

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XVII

HELSINKI 1983 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Jaakko Aronen	Ἄπωσίκακοι θεοί and Ἀθήνα ἀποτροπαία in the Roman Forum: A Note on IGUR 94—95	5
Iiro Kajanto	Notes on the Cult of Fortuna	13
Mika Kajava	A Note on the Text Tradition of CIL IX 1973	21
Bengt Löfstedt	Zur Latinität von T. Mores Utopia	23
Martti Nyman	Reconstructing Compound Accentuation: On the Pre-Latin Initial Stress	31
Tuomo Pekkanen	The Hellusii and the Oxiones of Tac. Germ. 46,4	49
Leena Pietilä-Castrén	<i>Atria Tiberina</i> : Remarks on Ovid's <i>Fasti</i> 4,275—347	61
Olli Salomies	Appius Claudius Iulianus und CIL X 1688	69
Timo Sironen	Un nuovo documento osco-lucano del IV sec. a.C. da Pisticci	79
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica LXXX—LXXXV	87
Rolf Westman	Analecta Oenoandensia: Zu neuen Fragmenten des Diogenes	109
Toivo Viljamaa	Gallus — Soldier or Shepherd?	119
Maija Väisänen	Una nave d'Alceo in tempesta: Che tipo di allegoria: Un commento al "Dichter und Gruppe" di W. Rösler	123
De novis libris iudicia		135

NOTES ON THE CULT OF FORTUNA

Iiro Kajanto

I completed my article on Fortuna for ANRW II 17.1 (1981, 502—558) as early as 1976. Since then, some new epigraphical material has come to light. Most of the new finds naturally record simple *Fortuna* or *Fortuna Augusta* and *Fortuna Redux*. I do not consider them here since additional material does not in any way modify my conclusions. There are, however, a few new epithets worth noting. Moreover, one epithet listed in my article should be deleted and another reconsidered.

Three new epithets of Fortuna

AE 1980 No. 634 records the following inscription from Lyon (Lugdunum):

[Bono] Eventui / [convent]us arensis / Fortun[ae] Favens[ti] /
[tres provin]ciae Galliae.

The main part of the inscription, containing lines 1, 2 and 4, has been published in CIL XIII 1671. The editors observe that the curved pedestal of the monument bore statues and that the mention of *conventus arensis*, i.e. *consilium Galliarum*, suggests a date between 12 B.C. and the reign of Hadrian.

The epithet of *Fortuna, Favens*, is so far unknown. It is one of the numerous epithets suggesting *Fortuna* as a benevolent power, listed by me in ANRW 17.1, 510sq. under the general heading of *Vis Fortunae*. These include *Fortuna Confluens, Conservatrix, Felix, Manens, Memor, Obsequens, Opifera, Praesens, Propagatrix, Respiciens, Salutaris, Servatrix, Stabilis, Tutatrix, Tutela*. None of these epithets was very frequent. Some of them were indeed found only once, as is our *Favens*.

Fortuna Favens is here joined to *Bonus Eventus*, a male divinity representing the lucky outcome. He was not as popular as *Fortuna*, rare especially in official cult, but was worshipped in the provinces.¹ There is here no difference between these deities, even as *conventus arenensis* and *tres provinciae Galliarum* are one and the same thing.

AE 1978 No. 40 records a brief inscription from Rome:

Fortunae / Zmaragdianae.

The *fortuna* to whom something has been dedicated here is one of the rather few cases in which she is a substitute for the *genius* of a person. In ANRW 17.1, 513sq. I listed *Fortuna Crassiana, Flavia, domus Furianae, Pientiana, Plotiana, Torquatiana, Tulliana*, and one ambiguous case to be discussed shortly. It is, however, possible that *Fortuna Tulliana* is connected with the alleged founder of the cult of *Fortuna*, Servius Tullius: *aedituus aedis Fortunae Tullianae* suggests something more important than the *Fortuna* of a *gens*.

If we exclude *Fortuna Flavia, domus Furianae* and *Plotiana*, which seem to refer to *gentes*, and *Fortuna Pientiana*, of a somewhat uncertain interpretation: the *Fortuna* of a *Pius?*, the only parallel cases are *Fortuna Crassiana* and *Torquatiana*. Both *Crassus* and *Torquatus* are common enough cognomina.² They were, however, seldom borne by slaves or freed slaves, whereas *Zmaragdus*, a Greek name, was largely a slave name.³

It is worth noting that whereas in regard to bodies of people the genitive is used, *Fortuna cohortis, collegi, legionis, populi Romani*, here an adjectival formation in *-ana* is preferred. *Fortuna Flavia* is in fact a similar formation, for the old suffix *-ius/-ia* still retained its old adjectival meaning, cf. *via Aurelia*, etc.

Why, then, have we here *Fortuna Crassiana*, etc., not *Fortuna Crassi*? Only a hypothetical explanation seems possible. One could argue that the expressions are elliptical for *Fortuna (domus) Crassianae*, etc., the *Fortuna* protecting the *domus*, i.e. the family of *Crassus*. There is in fact a case which seems to lend some support to this explanation, *Fortuna aeterna*

¹ G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*², 1912, 267sq.

² See my *Latin Cognomina*, 1965, 244 and 346.

³ H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch*, 1982, 1139sq.

domus Furianae, from Moesia superior, see ANRW 17.1, 513, the family of (one branch of) the *gens Furia*.

In the casa delle Hierodule at Ostia, there is a graffito, communicated to me by Dr. H. Solin:

XII Kal. Augustas / promisit votum / Luceia Primitiva / Fortunae Tauria/nensi.

This is in many respects an interesting inscription. *Fortuna Taurianensis* is not known before but is clearly a *Fortuna* protecting towns. In ANRW 17.1, 514sq. I listed a number of these cases, *Fortuna Antias/Antiatina*, *Arelatensis*, *Ephesia*, *Folianensis*; *Karn(untiensis)*, *Nemausensis*, *?Viruniensis*. In all these cases, the corresponding ethnic was used. There is only one case of the town name in the genitive, *Fortuna Visent(i)*.

The town in question is Taurianum in Bruttium.⁴ The usual ethnic seems to have been one derived with the suffix *-ensis*.⁵ It is found only in the correspondence of Gregory the Great in referring to a bishop of the town. Three variants are recorded, *Taurianensis*, the most common form, *Taurenensis*, and *Tauritanensis*.⁶ The latter is not, however, found in the place indicated. It is of course due to chance that earlier examples are lacking. In the Ostian graffito, we have the commonest variant of the ethnic.

Two further things are here of interest. Firstly, the woman was probably an immigrant from Taurianum, who promised to set up a votive offering to the *Fortuna* of her native town. Because the reason for making the vow is not stated, it is not possible to know what favour she asked the goddess. At any rate, because in most cases there is a connection between the *votum* and the deity to whom it is made,⁷ it probably had something to do with Taurianum.

According to the list of passages kindly forwarded to me by the Thesaurus linguae Latinae, there are ca. ten examples of *votum promittere*. Most of

⁴ Oldfather, RE IVA, 1932, 2540—42.

⁵ For this suffix, see, e.g., P. Castrén, Von *populi Albenses* bis *cives Campanienses*. Anmerkungen zur Frühgeschichte des lateinischen Suffixes *-ensis*, Arctos 15 (1981) 5—12, especially 11.

⁶ Monum. Germ. Hist., Epistolarum I—II², 1957, 1978; see the index, II 510.

⁷ W. Eisenhut, *votum*, RE Suppl. XIV, 1974, 972.

them are from Africa, and almost a half are Christian. The idea suggested by the phrase is clear in the one republican example, CIL I² 2231 = Degrassi, ILLRP 308: *Pamphilus Pescen(ni) / Q. ser(vus) votum quod / promiseit s(olvit) l(ubens) M(ercurio?) m(erito) / pro [f]i[l]io*. Thus *votum promittere* and *votum solvere* represent two phases in the bargain made with the deity. One case from Africa, CIL VIII 20743, is valuable as it also gives the motive for the *votum*: *Caelesti Aug. reduci et conservatrici domus suae ///// hanc aram operis quadratari donavit numi/nique peregre promissum libens reddidit votum / feliciter*. *Caelestis*, the Latinized equivalent of the Carthaginian goddess Tanit,⁸ was presented with a stone altar by a man in gratitude for finding his parents well and safe on returning home. The votive gift was promised *peregre*.

The Ostian graffito is thus explicable as a memento scribbled by the woman on making her *votum* to see whether the deity will fulfill her part of the bargain within some definite time. If her wish is realized, she will carry out her promise and dedicate her gift to the goddess.

An epithet of Fortuna deleted

In ANRW 17,1, 513 I recorded CIL XI 3075 (from Falerii), *Fortuna imperii*, rejecting the conjecture of Bormann *Fortunae imperi[o]* as improbable. The inscription, which is still extant, has recently been republished:⁹

[F]ortunae / imperio / aram p[ro]s[er]uit / Selia [] / eaedem / dedica[vit]

The decisive *o* on line 2 is faintly visible in the photograph. Yet there is no reason to doubt the correctness of the reading, especially as *imperio* of a deity is a current expression,¹⁰ e.g. CIL X 1596 (A.D. 134): *imperio deae Veneris*. Thus *Fortuna imperii* vanishes from the nomenclature of that deity.

⁸ K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, 1960, 346.

⁹ *Supplementa Italica* N.S. 1, 1981; Falerii Novi by I. Di Stefano Manzella, No. 2.

¹⁰ *Thes.* VII.1, 569,34; in epigraphy: 1. 45.

Fortuna Iuveniana Lampadiana reconsidered

CIL VI 189, a marble altar still extant, bears a brief inscription:

Fortuna / Iuveniana / Lampadiana

In ANRW 17,1, 513 I included it among *Fortunae hominum*, with the note: the *Fortuna* of a *Iuuenius Lampadius*. But I admit that the epigraph is worth a more detailed comment. It is in some respects unique.

The first remarkable thing is the fact that though the inscription clearly is dedicatory, the name of the goddess appears in the nominative instead of the dative normal in these cases. In CIL VI, I have found few unequivocal examples of the nominative. *Marspiter*, the single word cut on a pillar,¹¹ as well as *Remureine* on a similar pillar,¹² are highly doubtful. Firstly, these ostensibly antique epigraphs were of a later date, either restored or faked.¹³ Again, the grammatical case of the names is not certain. *Remureine*, an obscure deity,¹⁴ may be in the nominative, but since no other forms of the name have survived, this is not beyond doubt.¹⁵ *Marspiter* is indeclinable according to Varro.¹⁶ Nevertheless it is improbable that *Marspiter* should represent the dative here. But all doubts are not removed. Even if *Marspiter* be merely restored and not faked, it belongs to the archaic period and is thus not a parallel case to our *Fortuna*, which is from the Later Empire (see below).

The other cases of a presumable nominative are also open to some doubt. VI 30964, extant, LIBER P.V.S. / AEL. VALES seems to be interpretable as *Liber p(ater). v(otum) s(olvit) Ael(ius) Vales*. Yet it is possible that LIBER P. was a simple mistake for *Liberio patri*. The following example seems more unequivocal. VI 131 = ILS 3253, not extant but seen and copied in the 17th century by Doni: *Diana / Cariciana. / M. Aurelius*

¹¹ CIL VI 487 = CIL I² 970 = Degrassi, *Inscript.Lat.lib.reipubl.*, 1957, 220: found on the Palatine, not extant.

¹² CIL VI 566 = CIL I² 971 = Degrassi 252, extant.

¹³ Degrassi, note sub 447.

¹⁴ Wissowa 242sq.

¹⁵ Wissowa, loc.cit., gives the name in the form *Remurina*. Degrassi, sub 252, hesitates between *Remureina* and *Remureine*. He even thinks that *Remureine* might be a mistake for *Remureini*.

¹⁶ De ling. lat. 8,49; 9,75.

Caricus, / aquarius huius loci, / cum libertis et alum/nis sigillo Dianae. / [I]m[p] Antonini Aug. et / dedic(atum) idib(us) Aug. / Oclatinio Adv[e]nto cos., i.e. A.D. 218. The name of emperor Antoninus (Elagabalus) has been erased. Line 7 is wrongly placed since it clearly belongs with the consular date, and *sigillo* should be *sigillum*. Because the stone is not extant, we cannot tell whether the mistakes were due to the stone-cutter or to the copyist. But I think there is no reason to doubt the correctness of the nominative *Diana Cariciana*. In the dedicatory phrase in the text, the name appears in the dative. Yet even this epigraph is not a clear parallel to *Fortuna Iuveniana Lampadiana* since the latter lacks the dedication included in the former. One could of course argue that there had been another stone bearing the dedication, but this is a mere guess.

To conclude, the name of a deity in the nominative in dedicatory epigraphs was extremely rare but not quite unknown. *Fortuna Iuveniana Lampadiana* seems to be one of these exceptional cases, though its more precise interpretation is beyond our reach.

Another problem concerns the very subject of the inscription. My former explanation, the *Fortuna* of (the house of) *Iuvenius Lampadius* is still conceivable. There is, however, one difficulty. *Iuvenius* has not been recorded as a gentile name. It is only explicable as a new cognomen derived with the suffix *-ius/-ia* from *Iuvenis*. So far, only one example of the name is known to me, found on a brick stamp in Gaul.¹⁷ *Lampadius* is also a new coinage in *-ius*, from *Lampas*, but more frequent.¹⁸ Because the new derivatives in *-ius/-ia* came into use since the early 3rd century,¹⁹ we have a *terminus post quem* for our inscription.

If the subject of the epigraph is the *Fortuna* of a man called *Iuvenius Lampadius*, his name is only explicable as a double cognomen.²⁰ In this case, the inscription must be rather late, a man bearing a double cognomen, both ending in *-ius*, suggesting a not very early date.

¹⁷ Latin Cognomina 300.

¹⁸ Solin 1156, 1364: 12 cases.

¹⁹ See my Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage, 1963, 72.

²⁰ For the double cognomina, see op.cit. 24—30.

But though I still hold this explanation to be a likely one, I admit that the rareness of the name *Iuuenius*, included moreover in an exceptional double cognomen, may justify doubts. We are thus free to seek some other explanation, too.

Now it is also possible to interpret the epigraph as representing the *Fortuna* of a youth club, of *iuvenes*, a very common type of *collegium* throughout the Roman world.²¹ If this be so, we can explain the second name, *Lampadiana*, as deriving from the cognomen of the club. Cognomina of youth clubs were not rare, though they mostly derived from the name of the town or place where they had their headquarters, sometimes from that of the divinity particularly worshipped by them, the pride of place belonging to Hercules.²² But there were other types of nomenclature, too. A case parallel to ours seems to be CIL XII 22 = ILS 7307 (Vintium), *collign. iuvenu[m] Nemesiorum*, the college of *iuvenes Nemesii*. There was no place name *Nemesia*. Hence it is only possible to interpret it as as a new coinage in *-ius* from *nemesis* or *Nemesis*,²³ with a significance or message obscure to us. In later times, club names in *-ius* were very popular. In another connection, I have listed ca. 40 relevant cases.²⁴ Although these names normally belonged to funeral clubs, the above example of *Nemesii* suggests that the new type of nomenclature had spread to youth clubs, too.

One difficulty still remains, the name *Iuueniana*. Since there is no adjective **iuuenianus*, it cannot derive from *iuvenes*, the usual designation of a youth club. But a rare variant of *iuvenes* as denoting a club exists, *iuvenii*, twice recorded in the epigraphy of Upper Italy,²⁵ CIL V 5742, extant, *Herculi / Modicia/tes iovenii*.²⁶ The other case is somewhat more uncertain. CIL V 5664, not extant,]*Nigellioni / Severi f(ilio) / ioveni*, i.e. *iuvenii*, the youth club, as the dedicator of the epitaph. We have no

²¹ Cf. E. Ziebarth, RE X, 1919, 1357sq. and Suppl. VII, 1940, 315sq.; De. R. Francesco Lo Bianco, *Iuvenes*, Ruggiero, Diz. Epigr. IV, 1946, 317sqq.

²² Ruggiero 317.

²³ For *Nemesis*, a women's name, see Solin 432: ten cases.

²⁴ *Supernomina. A Study in Latin Epigraphy*, 1966, 49.

²⁵ Thes. VII.2, 732,73.

²⁶ The ethnic of the town name Modicia, modern Monza, derived with a Celtic suffix, see RE XV, 1932, 2327.

criteria to tell the age of the inscriptions. In the epitaph, the nomenclature is of a provincial type: single name followed by the patronymic.

If these arguments are acceptable, there would thus have been in Rome a youth club bearing the name of *iuvenii Lampadii*. Instead of the more usual *genius*,²⁷ the *Fortuna* of the club was venerated by dedicating an altar to her. The epithet of the deity was derived from the club name with the suffix *-ana*.

In this interpretation there is admittedly one obvious weakness. I have found two cases of the *Fortuna* of a college, but in both the genitive was used, *Fortuna mel(ior) coll(egi) centonarior(um)*, and *numini Fortunae col(legi) fa[brum]*,²⁸ whereas the derivatives in *-ana* were used only of personal *Fortuna*.

I can thus give no unequivocal explanation for this very singular epigraph. I have not personally seen the stone, but there seems to be little reason to doubt the accuracy of the transcription or even to dismiss it as a later forgery.

²⁷ See Ruggiero 317.

²⁸ ANRW 17.1, 511 and 513.