. Note that Val. Max. 1,7,5 (in aedae 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, 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”.

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.). 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

---

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). 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.

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.

---


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 Venelia³), 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

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 1912¹, 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 1979², 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; 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.

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.

---


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 Ovatio 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 dedicated’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.)*. The epithet has been explained with reference to the founder of the temple but has also been interpreted to mean ‘blood red’. 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*”.

If not for other reasons, at least onomastically this is impossible, 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)*. 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 ein 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 Galitiae Oriö* (*CIL* VI, p. 4130), that is, a dedication by a man called Oriö 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 peut-être 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(an); 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.\(^\text{18}\) 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[i]is Laribus immolabant*, which is not only good and idiomatic Latin (Cic., etc.), but also a logical expression in content.\(^\text{19}\) 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*.\(^\text{20}\) 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(on) 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. I. / Myrtale, / Cupania N.f., / magistr(ae) / Dianae Karen(ae) / d(on) 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.


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.\(^\text{26}\)

(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 / [Pla]c[ii]dus 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.\(^\text{27}\)

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. *Mattius* in *CIL II 4970, 309* (Tarraco; recorded by Schulze 1904, 275): *Officina Matii* (but this is probably *M. Atii*). 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- (< *meh₂-to), it could show an otherwise undocumented cognate of matura, matuta, etc. (cf. Mater Matuta, Osc. maattīs). 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 gentilicum as well. Parallels for such a scenario may exist (cf. No. 6: Diana Karena, No. 42: Meftis Uritiana).

2.3. Africa

(8) Genius Ulpius (††)
An early second-century AD 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 Flaccus, 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. By another hypothesis,

28 De Simone 1999, 397.
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 *Uliensiis. 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 Laquiniae(n)sis (CIL II 2405 = RAP 206; conv. Bracaraugustanus); Genius Viriocelensis (AE 1998, 759; ibid.); Genius Tiaurauceicus (ILS 9297 = AE 1952, 65 = RAP 207; Estoros, 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.
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Genius Ulpius would quite uniquely indicate the Genius of a cohors Ulpia.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{33} This interpretation is obviously correct, but the reading of Ulpio as a dative is not:\textsuperscript{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 Alostianus”, which is to be understood as Genius Alostiani). 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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{33} Brahmi 2017, 48; Gasparini, forthcoming.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. the Celto-Iberian cases mentioned in n. 31. Also Celtic is Genius Arvernsus (CIL XIII 1462 = ILS 7037 = ILA-Arve 3; Augustonemetum), as is Genius Acorsus/Adcorsus (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)si(um), unless one reads Genio foresui(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 / Domini / Zoila vilic(a). However, since the expression Genius Dom(i)nicus, though possible (cf. the Latres 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.nii(um) [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 / Latres 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. 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.

(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* is, of course, well known, but the epithet must rather relate to Silvanus. 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* II 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: *Anicii Domitio(rum)*; *CIL* XV 992a: *Duor(um) Domitio(rum) Callisti*; *CIL* XV 993: *Cypherus Domitio(rum)*; *CIL* II 4970, 183c-g (Tarraco): *Officin(e) 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.

deity Baal Addir. 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* 111 (2nd cent. AD, unless earlier): *Deabus / Lucretis / Iulia Matel/rna votum / solvit libens / merito Drou/sa filia res(tuit)*; *I.Köln* 110 = Kakoschke 2017, 4–6 (2nd cent. AD): *Lucretis An[a]ll[uus] / pro se / et suis / v. s. l. m.* (both are listed in Girardi 2019, 240). 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.

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? 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 lucrī* (Arnob. 4,9). Finally, it has been claimed that the name of the local goddesses was *Lucretae*, not *Lucretiae*. 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, 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, *pasim*. 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. 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 *Lubo*- were peculiar to Celtic regions, 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 gentilicum.

---

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 Iulineiae* (*CIL* XIII 7882; probably from the doublet *Iuliniacum*). The roots of the names of *Amnesia* or *Amnesa* (*CIL* XIII 12066; Thorz, 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, 209.

47 E.g., *Abianius*, *Albius*, *Brittiae* (matres), *Cis(s)onius*, *Gabiae* (matres), *Narius/la*, *Vintius*, etc.
3. Theonym + nomen-\textit{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 -\textit{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 \textit{fundus} (e.g., nomen \textit{Lusius} > \textit{fundus} \textit{Lusianus} / \textit{Silvanus Lusianus}).\textsuperscript{1} In such cases, naturally, the epithet could also function as a topographic reference.\textsuperscript{2} However, these and many other gods could also be worshipped within a \textit{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., \textit{CIL} XI 3082 [Falerii Novi]: \textit{Silvano} / \textit{Veturiano}; \textit{CIL} IX 2631 [Aesernia]: \textit{Libero} / \textit{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 (\textit{CIL} IX 1455; AD 101). Just as the evidence of this document suggests that the name of a \textit{fundus} often remained unchanged on the arrival of new proprietors (and in fact many names can go back in time considerably earlier than Trajan),\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{1} Maio 1976; Matijašič – Tassaux 2000, 75; Camodeca 2017, 120–22; Id. 2021, 108.
\textsuperscript{2} De Fino 2014, 633.
\textsuperscript{3} Champlin 1981, 246–50; Torelli 2002, \textit{passim}. 
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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 Ianarius 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 Tarquinius / 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.” 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. 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

(A11) *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. 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). No

---


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


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 aeditus 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 Cornific(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(edit), while CIL VI 2210 (= ILS
4999) records the epitaph of C. Iulius Hymetus, an aeditus Dianae Plancianae,

11 For the historical context and the choice of the Aventine temple of Diana for rebuilding, see
12 E.g., recently, Prim 2021, 371 and passim (she also restores Cornificiae) 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.  

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.  

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), 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), and there were the horti Tauriani (CIL VI 29771; first cent. AD)

---

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). 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.

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.

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 dicitur.

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 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 I² 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*). 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) 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. 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* I² 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.
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).

(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.* 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. 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, 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 Cocceianus (?) (*)**

24 For the monument’s modern history in England, see Caldelli 2019, 78–81.
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 Caesarii*, 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, 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. Others have implausibly thought of a private apotheosis involving the identification of a Iulianus with the god Hercules. 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*).


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 1966¹, 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 “Göttergleichung” (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 family34), 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

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

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 *anna*, 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. 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. 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. That Anna appears alone would perhaps not be surprising by itself, because Anna and Perenna also figured as two separate entities. 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. However, as far as I know, Anna Perenna did not have any special connection with the Caelian Hill, 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). 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? 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).


39 Mart. 3,68,8 (*sexta mensa*), 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).


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

45 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.
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)ris, Pel. sadries], Satrienus, etc.). Nor is it entirely impossible that there was also a nomen *Satrianus/a, identical with the theonym.48

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 19942, 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"). 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).

(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).

---

49 Correctly, Bömer (1981, 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, 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 Statiae 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*  

(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 Sevineae*, 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 -ina 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.
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): Diana Pamneti/tiane Q. Iuli/us Pompo/nius. 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 Panneliana). 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 / Aelianus / sacrum, / quem consacra/vit Sammius / Tertullinus, / ex maioriario. The epithet perhaps refers to Emperor Hadrian who conferred the title of colonia Aelia Augusta on Aeclanum, but a local family cult cannot be excluded.

(31) Hercules Cefr(i)anus
Johnson 1935, 116 n. 2 is a brick stamp from Minturnae in southern Latium (1st cent. BC): Herc(uli) Cefr(i)ano sanct(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.

---

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 19942, 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:

\[\text{Herculi Victorii / Certenc\'i\'ino / M. Aurel(ius) Aug. lib. / Zoticus / nom(enclator) a censibus / d(ono) d(edit).}\]

(dating follows). Concerning the so far unexplained epithet *Certencinus*, it does not look like a derivation from a Latin anthroponym, unless this is an error for *Certencianus*, in which case one might assume the existence of a nomen \(*\text{Certencius}\) (cf. *Certius*, and *Cupius* – *Cupencius*, *Pacius* – *Paciencius*, etc.). Interestingly, between the letters C and I, the only point where there was space left, the stonemaster 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*-1277756). 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:

\[\text{Cult(oribus) Hercul(is) / Front(oniani?) loca data / ab C. Vibenn(io) Honorato. / In fr(onte) p(edes) CL, / in a(gro) p(edes) CXX.}\]

The epithet is normally understood as

---

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


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 Victor, 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 *Certencini* 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 Herculis / Gagilianis. 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 Heruvianus (††?)
See: (36) Hercules Nerianus.

(35) Herc(ules) Nel(---) (††?)
CIL I² 3610 (Interamnia Praetuttiorum; 1st cent. BC; lost) is an inscribed votive67 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 Alliaë).
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 (Γαγίλιος) 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**  
\textit{CIL X 4851 (= ILS 7318a; Venafrum; 1st cent. AD): Amicitiae / Herculis / Neriani. / [I]n fr(onte) p(edes) C.} Probably from the nomen \textit{Nerius}, suggesting that the family had a special relationship with Hercules. This case must be compared with another, later, text from Venafrum, \textit{CIL X 4850 (= ILS 7318)}, also concerning a grave area of a sodality involved in the cult of the god: \textit{amicitiae Herculaniorum / 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 \textit{Hervius} does not seem to be attested.\(^70\) Yet, the similarity of \textit{Nerianus} to \textit{Hervianus} (or \textit{Hervianii}) might make one wonder if the two inscriptions referred to one and the same \textit{amicitia}, which is why Dessau assumed one of the epithets to be erroneous (\textit{ILS} 7318a: “vix videtur dubitari posse quin altero uno loco erratum sit”). The last line of \textit{X 4850} is difficult to read. I saw and copied the inscription in 1998 (and there is a good photograph in the \textit{CIL X} archives in Helsinki): to me \textit{NERIANI} seems more likely than \textit{HERVIANI}.\(^71\) If this is correct, the association of the worshippers of \textit{Hercules Nerianus} in Venafrum was called \textit{amicitia Herculi Neriani} in one case and, later, \textit{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 (\textit{Herculi Aug. Turraniano}) appears in an unpublished dedication from Ostia (Bloch 1958, 213; cf. Meiggs 1973, 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 \textit{Herculanii Hervianii} with the nomen \textit{Ervius} attested by \textit{CIL X 4880} (Q. Ervius Bassus, an \textit{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 \textit{CIL X 4850}.  
\(^{71}\) At \textit{EDR-113323}, this is given as \textit{Herviani(orum)}, but \textit{ORVM} is an old restoration (cf. Mommsen, \textit{CIL X 4850} comm.).  
\(^{72}\) It is not recorded in the principal databanks (\textit{EDCS, EDR}), or in Ceccarelli – Marroni 2011, or van Haepener 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\textsuperscript{73}, and the name of the dedicator is not cited either, the epithet suggests that someone from the Turrianian family had founded or renovated a cult of Hercules Augustus at Ostia (for the form, cf. the \textit{Caelestis Aug. Graniana} from Africa, No. \textbf{54}). The nomen \textit{Turranius} is well attested at Ostia and Portus, as is the cognomen \textit{Turranianus}.

(38) \textit{Isis Geminiana} (†?)
This goddess is attested as the name of a \textit{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; \textit{CIL XIV} 2028 = \textit{RICIS} 503/1132).\textsuperscript{74} The epithet\textsuperscript{75} might well originate from the nomen \textit{Geminius}, though the cognomen \textit{Geminus} as a source would be equally possible.

It was common in the ancient world for ships to be named after deities (Isis,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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,\textsuperscript{77} or some other person associated with it and perhaps at the same time with the grain transport, may have been called \textit{Geminus} or \textit{Geminus}? This is the usual explanation, the popularity of which is perhaps increased by the fact that the widely diffused nomen \textit{Geminius} is also well documented at Ostia. It is conceivable, moreover, that the epithet helped differentiate this ship from others named after the same

\textsuperscript{73} This was the only thing revealed by Herbert Bloch 1958, 213.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{75} Frequently given as “\textit{Giminiana}”. The second letter, which looks like an I, must perhaps be read, and certainly understood, as an E. The form “\textit{Isis Gemina}” in Deniaux (2007, 76) must be due to a simple slip.
\textsuperscript{76} For the grain ship called \textit{Isis} described by Lucian in his \textit{Navigium}, see Houston (1987, 446 n. 9), pointing out that the name of the ship in Petronius’s \textit{Satyricon} (114) may also have been \textit{Isis}.
\textsuperscript{77} Thus Floriani Squarciapino 1962, 33, and many others. Vidman (1969, 254) claimed that the person who had named his boat \textit{Giminiana} was the steersman (\textit{Farnaces magister}) depicted in the fresco.
goddess. 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, Geminius 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.
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each other,\(^{83}\) or by a deity having something in common with, or covering the qualities of, another.\(^{84}\) The interpretation of \textit{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 \textit{Isis} inscribed on its bow: the ship so named can be clearly associated with the \textit{parasemon} of one of the Dioscuri on the same vessel.\(^{85}\)

\textbf{(39) \textit{Lares Apic(atiani?)} (†?)}

\textit{CIL} IX 8193 (= \textit{Suppl. It.} 9: Amiternum 5; second half of the 2nd cent. AD; see photograph at \textit{EDR}-100054): [\textit{Pro} sa[lut(e)] / [-] Baebi Ruf[i]ani Iuliani / \textit{Laribus Apic(atianis)}]. If the reading is correct,\(^{86}\) this could be a dedication to the \textit{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 \textit{Apicatus} is otherwise attested at

---

\(^{83}\) E.g., \textit{Bona Dea Apollinaris}, where the Apollo in question may be the \textit{Medicu/s Sosianus} (\textit{CIL} VI 39819 = AE 2007, 251, found in reuse in the exedra of the Crypto Balbi); \textit{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, \textit{LTUR} III [1996], 123). A related, though not quite similar, case is found in Portus, where a priest of \textit{Liber Pater Bonadiensium} made a dedication to \textit{Silvanus} (\textit{CIL} XIV 4328 = Brouwer 1989, 72–76, No. 67), his title suggesting that there was a cult of Liber Pater in a \textit{vicus} called \textit{Bonadiensium} (or \textit{Bonadiensis}), obviously so named after a sanctuary there of \textit{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 \textit{Trajan} (see Van Haerperen 2019, 276–77, 291–92; Ead. 2019–2020, 285; Ead. 2021, 205). The god Liber himself probably could have been called “\textit{Bonadiensis}” as well.

\(^{84}\) Cf. \textit{Venus Martialis} (together with \textit{Victoria} and \textit{Isis}, \textit{CIL} XI 5165 = \textit{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; \textit{Augusta Bona Dea Cereria} (\textit{CIL} V 761 = \textit{ILS} 3499) and \textit{M(a)ter D(eum) M(a)gn(a) Cereria} (\textit{CIL} V 796 = \textit{ILS} 4101), both from Aquileia; \textit{Bona Dea Isicca} (\textit{Suppl. It.} 18: Ameria 1). As for the theonym \textit{Mars Cyprius} of \textit{CIL} XI 5805 (= \textit{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 \textit{kupro}—meaning ‘good’). Cf. also \textit{Silvanus Pegasianus} (No. 91) and \textit{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 (\textit{Acts} 28:11). Who knows if the ship bore the name of \textit{Isis}?

\(^{86}\) Line 1 is especially uncertain, and one may wonder whether a dedicator’s name should be looked for in line 3.
Amitemum (CIL IX 8273–74 = Suppl. It. 9: Amitemum 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 apicem or apices, 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 sources88 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 mari ismuthians known from a late fourth-century BC Etruscan mirror from Bolsena (CIE 10840 = Rix, ETVs S. 14; G. Camporeale, ThesCRA II 54, No. 98), Heurgon (1950, 487) deduced from it the existence of

87 The possibility of argenti p(ondo) IC is duly excluded by M. Buonocore, CIL.
88 ThLL II 226–27. Cf. CIL VI 1288 = I2 10 (Elog. Scip.): quei apicem insigne(s) Dial[is f]laminis geistei.
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 Isemnios, 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.\(^\text{90}\)

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,\(^\text{91}\) 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 (*tou to 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.\(^\text{92}\) 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.


\(^{91}\) Used as a cognomen in inscriptions from Etruria (\textit{CIL} XI 1616 [Florentia]; \textit{AE} 1987, 366 [Clusium]) and found in Oscan inscriptions (\textit{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.

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, -32 [Lejeune 1990, 17–18], -45; *CIL* I² 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).

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 theItalic pantheon (Jupiter, Mars, Hercules) and her close relationship with Juno and Leucothea is well known.

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, 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.

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 ([---] Acerr[niu]s [---] / [---] *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[tianae] sacra* is to be corrected to *Mefitu(-) sacra* (see add. p. 976 and *CIL* I² 3473).

95 Poccetti 2008.


97 Cf. *Imag. It.* 1399: Potentia 22 (= *ST* Lu 31); *ϝενζηι Mε[fti---]* (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, 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 I² 1761). 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. 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 Utius) 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*. 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 Iauarius 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. However, although Domitian may have had to do with the
baths, the epithet given to the Nymphs does not prove this, 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, 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 ‘A. P(---)’ / Rufius 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
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.
Naming Gods

Silvanus Curtianus

_AE_ 1981, 240 (Beneventum; late 2nd to early 3rd cent. AD): _Silvano / Curti[a-]no / L. Staius / Herodotus / v. l. s. / Ἕκτε_. A _fundus Curtianus_ is attested in AD 101 (_CIL_ IX 1455, col. III, 69). A child homonymous with the dedicator is known from _CIL_ IX 1971. The fourth-century addition of the signum (voc. of Ἕκτε(o)), whether referring to a later owner of the _fundus_ or to some other person, might indicate that the cult still endured at that time.

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_. A connection with the otherwise known _fundus Lusianus_ is likely (_CIL_ IX 1455, col. II, 70; AD 101).

Silvanus Nervinianus

_CIL_ IX 8955 (= _AE_ 1994, 560; Cures Sabini; 2nd cent. AD): _Silvano Nervi/niano_ sacrum. Probably from the (originally Umbrian?) nomen _Nervinius_. Perhaps there was a _fundus Nervinianus_, of which this Silvanus was the guardian.

Silvanus Settianus

_EE_ VIII 94 (Beneventum; AD 211): _C. Oppius / Athenio / Setti’a’no / Silvano volution 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). The god may well have operated in a _fundus Settianus_ (< Settius).

---

105 Cf. Maio 1976; De Carlo 2013, 305.
106 The editor took the signum as either Ἕκτε or Ἕκτη, but see L. Robert, _BullÉp_ 1978, 575.
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.
(49) *Silvanus Staianus*
*CIL* IX 1552 (Beneventum; lost): *Silvano Staiano / Plautia Felicitas / pro filio Crescentino / votum libens solvit.* 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).

(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. 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). 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. 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, the possibility exists that the statue at Mutina was not the only one representing *Victoria Mariana*. Cf. Introduction p. 14.

---

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).
(52) [--- N?i]ervaianus
CIL IX 8154 (ager Aequiculanus; 2nd cent. AD): C. +ullius Pf. [---] / dat don(um) / [--- N]ervaiano / [v. s.] l. m. Perhaps an epithet coined from a nomen ending in -ervaianus (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). 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). 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 Delventinum, Narnensium Visidianus, Asculanorum Ancharia, Voliniensium Nortia, Ocradiculorum Valentina, Saturinorum 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, Narnensium Visidianum, Atiniensium Numiternum, Asculanorum Anchariam, et quam † praesuerunt, Voliniensium 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 gentilicum (*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

**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: *Caelestis Augusta Graniana sacrum*. / Q. Voltius Senecio templum vi fluminis eruptum transtulit et a solo fecit idemque dedica[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 *Visidiens* 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. 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. 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, had their epithet from the nomen *Cassius*. In both cases, the goddess’s name is in the nominative (cf. *Diana Cariciana* [No. 66], *Fortuna Juveniana / 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

---


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.\textsuperscript{126}

\textbf{(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 (\textit{BCTH} 1936-37, 110–11): \textit{N<\textit{yp}>mp(his) Fl(avianis) Sep(timianis) Aug(ustis)}. The epithet \textit{Flavianae} alludes to the Vespasianic foundation of the building, and \textit{Septimianae} to its restoration carried out by Septimius Severus.\textsuperscript{127}

\textbf{(58) Venus Cassiana}

See: (56) \textit{Iuno Cassiana}.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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). 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. 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 Sanctissimae / 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, 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. 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. Thus, the provenance of the altar seems uncertain, but it may not be Roman.

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”. 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 Annianensis (as he, and many others later, read the term) could indicate a people named “Ant(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). 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), 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.

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 a[ctor] / 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).
derived from the name of a fundus Folianus (< Folius; cf. Foglianise, in the province of Benevento¹¹). 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<ur>stas / promisit votum / Lucea Primitiva / Fortunae Tauri/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 is¹³). 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 toponymic 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 Haepen 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, Publicensianus16): 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 Publicensis 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 19812, 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, Štienne 1958, 344; Latte 1960, 333. Cf. also EDCS-12401624: Caes<e=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.


17 Unless, perhaps, which seems less likely, the dedicator was called Praestant[i]us / [C]oncordius (the nomen Praestantius is known, but the lacuna may be too small for two letters). The title Praestantisimus (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 - Ceriens(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 Tutilum [Beneventum]; early 3rd cent. AD): *Silvano Valerian/ensi Felici/anus, C. Beti/ti Piì 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).

---

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).

---

Fortuna Crassiana

*CIL* VI 186 (= *ILS* 3714; first half of the 3rd cent. AD) is an altar dedication to Fortuna *Crassiana* 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 Victoriae / Imp. Caes. M. Aurelii Severi Alexandri Pii Felicis Aug. / aram Fortunae Crassianae / Fabricius Iustus cum Iusta et Iusto filis d(on) d(edit)*. This Fortuna was probably the protector of either a Crassus or his house (*domus Crassi / Crassiana*); 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.

Fortuna Lampadiana

See: (16) Fortuna Iuveniana.

Fortuna Pientiana

*CIL* VI 30874 (= 36753 = *ILS* 3716; lost) is a statue base inscribed *Fortunae / Pientianae / «feliciter». This Fortuna has been tentatively interpreted as that of a Pius.*

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. 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.

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 Torquatii / Torquatiana*) by a certain Narcissus: *Fortunae / Torquatianae / Q. Caecilii / Narcissus / d(on) 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.


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, praeffectio, ser[vii] 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[vii] / ἢρκελος / d(on) / d(ecerunt)*. 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(on) / 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

---

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

---

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).
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.\footnote{Dessau, ILS 3358; Degrassi 1949, 73 (= 1962, 343). Caldelli (2004, 233–34) tentatively thought of P. Aelius Aug. lib. Callinicos, 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.}

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,\footnote{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).} one wonders if the theonym Liber Kalliniclanus 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).\footnote{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 Amarantha(h)iana and the Imperial fiscus: CIL VI 10233 (AD 211), with Caldelli 2004, 248–51; Alessandri 2021.} 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.\footnote{Weinstock 1957, passim; Orlin 2010, 62.} 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.
(78) **Liber Pater Proclianus**

*CIL VI 466 (= ILS 1930 = RICIS 501/0213; 1st/2nd cent. AD)* 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 Isis [et ---].*\(^\text{16}\) It has been implausibly suggested that the epithet derives from a vineyard called “Procliana”.\(^\text{17}\) 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.\(^\text{18}\) 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*).\(^\text{19}\)

---

\(^{15}\) 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.* 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 / Glaucopianae* (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). 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[lanae]*/; Fast. Sab. *Inscr. It.* XIII 2, 5, p. 53: *ludi Vict[oriae] Sull[lanae]*/ 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). 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 *ludi Vict[oriae]*/ (no mention in the Fasti Praenestini or Amiternini). For parallelism between Sulla’s Roman *ludi* and the Athenian *Syleia* (*IG* II² 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, servìtor deorum, ex vi/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,

---

\(^{23}\) 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 *Aloia* 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-*. 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: *iusu 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. 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. 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. 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.


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 / Extricatiano / 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.
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 *Pf.*, 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 deities36 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 Pegasiano, 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).
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 genitive³), 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. 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. 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. 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, / Bona Deae / sacrum / Martialis / servos; CIL X 6595 (Velitrae): Antonioae / Q.f. / Deae / Bonae, / Piae.

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; PIR² 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.

Cf. the dedication CIL XIV 2251 (Albano): Ex visu iussu Bonae Deae / sacrum / 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.

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 Haepenen 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: either this is a private consecration of a woman called Livilla, or perhaps, rather, we are dealing with a dedication to a local goddess of Celtic origin, whose name could be compared to the epithet of Apollo Livicus, ‘the shining’ (?), in Bonna (CIL XIII 8006; with Hofenender 2010, 97); cf. OIr. li, ‘beauty, colour, lustre’, Lat. livor, Livius, etc. (Holder 1904, 251; Delamarre 2003, 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”.

7. Théonym + 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 Athenodoriam; 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 Athenodorian, 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 Athenodorian 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)enodorian<am>. That am was dropped before am at some stage is technically imaginable (the earliest mss. are

² Although -ius also occurs in earlier sources (Cic., etc.), they typically have -eus (cf. Gr. -εος, -ειος), e.g., Cic. onat. 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 Apollodoren, i.e., the declaimer Moschos, pupil of Apollodoros; Quint. 2,11,2: Theodoreus an Apollodoren (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 Athenodoria* 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 *Athenodoria* had been in earlier use, the style *Isis Athenodoriana* 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). 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.

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.


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)

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, but dedications to “Iuppiter Silvanus” are known from both Rome and Numidia (and some other provinces), suggesting a close association between the two gods. 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).

---

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 Valentii, Aesculapio, Silvano Pegasiano, Dis Patriis (cf. No. 91: Silvanus Pegasianus). In CIL VIII 2579d (= ILS 3034 = Benseddik 2010, II 127, No. 16), Iuppiter Valens appears alone.


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), sec. e.g., CIL IX 2124 (Vitulano/ager Benev.); EE IX 762a (Praeneste); Suppl. I. 16: Rusellae 2 (uncertain); CIL Cáceres-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.
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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 Augustula, but the genitive Augusti (Augustorum) sometimes occurs, cf. Panciera (2003, 238), observing that there was probably no substantial difference between the two styles.


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(on) 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 Volusianoi* 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,* 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: [*Τύχη / οἶκον / 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

---
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and Rufinus, are very untypically⁶ 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* II² 14, 838 = *ILS* 3605): *Laribus et [Ti]/telae, Genio L. / n(ostri), Telephor(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(ostri)*, 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, *Flavorum* 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 pontific(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 Feliculae / votum solvit iunicem alba(m) / libens animo ob luminibus / restituitis; derelictus a medicis, post / menses decem beneficio dominæ medicinis sanatus, per eam / restituta omnia ministerio Canniae Fortunatae. It was commonly thought that this Bona Dea had her epithet Felicula from the dedications referring to the renovation of a sanctuary of the same goddess turned up (CIL VI 39822, ll. 2/3 = AE 1980, 53: Bonæ Deæ / Feliculae Agresti fānum, 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.), 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, 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. 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) Nymphæ Geminae (†)
CIL IX 5744 (= ILS 3866; Urbs Salvia [and not Ricina]): Nymphìs Geminìs / sacrum / C. Fufius Gemini l. / Politicus. / Ídem aquam perduxit. It is commonly believed that these Nymphs were named after the cognomen of the dedicator’s ex-

---

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

---


8 As already observed by Ihm (1887, 95 n. 1): “Merkwürdig wäre es, wenn dieser Beiname von einem Menschen hergenommen wäre, wie Mommsen vermutete.” 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* 1992, 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”). 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, 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”. 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). 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.

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 *Purpurioni* as Jupiter’s epithet, an idea that has undeservedly been forgotten.\(^\text{15}\)

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.\(^\text{16}\)

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\(\text{i}o\)\(n\)), 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 Tauriannon*). 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 Glaukopiana*, 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*,
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*pons Aemilius* — *porticus Octaviae, theatrum Balbi*, etc.). Suffixed forms, coined from both nomina and cognomina, were also widely used (*horrea Unnimidiana* 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 gentilicum (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 Panmetiana (epithet perhaps Panentiāna), (No. 32) Hercules VictorCertencinus (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 Uriana (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 Visidi), (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 Taurus, 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 Gratilianus), (No. 84) Genius Aloitanius (to be understood as Genius Aloitani), (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 Athenodoroiōn), (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 Geminius, but denoting a double spring), (No. 98) Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Purpurio (epithet Purpurio not derived from the dedicatory’s cognomen Purpuris, but an independent designation).
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3. Personal Names

(†† = divine epithet non-existent;
††? = existence of divine epithet doubtful, uncertain, or hypothetical)
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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
- I geomios: 54
- Livicus: 85
- Medicus: 52 n. 83
- Smintheus: 54
- “Sminthianus” (††):
- Sosianus: 3, 9–10, 14, 33–35, 52 n. 83, 103–104
Arverns (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
- 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
- Panteiana (?): 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
- Aeterna: 93
- Grassiana: 72
- Crescens: 92
- Flavia (††): 18, 19 nn. 8–9, 20, 92
- Folianensis: 67–68
- Huissce 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
- 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
- Fundanus (?): 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
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- **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
- **Iulineiiae (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
- **Laquinia(nis) (genius ~ 'god')**: 25 n. 31
- **Apie(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
- **Callinicidanus**: 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
- **Cyrius**: 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 Septimianeae Augustae: 63
- Gemaiae: 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
  - - **Agrestis**: 32–33
  - - **Aurelianus**: 14–15, 43–44
  - - **Caesarianensis**: 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
- Prastantissimus: 69 n. 17
- Public(i)ensianus (?): 69–70, 107
- Settianus: 58, 88
- Silvester: 99 n. 9
- Staitius: 59
- Valerianensis: 11, 65, 70, 105
- Veturianus: 54, 59, 99 n. 9
- [---]rilianus: 44–45
- Sta Mater:
  - - Secciana (?): 45
- Statilina: 22 n. 18
- Tanit: 62 n. 124
- Thamogadensis (*genius* - ‘god’): 25 n. 31
- Taurauceicus (*genius* - ‘god’): 25 n. 31
- Tutela: 76, 93–94
  - - **Candidiana**: 76
  - - Tutilina: 22 n. 18
  - - Tóyn: 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
  - - Félix: 4, 92 n. 3
  - - Félix Gabina: 5 n. 6
  - - Física: 55 n. 97
  - - Lucilliana: 37 n. 21, 62, 74, 77, 80, 84, 103, 107
  - - Martianis: 52 n. 84
  - - Placita: 4
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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
Curati: 21
L. Decianus M.f. Arn. Extricatus (prominent Carthaginian): 81 n. 35
Didius Julianus: 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
Iulii Bassilia (in Thuburbo Maius): 81 n. 35
Iulii Candidi: 76 n. 19
Lampadii: 37
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
Pinarrii: 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
Statilius 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
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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
Ervis: 49 n. 70
Eyschus: 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
Gaegilius: 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
Gradius: 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
Lollus: 37
Lucius: 30
Lucilla: 77, 84
Lucretius: 28–30, 107
Lusius: 5, 10, 31–32, 58, 104
*Mamertius: 10 n. 18
Marcellinus: 53, 93
Marcellinus: 53, 93
maris: 53–54
Martinus: 12
Matusius: 24–25, 29, 43, 104
Mintius: see Smintius
Naevius: 44, 73–74
Narius: 30 n. 47
Natalianus: 37
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natalis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Neleius (?)</td>
<td>48 n. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nellius</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelpius</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerius</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Nervaius (?)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervinius</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikētī(o)ς</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobilianus</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobilis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numistus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovanius (?)</td>
<td>18 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladius</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panmetius</td>
<td>see Panentius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panentius</td>
<td>46, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Panneius (?)</td>
<td>46 n. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perikles</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philio</td>
<td>4 n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pientianus</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pientinus</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pientius</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plancina</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plancius</td>
<td>34–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plancus</td>
<td>34–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plotius</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompeius</td>
<td>11, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praestantius</td>
<td>69 n. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc(u)lus</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Public(i)ensius (?)</td>
<td>69–70, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publius</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repentinus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanilla</td>
<td>44, 73–74, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanillus</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufilius</td>
<td>19, 87 n. 3, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad(i)riis</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadries</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadrius</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(a)evius</td>
<td>45–46, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Satrianus (?)</td>
<td>43, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrienus</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturninus</td>
<td>43, 104, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σάτυρος</td>
<td>43 n. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaurus</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seius</td>
<td>17, 43 n. 48, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settius</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevius</td>
<td>see S(a)evius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siccius</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvius</td>
<td>18, 27–28, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittius</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smintius</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosius</td>
<td>9–10, 14, 33–34, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulla</td>
<td>5 n. 7, 14, 74, 77–78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullinus</td>
<td>5 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullius</td>
<td>5 n. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurianus</td>
<td>68, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurus</td>
<td>68, 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarus</td>
<td>35–36, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torquatus</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullius</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turranianus</td>
<td>49–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turrius</td>
<td>49–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulpius</td>
<td>25–27, 106–107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utianus</td>
<td>56–57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utiiis</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utius</td>
<td>54, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valens</td>
<td>88–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius</td>
<td>36–37, 65, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venelius/Venilius</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venerius</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verzobius</td>
<td>67–68, 80–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veturius</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vintius: 30 n. 47
*Vistidius (?): 60–61, 104
Vistidius: 61 n. 119
Vistidius: 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 (Herkules): 46
Annianensis (Bona Dea): 65–67, 107
Aptic(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
Caedius (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
Crassianus (Fortuna): 72
Cryptensis (Saturnus C. Purpuratus): 100 n. 14
Curatius: see Curiatus
Curatius (?): (Ianus): 18, 21
Curtianus (Silvanus): 32, 58
Cyprius (Mars): 52 n. 84
Damatrios (Zeus): 51
Demainetos (Asklepios): 7 n. 10
Diamedontios (Herkules): 7 n. 10
Domesticus (Genius, Silvanus): 26 n. 35, 32–33, 93, 99 n. 9
Dom(in)icus (Genius?, Latens): 26 n. 35
Domitianae (Nymphae): 57, 107
Euchianus: see Euchianus
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
Foliannensis (Fortuna): 67–68
Forensis (?): (Genius - 'god'): 26 n. 35
Front(---) (Hercules): 47–48
Fundanates (?): (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
Gemini (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
Iulianus (Hercules): 39–40, 107
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
Livius (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?]ervianus (Silvanus?): 60
Nervinianus (Silvanus): 58
Orientalis (Silvanus): 32–33
Palladianus (††?) (Mars): 80–81, 107
Pannetiana: 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
Redux (Fortuna): 68 n. 12, 91
Repentius (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
Settius (Silvanus): 58, 88
Sevina: see S(a)eviana
Secciana: 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
Staiana (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
Ulpianus (††) (Genius): 15, 18, 25–27, 78 n. 26, 106–107
Utiana (Meftis, 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
Vetulianus (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
[---]riulianus (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:
- ara Luciae: 8 n. 14
Alba Helvorum: 93–94
Albano Laziale: 71, 84 n. 5
Ameternum: 11, 52–53
Anio: 66–67, 101 n. 15, 107
Aqua Flaviana (Numidia): 63
Aquinum: 18, 23–24, 32
- fundus Domitianus: 32
Arete:
- pagus Lucretii (or -ianus?): 29 n. 42
Ariminum: 26 n. 35
Ascolium Picenum: 17
Athens: 36 n. 18, 77 n. 22
Aventicum: 85
Beneventum: 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
Iliipa 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
Otriculum: 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
- 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
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
- followed by human name in genitive: 83–84
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
Coceiani: 38 n. 27
collegium:
- ararum Luciarum: 8 n. 14
- centonariorum: 23
- cultorum Herculis Gagilian: 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
curiatius: 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,
Naming Gods

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
forense: 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
- 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 (fiundo): 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
juvenii Lampadii: 37 n. 22
lararium: 58
- followed by human name(s) in genitive:
  15, 20, 92–94, 106
legio III/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, legionario 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,
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
Syleia (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
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