

GLOCALIZATION EXAMPLES OF DIVINE EPITHETS IN ROMAN DALMATIA¹

This paper identifies glocalization elements or examples of the divine epithets from Roman Dalmatia. Through six categories defined by J. Linderski, said elements were found only with two divinities, and not necessarily in their epithets, but in their iconography. All six categories were supplied with examples from the Roman province of Dalmatia.

Key words: Roman religion, Dalmatia, glocalization, Janus, Silvanus, Diana / *Ključne riječi: rimska religija, Dalmacija, globalizacija, Jan, Silvan, Dijana*

In Roman religion, an epithet is a descriptive term or a title attached to a deity's name. Epithets can be identifying or characterizing a deity and they serve to identify the deity and distinguish them from other gods and goddesses. They often reflect the deity's attributes, powers, or sphere of influence. Each deity had its name, but this name could be hidden or unknown (hence the formula in addresses 'whether god or goddess', *sive deus, sive dea*, or a similar construction which would have been used to ensure deities' patronage '*sive quo alio nomine fas est nominare*'.² If it was known and could be uttered (as the hidden name could not), it was often accompanied by epithets and surnames (*cognomina*). They are either descriptions used informally or true names occurring in actual cult (attested in formulas, dedications, and names of temples, although strict distinction is not always possible.³ For example, the Roman goddess Juno was known as Juno Moneta, which translates to Juno, the one who warns, reflecting her role as a goddess of prophecy and warning. Currently, Croatian Science Foundation is funding the research project titled *Among Gods and Men, The Cults and the Population of Roman Dalmatia According to the Votive Inscriptions*⁴ and the main goal of the research project is a thorough review and/or revision of the votive inscriptions and figural representations of the deities and their systematization, which is the reason why will hopefully result in extensive insight into social aspects of religious beliefs, traditions, practices, and their combined impact on the evolution of cultural identities.

Robertson who, together with, e.g., Bauman, developed the concept of glocalization for the social sciences, sees this framework as a better model to understand how global phenomena occurred in local contexts. He proposed that both the global and the local are mutually inclusive and that they also exist interconnected with both being different

1 This paper is based on the talk given at the EAA conference, Belfast, August, 2023.

2 Or by what another name it is right to call it, Alvar 1985: 236.

3 Linderski 2016.

4 IP-2020-02-7214.

manifestations of a reality.⁵ By adopting contemporary concepts of globalization, it is useful to conceive that Roman imperialism was effectively established through a common set of formats and structures – a culture that mediated between the societies that came to participate in it through their own local actions. Roman culture was flexible and incorporated many within its structure, but the concept loses all value if it is extended to incorporate everyone.⁶ Of course, any flexibility must have its limits, given that without them, it becomes meaningless. The ways that new objects and practices are accommodated or assimilated into local cultures have come to be emphasized in recent accounts. These mechanisms are not necessarily anti-globalist, rather they create a conjunction or an intersection. They operate through a process that is sometimes called ‘glocalization’ or ‘local globalization’.⁷ To sum up, glocalization polarizes mobility, which is the ability to use time to annul the limitation of space. That ability or disability divides the world into the globalized and the localized. Both globalization and localization are inseparable, with the two parts of the world population seem to be living on different sides, facing one side only.⁸ Glocalization, defined as “globalization refracted through the local”,⁹ has been developed as a response to the growing emphasis on diversity and the local character of evidence within global phenomena,¹⁰ somewhat similarly to what scholarly literature used to refer to as e.g. *interpretatio Dalmatica* in this case. Generally speaking, as a result of the glocalization point of view, investigations of the votive inscriptions view them as part of a global phenomenon within which local and provincial characteristics can be identified. Thus, instead of understanding them as the result of foreign influences, styles, and hands, recent studies have focused on uncovering the provincial and local mechanisms behind the adoption, commission, and display of the votive inscription and the deities’ iconographies: in short, approaching them as part of an interconnected Roman world.¹¹ Conceptually, glocalization emphasizes the local responses to global engagement, and focuses on the ways in which broadly shared ideas, goods, and practices are modified and adapted locally to accord with local practice, customs, habits, and beliefs. The variability of such responses is immense, and these should not be regarded somehow as lesser or misinformed performances of global practice. Instead, they need to be regarded on their own cultural terms. Glocalization is thus an integral aspect of globalizing processes.¹²

The recent book by Mika Kajava is 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).¹³ Dealing with the epithets of gods is an extensive work, especially if the aim is to cover all the votive inscriptions from

5 Robertson 1995.

6 Hingley 2005: 118.

7 Hingley 2005: 111, with literature mentioned there.

8 Bauman 1998: 45.

9 Roudometof 2016: 65.

10 For a very informative overview of the development of the concept of glocalization in archaeology see Montoya González 2021. Further reading: R. Laurence, F. Trifilo, The global and the local in the Roman empire: connectivity and mobility from an urban perspective, in: W. Pitts, M. J. Versluys (Eds), *Globalisation and the Roman World: World History, Connectivity and Material Culture*, Cambridge, 99–122; Hingley 2005: 118; M. Sommer, Glocalising an Empire: Rome in the 3rd Century AD, in: F. De Angelis (Ed), *Regionalism and Globalism in Antiquity: Exploring Their Limits*, Leuven, 2013; T. Hodos, Global, local and in between: connectivity and Mediterranean, in: M. Pitts, M. J. Versluys (Eds), *Globalisation and the Roman World: World History, Connectivity and Material Culture*, Cambridge, 240–254.

11 Montoya Gonzalez 2021: 92–93.

12 Hodos 2017: 6–7.

13 Kajava 2002.

one province, in this case Dalmatia. The intention of this paper was to present the epithets that appear on the votive inscriptions of the Roman province of Dalmatia in order to determine which and what elements of glocalization can be observed and applied to the mentioned spectrum, contextualizing them within other inscriptions within the province and usually Rome as the originator. By no means is this paper a comprehensive review or survey of all the divine epithets in the province of Dalmatia, but instead, it is an overview of the six general types of epithets and their examples, with special attention given only to those divinities that displayed (local) elements non-existent in the originator cult. The sheer number of the votive inscriptions from Dalmatia makes it impossible to present them in one paper, and the best way would be to deal with them in a book. For that reason, I have opted to present only deities and their epithets viewed from the mentioned glocalization point of view, i.e. those that exhibited the changes determined to be of local character. In short, the purpose of this preliminary research is to focus primarily on three deities, two of which showed elements of glocalization, and also on one deity that in contrast to the two remained unchanged, meaning that there were no indications within the cult that would allow any of its aspects to be viewed as applied glocalization elements. With that being said, I have decided to use Linderski's division of epithets, as it offers six different categories that provide a wider and more exhaustive framework than that of Kajava's survey, with some overlapping between the provided categories, which is to be expected.

The most numerous epithets are those describing the function of a deity or its manifestation. As Linderski's division goes, **in the first category** we can find purely literary descriptions. Those would be e.g. of Mars by Virgil as harsh, wicked, untamed, savage or powerful in arms: *durus, impius, idomitus, saevus, armipotens* (*Ecl.* 10.40; *G.* 1.511; *Aen.* 2.440, 11.153, 9.717).¹⁴ But, not only Mars was harsh and savage and wicked, those are some epithets that were ascribed to Silvanus also, and in his case by Horace. Horace wrote of Silvanus as the *horridi dumeta Silvani* – 'the hirsute/horrible Silvanus' (Horace, *Ode* III,23). Contrary to this, Lucan tell us in his *Farsalia* (3.402) while describing a grove which no hand of man ever touched, and in which not even master of groves Silvanus nor rural Pan had their place, but was ruled by the horrible barbaric rituals and ancient myths, it was precisely the absence of Silvanus from the forest that contributed to the state of fear and terror.¹⁵ Only in Pannonia he was invoked as explicitly a warlike deity, i.e. as Bellator.¹⁶ The phrase '*sive quo alio nomine fas est nominare*' is applicable to Silvanus' dual or ambiguous nature as in his case we do not know whether we are to fear him or not. While we are still discussing Roman writers and Silvanus, it is important to note that he just might be the best example of glocalization in Dalmatia, although not so much in his epithets but in his appearance. Silvanus' most common epithets are Augustus, Silvester and Domesticus, and at the same time those are the three epithets he usually appears with in most of the Roman Empire.

Since the epithet Augustus was mentioned, it is worthwhile to note that the meaning of the epithet Augustus is still unresolved, but most scholars believe that through it, at least loyalty to Rome was expressed.¹⁷ To Duncan Fishwick, the divine epithet Augustus was so varied in its use and application that no particular meaning beyond a vague expression of loyalty can be attached to it.¹⁸ Despite the extensive scholarly literature on the subject of the Imperial cult or/and Augustan gods, the greatest uncertainty remains

14 Linderski 2016.

15 Perinić, forthcoming, *Limes XXIII Proceedings*.

16 *CIL* III, 6438 = 10220; Perinić 2016: IV.1.60. **[S]ilvan[o] / [Be]llator[i] / [Ae]ll(ius) Marcel(linus) / [d]ec(urio) col(oniae) II vir / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito)*, *CIL* III, 6438 = 10220; Perinić 2016: IV.1.60.

17 Schraudolph 1993: 68, n. 29 with bibliography.

18 Fishwick 1991: 448.

over whether Augustus was meant to relate the invoked divinity with the Imperial cult or it was simply used to convey that the invoked divinity was 'sublime'. In his extensive research of the Imperial cult, Fishwick spoke of less or more civilized or Romanised areas. Removing the not so pretty connotations that stand behind the terms 'civilized and/or Romanized', Fishwick was of the opinion that the areas with a lesser Roman presence will show a greater potential of an early development of the ruler cult. The use of the genitive (which is the proper way to address the ruler cult) is very limited, and by far the most common when Augustus is used in adjectival form. Obviously, this is due to lower specificity, more consistent with the nature of the god than a situation where a god is directly linked to the emperor by the use of the genitive.¹⁹ In a certain way, Villaret's opinion goes a step further than Fishwick's, explaining the "augustalization" of gods as the process of mediation of an emperor between gods and people and considers it as a phenomenon of political, religious and social acculturation in the Western provinces: Augusti were usually the most popular, important regional gods, invoked more often for the health of individuals than for the health of an emperor. Almost half of those individuals (41%) were members of the local elite who spread and popularized the cults of dei Augusti throughout the territory.²⁰ Bert Lott argues that during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius the epithet was not intentionally vague or generic, as earlier authors have asserted, but served several distinct purposes, depending on who used it, where, and under what circumstances, just as other aspects of imperial ideology, like *consensus*, functioned in different ways in different contexts, in particular related to connecting the local cults and individuals to imperial events in Rome.²¹ The cult of Imperial genius eventually disappeared in favour of the Imperial numen and Domus Divinae. At the same time, throughout the entire Empire Augustan gods multiplied, as did Augustan virtues, in countless variations.²² The fact that Silvanus is most often celebrated as Augustus seems to contradict the assumption that his cult had autochthonous traits but observing his cult through a glocalization lens and establishing local features in it, the epithet Augustus does not seem significant. If, on the contrary viewed through Fishwick's and Villaret's opinion, the epithet Augustus proves that he was the most prominent god in Dalmatia (even when the epithet Augustus is not mentioned in genitive case), which was already known judging solely by the number of votives dedicated to him.

Still, there is one Silvanus' epithet that does stand out in Dalmatia and it is Messor. In *Georgics* 1.21 the poet invokes all the gods and goddesses in charge of the land and its cultivation, and among them the boy who revealed the curving plough, and Silvanus carrying a tender cypress by the roots. In Servius' commentary on *Georgics*, Silvanus somehow became the reaper through the story he served in which Silvanus, as he tells us, fell in love with a boy called Cyparissus, but the affair ended in tragedy. One day Silvanus killed Cyparissus' pet stag by mistake and the boy died from grief. Also grief-stricken, Silvanus turned him into a cypress, which is why he now carries it around with him.²³ Of course, this story reminds us of Cyparissus, the son of Telephus, and his lover Apollo, but also in some parts Silvanus' love story resembles the story of Diana and Actaeon (see the last category). However it may be or was, the epithet Messor appears on three Silvanus' monuments from Dalmatia. Previously, scholars connected Silvanus' epithets with differences that had to do with factors of the local economy, i.e. the specifics of the cult were supposed to relate to the predominant economic sectors in parts of

19 Fishwick 1976: 376–377; Gradel 2002: 103–106.

20 Villaret 2019: 397–400.

21 Bert Lott 2014–2015: 133–134.

22 Fishwick 1978: 1251; Bert Lott 2014–2015: 148.

23 Hunt 2019: 139–195; Fowler 1997: 73–79; Dorsey 1992: 15–16.

Dalmatia, which resulted in the addition of various epithets and attributes.²⁴ The three times Messor appeared as an epithet, it was in addition to his common epithet Silvester. The monuments were found in Danilo (two),²⁵ and in Grahovo (one).²⁶ The relationship Silvanus' cult had with agriculture was already established in the Delmatae areas (upper Cetina, Danilo-Rider), which, after all, have provided us with the epithet Messor (reaper). In addition to this epigraphical testimony, there are several iconographic elements that link and possibly confirm it – the sickle appears on monuments from Privlaka Nin,²⁷ Trilj,²⁸ and Danilo.²⁹ However, it must not be forgotten that Silvester and Messor were what one might say: the two sides of the same coin. They formed a bond through activities necessary for any harvest. Namely, the forests needed to be reclaimed, and prepared for cultivation, which is followed by a harvest. Therefore, Silvester and Messor should be rather understood as linked, and not necessarily as separate, given the fact that harvesting must assume prior preparation and tillage, including forest clearing where required. The epithet Messor was also used in supporting the theory of Silvanus as a disguised local indigenous deity,³⁰ but the name Messor itself cannot be considered as a local name. The spread of the name Messor, Messorius, etc. throughout the Empire makes this opinion even less likely to be true.³¹ What this epithet may suggest is a connection to the Italic Silvanus who was usually represented with a sickle (*falx*).³² One inscription from Klis, at the slopes of Mosor mountain above Salona, is dedicated to Messor³³ (no other names of gods or epithets appear on the monument) and coincidentally it was found near and/or together³⁴ with the inscription dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus Caelestis Patronus,³⁵ with Caelestis being one of the rarest epithets of Jupiter in Dalmatia. From Klis comes yet another one rather interesting inscription.³⁶ It suggests the existence of a shrine in Klis dedicated to Silvanus and the spring nymphs, erected by Fescenia and her companion and husband, Titus Faustus, *sevir* and *augustalis*, by the command of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, with the council of the forest gods and goddesses (Perinić, forthcoming). There is a chance that the three inscriptions, one dedicated to Messor, the second dedicated to Jupiter Caelestis, were from the same sanctuary mentioned in the third inscription erected by Fescenia and her husband which indeed clearly suggests the existence of a sanctuary. Silvanus was also called Caelestis, but only once on an inscription from Rome.³⁷ The construction of this shrine, or its establishment, resembles the passage from Ovid in *Metamorphosis*, in which Jupiter assumes lordship

24 D. Rendić-Miočević 1951a: 34; A. Rendić-Miočević 1974: 30, 32; D. Rendić-Miočević 1989a: 482. According to D. Rendić-Miočević, accepting the opinion of C. Patsch, whereby the epithet Messor suggests that the economy in their area largely relied on livestock and agricultural production.

25 D. Rendić-Miočević 1951b: 51, no. 2 with the picture; *ILJug* 5, 175; Perinić 2016: III.3.4; *CIL* III, 9867; D. Rendić-Miočević 1951b: 35, no. 9; *ILJug* 5, 176; Perinić 2016: III.3.5.

26 *CIL* III, 14970; Imamović 1977: 7; Perinić 2016: III.3.10.

27 *CIL* III, 143222; D. Rendić-Miočević 1989a: 461–507 (note 26 and p. 474); Perinić 2016: III/32.

28 *CIL* III, 13187; D. Rendić-Miočević 1989a: 461–507, Pl. LXXXIV, 2; Perinić 2016: III/64.

29 Gunjača 1968–1969: 177–184; A. Rendić-Miočević 2003: 407–419; Perinić 2016: III/30.

30 E.g. D. Rendić-Miočević 1989a: 463–465 assumed autochthonous origins for the name Messor, also simultaneously seeing it as theomorphic, an opinion not proven beyond reasonable doubt.

31 Kajanto 1965: 82, 361; Džino 2012: 264.

32 Perinić 2016: 13, 25–26, 48.

33 *CIL* III, 1949.

34 The entry for the inscription in *CIL* does not make it clear.

35 *CIL* III, 1948; Medini 1976: 188, n. 18; Sinobad 2010: 186, no. 38; HD053840 (19.01.2009); EDCS-27500038; Vukov 2018: 419 – for this paper I have used Mirna Vukov's dissertation, but since then, the book has been published (*Rimski zavjetni žrtvenici s područja Hrvatske*, 2022.).

36 Bulić 1907: 103; A. Rendić-Miočević 1982: 126; Maršić 1997–1998: no. 14 – mentions also the remark made by F. Bulić that a small damaged statue of Silvanus was also found near this monument. Silvanus carries a goat in his right hand; Bekavac 2011: 161; *ILJug* 2003; Perinić 2016: 73, III.5.6.

37 Dorcey 1992: 31, *CIL* VI 633.

over Silvanus, embracing him into his circle, while threatening to destroy the human-kind. (Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, I,177–198). Also, the epithet Caelestis could also be hiding in the inscription dedicated to Jupiter from Radoinja, south of Užice in Serbia, and not necessarily Cohortalis or Capitolino: *I(ovi) O(ptimo) C() sacrum / P(ublius) Ael(ius) Pla(d) omenu(us) / posuit*.³⁸

The following type of epithets (**the second category**) are those which consist of popular descriptions derived either from a special feature (often iconographic) of a deity, e.g. Hercules Bullatus, wearing a *bulla* (an amulet worn by young boys, and girls³⁹), Puerinus, Youthful; Pusillus, Small (*CIL* VI, 302, 126; Mart. 3.47.4), also Monolithus ('Made of a single stone') Silvanus (*CIL* VI, 675)), or from a story concerning a deity, e.g. Minerva Capta, Captured, since she was transported to Rome after the capture of Falerii Veteres in 241 BCE (*Ov. Fast.* 3.835–848).⁴⁰ In this section, I have chosen to display the evidence for the cult of Janus, i.e. the votive inscriptions dedicated to him, since his cult appears not contaminated. Most common epithet of Janus in Dalmatia is *pater*, as in the rest of the empire. Janus as the god of beginnings presided over all beginnings and transition, whether abstract or concrete, or as Horace would say (*Sat.* II,VI,20–22): "Father of the Dawn, Janus if you'd prefer that name, under whose auspices men undertake the beginnings of labour and life's toil".⁴¹ The doorways into houses had tremendous symbolic and spiritual significance for the Romans and this aspect was enshrined around the uniquely Latin god Janus. The importance of principal entrance doorways was made obvious by the architectural embellishments used to decorate doors and door surrounds that helped to create an atmosphere of sacred and ritual eminence. The threshold was not only an area of physical transition but also of symbolic change intimately connected to the lives of the inhabitants of the dwelling.⁴² In Roman household it was the *pater familias* who was the head of a Roman family. Usually, it was the oldest living male in a household who could legally exercise authority over his extended family and probably one of the reasons that Janus carried the epithet *pater*. One of the most prominent monuments of Rome was the temple of Janus Geminus. Numismatic evidence has shown that the temple looked like a simple rectangular building with two arched doors opposite one another, flanked by two columns. The building contained a statue presumably dedicated by Numa (the second king). The door of this temple was opened during the times of war and closed during the times of peace.⁴³ Augustus himself mentioned that during his reign he had this door closed three times, when it is known that before him, they were closed only two times (*Res gestae divi Augusti*, 13). While we have accepted Janus as the god of beginnings and thresholds (both physical and virtual) it might have not been so in the beginning for the Romans themselves, as probably the Janus Geminus temple could have suggested. Janus was not the god of the first day of the year, nor of the first day of the month, nor of the first month of the year in the early calendar, nor of the first hours of the day, not until 153 BC when the new year was moved from the Ides of March to the Kalends of January (January 1) so that newly elected consuls could assume office.⁴⁴ Janus was represented by a double-faced head – *bifrons*, or a four-face head – *quadrifrons*, and he was represented in art either with or without a beard. The inscriptions dedicated to him

38 *ILJug* 68; Vulić 1931: 251; D. Rendić-Miočević 1950: 48, no. 44.

39 Migotti 2007: 187–219.

40 Linderski 2016.

41 Translated by A. S. Kline, <https://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Latin/HoraceSatiresBkIISatVI.php>

42 Mac Mahon 2003: 58.

43 Müller 1943: 437–440, fig. 1; Taylor 2000: fig. 3–5.

44 Burchet 1918 gives an extensive critical overview of ancient literary sources on Janus; Taylor 2000: 1–40.

were found e.g. in Bribir,⁴⁵ Benkovac, Podgrađe near Zadar,⁴⁶ Nin,⁴⁷ Nadin,⁴⁸ Plomin⁴⁹ and Labin⁵⁰ (only the inscriptions that mention Janus as *pater* have been transcribed).⁵¹ During the research for the project that was mentioned at the beginning of this text, looking through the cults' prism, this area of Dalmatia has so far provided us with more 'traditional Roman' religious images as well as several autochthonous gods, than is the case with, for example, the Salonitan area. Certainly, it is not possible to predict whether the results will paint a different picture by the time the project ends.

One interesting inscription comes from Nin (Aenona). It was a builder's inscription or a monument base.⁵² The inscription goes: *Iano Aug(usto) / sacrum / Cinius Genial/ is pro salute o/rdinis sui et civilum suorum si/mulacrum <e=T>i / reformavit a<t=D>/ que restitui<t=D>*. The inscription conveys the partial restoration of Janus' sanctuary or shrine where Janus' figural representation stood. It was dated by Zović and Kurilić to the early Principate,⁵³ meaning that the shrine was built earlier than that. As Sanader tells us, Ivan Lucić of Trogir and Ciriaco of Ancona were already familiar with this inscription. The site where it was found is uncertain: Ciriaco mentions both Nin and the village of Vlašići on the island of Pag because, according to the Pag notary and historian Ruić, it was broken sometime after 1796 and built into a tomb at the Vlašić cemetery.⁵⁴ Judging by all the Janus' inscription found in the province of Dalmatia, it is perhaps more plausible that the shrine was in Nin.

Next, in our list of epithets (**the third category**) are the descriptions indicating association with another deity attested in archaic prayers (*comprecationes*, Gell. NA 13. 23), e.g. *Lua Saturni*, *Herie Iunonis*, the second name standing in the genitive, thus indicating that the first deity was an emanation of the second or was acting in its sphere, cf. *Moles Martis*, 'Oppressions' of Mars.⁵⁵ In this category, so far we have not found any examples from Dalmatia. After this type of epithets, in the following, **fourth category** are geographical and local descriptions, e.g. *Bona Dea Subsaxana*⁵⁶ because she had her shrine *sub Saxo*, 'under the Rock' (of the Aventine (Cic. Dom. 136-137; Ov. Fast. 5.147-158), *Diana Aventinensis*, *Tifatina*, *Fortuna Praenestina*, or *Venus Erycina*, after their temples on the Aventine, in Tifata, Praeneste, and Eryx (Erice in Sicily), such descriptions often functioning (especially in dedications) as regular surnames, as was the case

45 *ILJug* 814: *Iano / patri / sacrum / ----*; Medini 1973: 106, note 85; Kurilić 1999: no. 2630; Zović, Kurilić 2015: no. 168; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 9; HD 03 4365; EDCS-10000826. *ILJug* 815; Kurilić 1999: no. 2631; Zović, Kurilić 2015: no. 164; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 8; *Lupa* 22924; HD 034366; EDCS-10000827.

46 *CIL* III, 9932; Medini 1973: 106, n. 86; Kurilić 1999: no. 2381; Sanader 2008: 177; 2015: 141, n. 30; Zović, Kurilić 2015: 436, no. 108; HD058026; EDCS-30301439; *Lupa* 22977; Vukov 2018: 340.

47 *CIL* III, 2969; Medini 1973: 106, note 88; Kurilić 2002: 227, no. 37; Kurilić 1999: 2276; Zović, Kurilić 2015: 499-450, IV; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 3; HD060340; EDCS-28400225.

48 *ILJug* 870: *L. Sen(tius) / p(atri) Iano / li(ben) m(erito)*; Medini 1973: 106, note 84; Kurilić 1999: no. 2644; Zović, Kurilić 2015: no. 94; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 5; HD 034505; EDCS-10000881.

49 *CIL* III, 3030 *Iano / patri*; Medini 1973: 106, bilj. 90; Kurilić 1999: 2295; Zović, Kurilić 2015: no. 16; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 2; HD 061842; EDCS-28400286.

50 *CIL* III, 10072 *----/ cro(n)ius / Iano patri/ v(otum) s(olvit)*; Medini 1973: 106, note 89; Kurilić 1999: no. 2431; Girardi Jurkić 2005: 136; Zović, Kurilić 2015: no. 10; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 1; HD 061807; EDCS-30400616.

51 Further reading on the cult of Janus in the province of Dalmatia: Medini 1973; Medini 1976; Kurilić 1999; Kurilić 2002; Zović, Kurilić 2015; Demicheli 2011; Sanader 2008; Sanader 2015; Sanader 2016.

52 *CIL* III 2969; Medini 1973: 106, note 88; Kurilić 2002: 227, no. 37; Kurilić 1999: 2276; Zović, Kurilić 2015: 499-450, IV; Sanader 2015: 141, note 30; Sanader 2016: no. 3; HD060340; EDCS-28400225.

53 See the previous note.

54 Sanader 2016: 127-128, n.s 10-11.

55 Linderski 2016.

56 Nordh 1949: 92.

e.g. with Jupiter Dolichenus ('of Doliche' in Syria).⁵⁷ As an example in this category, the only local and geographical demarcations without any doubt, are on a monument dedicated to Terra Hillyrica and Jupiter Maximus.⁵⁸ This votive monuments intrigued numerous scholars, and the research history as well as the interpretation of the monument is best seen in a recent paper by Sanader.⁵⁹ There, Sanader's research focused on the three major points: the altar itself as a monument, the writing of the inscription ((H)yllyricum), and the nature or character of the dedication itself. The writing of (H)yllyricum is explained from a chronological point of view, and the geographical differences have not been taken into consideration. It appears that the Hylliricum writing type is linked to the southern part of Dalmatia (Bigeste, Epidaurum, Narona), while Illyricum is linked to the central part (Salona, Burnum, Tilurium), and perhaps it would be interesting and worthwhile to investigate whether these two types of graphy have a foothold in the linguistic field as far as pronunciation is concerned. She concluded that the cult of Terra Hillyrica was a reflection of the revival of the cult of Terra Mater that happened during Augustus' reign, and not as a kind of rebirth of common Illyrian identity (spirit) from later Empire.⁶⁰ There is a possibility that these two categories need not be exclusive of each other, but to claim anything similar, further research is needed.

The next monument that might belong in this category is the altar dedicated to Venus, found in Postira, on the island of Brač. The inscription is as follows: *Veneri Aron(i?)/ae posuit Lolllia Quinta*.⁶¹

The altar is damaged at the inscription field, punctuation marks were used inconsistently. Due to the damage, it might have contained a letter (or several) at the end of the first line and/or the beginning of the second line. When the monument was first published, we explored and offered several possibilities, each of them explaining a version of the possible reading for Aron(i)a, a curious and so far not attested epithet of Venus. According to Marević's Latin-Croatian encyclopaedic dictionary, Arona (or Aronia) may refer to the city of Arona which was twenty kilometres north-east of Milan on Lake Maggiore, or it may be a certain type of plant. In short, possible readings are: Venus Aronia was a version of Venus worshipped in Arona, or aron(i)a was a plant, possibly aron, -i, m. a species of grass called calf's foot (less likely), or aronia, ae, f. – loquat (more likely).⁶² Then, there is a locality Aronia statio Dalmatiae, mentioned as a road station in the Ravennas' *Cosmography* (Ravenn. Pl. 209,1); and In Aronia on the Peutinger map (*Tab. Peut.* 6,4). (In) Aronia should be located in the Makarska region. The name of the votary, Lolllia Quinta, does not help us to narrow our choices more, as her name is equally 'popular' in Italy and in Dalmatia. Since the first publication of the inscription, our opinion has not changed. Lolllia Quinta may have originated either from Italy or from Dalmatia. If she was originally from Italy, then it is more likely that the monument was erected to Venus Aron(i)a, from a city on Lago Maggiore, and if she was originally from Dalmatia, than the Dalmatian locality is a more likely option. However, if it is a question of aronia as a plant/fruit, then the monument could have been erected by both Lollias, that is, it is quite certain that it did not matter where Lolllia came from.⁶³

Next in the line of epithet types are those referring to the civic standing of a deity: Jupiter Optimus Maximus, 'the Best (and) the Greatest', Juno Regina, 'the Queen'.⁶⁴ This

57 Linderski 2016.

58 Patsch 1908: 116–117, fig. 38; Imamović 1977: 416, no. 185; ILJug 1915; HD034233; <http://lupa.at/23809>; Sanader 2017: 119–133.

59 See previous note, Sanader 2017.

60 Sanader 2017: 126–127.

61 Jelinčić, Perinić Muratović 2010: 199.

62 Marević 2000: s.v. aron, i; s.v. aronia, ae; s.v. Arona; Jelinčić, Perinić Muratović 2010: 201.

63 Jelinčić, Perinić Muratović 2010: 199–202.

64 Linderski 2016.

is **the fifth category** in which numerous inscriptions from Dalmatia could serve as an example, which is why only two are presented. The first from Zaton (Bijelo Polje) is dedicated to Iuno Regina,⁶⁵ and the second from Doclea, to Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Epona Regina.⁶⁶ The inscription from Zaton is a standard votive inscription that reads: *Iun(oni) / reg(inae) / act(or) / l(i)b(ens) p(osuit)*. The inscription is dated to the first half of the 2nd century, due to the appearance of *actor* which is a senior mining clerk, or *argenti actor*.⁶⁷ The inscription from Doclea, is usually used as evidence of the presence of *cohors VIII voluntariorum* in the 2nd century when the monument is dated. It reads: *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) / Epon(a)e Regin(ae) / genio loci / P(ublius) Bennius Eg/regius mil(es) / coh(ortis) Vol(untariorum) adiu(tor) / princ(eps) b(ene)f(iciarii) co(n)s(ularis) v(otum) s(olvit)*. Its existence is both noteworthy and important since it is the only so far known confirmation of an auxiliary in the position of *beneficiarius consularis* in this part of the Empire.⁶⁸ The importance of the deities mentioned is so far accentuated only in Demicheli.⁶⁹ Epona was of a Celtic origin, a patron goddess of horses, asses and mules, and consequently she was worshipped by equestrians in a military milieu.⁷⁰ She was usually depicted seated or standing, flanked by horses, or other animals, sometimes with one hand on a horse's head. The second type of representation is Epona on a back of a horse, almost always riding sideways. Apart from horses and ponies, Epona's attributes are somewhat variable. A *cornucopia* is probably the most common, while bowls or dishes of corn or fruit are also frequent, with the same connotations of abundance and they relate Epona to the other goddesses, such as Fortuna and the Matres, who are equipped with similar attributes.⁷¹ The majority of inscriptions and images bearing her name have been found in Gaul, Germany, and the Danube provinces. On our inscription, she appeared with Jupiter and *genius loci*, and her regal position is most likely the reflection of her importance in the life of the soldier that erected this monument for her but also for Jupiter and *genio loci*.⁷²

The last, **sixth category** of the epithets is those describing the function of a deity or its particular manifestation: Apollo Medicus, 'Healer', Bona Dea Nutrix, 'Nurse', Jupiter Tonans, 'Thunderer', Stator, 'Stayer' (he stopped the advance of the enemy, Livy 1.12.3), Mars Ultor, 'Avenger' (he helped Augustus to avenge the murder of Caesar), Venus Verticordia, 'Changer of Hearts' (Val. Max. 8.15.12). Deities for whom the most epithets are attested are Jupiter (over 100), Fortuna, Juno (over 40), Hercules, Mars, Venus (over 30), Lares, Mercurius, Silvanus (over 20).⁷³ Concerning Jupiter in the province of Dalmatia, so far, the situation is the same as in the Empire as a whole. Here I will mention several inscriptions which are all very well rooted in his cult and his nature, but that are not so widely used. From Podgradina (near Livno) Jupiter is mentioned only as Fulgurator or Fulminator. The inscription reads: *Io(vi) F(ulguratori Fulminatori?) / -----*.⁷⁴ Jupiter Fulgur/Fulgurator, Lightning, Blaze Jupiter, had a temple in Rome already in the Republican period. Its location was revealed through the very interesting altar from the 3rd century (?), erected after two priests were advised by Mountain gods (Dei Montenses) to erect an altar to Jupiter Fulgurator.⁷⁵ It was the emperor Domitian who gave the Roman

65 *ILJug* 622; EDCS-10000638; HD033889; Škegro 1998: 106; Škegro 1999.

66 *CIL* III, 12679; Šašel Kos 2003: 298, n. 28; Tončinić 2004: 154; Matijević 2009: 46, 50; Glavaš 2016: 14, n. 46; Demicheli 2016: 115.

67 Škegro 1998: 89–117.

68 Matijević 2009: 50.

69 Demicheli 2016: 120, n. 68 and 69.

70 Linduff 1979: 817–837.

71 Johns 1971: 39.

72 Schmidt Heidenreich 2013: 170–171; Perinić, Radman-Livaja forthcoming.

73 Linderski 2016.

74 *ILJug* 153; *CIL* III 8304; Sinobad 2010: 166.

75 *CIL* VI, 377.

Gods of the Hills (Dei Montenses) their first common shrine at the juncture of the Quirinal and Viminal Hills. The altar mentioned was erected by two priests: one of Mithras and the other of Silvanus. Namely, Valerius Crescentio served Mithra as a *pater deorum omnium* and Aurelius Exsuperantius served Silvanus whose congregation was styled 'brothers and sisters'.⁷⁶ This inscription, in its essence, resembles the situation from Klis, previously mentioned in this text with an altar dedicated to Silvanus and the nymphs, that mentions the rebuilding from the ground by the command of Jupiter Optimus Maximus with the council of the forest gods and goddesses.⁷⁷ The other epithets of Jupiter are the already mentioned Jupiter Cohortalis,⁷⁸ Caelestis, followed by the ones not so frequently in use as Tonitrator⁷⁹ (who generates thunder), Aeternus,⁸⁰ Depulsor⁸¹ (who repels the enemies' advance but also repels the retreat of the defending units) and Tonans.⁸² In a certain way, also Nemorensis as Diana's epithet might fit into this category, but it also fits in the geographical and local descriptions category. In Rome, the temple of Diana dates, according to the early semi-legendary history of Rome, in the 6th century BC and it was built during the reign of the king Servius Tullius. Sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis or Forest Diana at the Aventine hill was located on the northern shore of Lake Nemi (nemus Aricinum), under the cliffs of today's village of Nemi. She appears on, e.g., one military votive inscription from Vid, Narona dedicated to Diana Nemores.⁸³ In Dalmatia, she is often portrayed with Silvanus, and such a relationship underlines their connection through the forest domain. Again, as was the case with Silvanus, her appearance on several reliefs serves the glocalization lens more than her epithets. Of particular significance in that sense is the relief from Opačići.⁸⁴ It (supposedly) represents Diana without her typical attributes (bow, quiver, arrows) and in a completely new and what appears to be an indigenous costume. On the left side is the anthropo-theriomorphic Silvanus with a *pedum* in his right hand (or *falx*), and a syrinx by his right side. By his left side is Diana with a scarf on her head. In her left hand is a leafy branch, and in the right, a palm or a spruce branch. The next relief represents the same Diana with the same attributes, standing on a pedestal (an altar) flanked by two female worshippers. This relief was first published by D. Sergejevski, who connected it with Diana thanks to the previously found one where she stands with Silvanus.⁸⁵ In addition to these monuments dedicated to Diana (supposedly), two more monuments need to be mentioned here. The first is from Proložac Donji, which used to be called Postranje. It is a votive relief dedicated by Titus Aelius Messor, showing the goddess as a huntress, using known elements of the classical Graeco-Roman iconographic repertoire (posture, clothes, craftsmanship, etc). The visual style fits the pattern of so-called Dalmatian 'provincial' portraiture, characterised by various degrees of abstraction, also seen on some other portraits of Diana,⁸⁶ but especially on the one recent chance find from Varoš, today kept

76 Palmer 1976: 43–46, 56.

77 See previously in the text. As for Silvanus and Mithras rapprochement see e.g. Perinić 2015: 227; Perinić 2020: 425–427.

78 E.g. *ILJug* 84; *CIL* III, 1782; Medini 1976: 188, n. 19, Marin *et al.* 1999: 175–177, no. 21; Sinobad 2010: 7.

79 *CIL* III, 2766a = 8374; Imamović 1977: 364, br. 97; Sinobad 2010: 166.

80 *ILJug* 1872; Sinobad 2010, 180, no. 11; HD034163 (14.10.2011); EDCS-10100820; Vukov 2018: 539.

81 Kurilić 1999: no. 2899; Zović, Kurilić 2015: 445, no. 176; Cesarik, Štrmelj 2016: 237–238; EDCS-63400078; *Lupa* 23073; Vukov 2018: no. 111.

82 *ILJug* 880; HD034495; Suić 1952: 213, no. 32; Medini 1976: 188, no. 15; Sinobad 2010: 112; Vukov 2018: no. 583.

83 *CIL* III, 1773.

84 Sergejevski 1929: 98, Pl. IX; Imamović 1977: 26; D. Rendić-Miočević 1989a: (Pl. LXXXII, 2); Perinić 2016: 25–26, III/76.

85 Sergejevski 1929: 95, T. IX and X..

86 Džino 2017: 336.

in the Muzej grada Kaštela.⁸⁷ Rather than focusing on stylistic analysis,⁸⁸ Džino shifted the emphasis to the social contexts in which the visual rhetoric of this monument was used for identity-construction and communication, utilising the glocalization lens. Luckily, the sculptor who made Diana left us his name (Maximinus), so we know his style or execution was adjusted according to the customer's demands. The monument is dated to the second half of the 2nd century.⁸⁹ A substantial corpus of material evidence shows that during the Roman era the area where Proložac Donji lies and where the monument dedicated to Diana was found, was a vibrant network of local communities, formed by descendants of the indigenous population and migrants, including a veteran settlement in Opačac-Glavina Donja. The dedication to Diana was found inside Badnjevic canyon, shaped by the Suvaja creek, removed from the major thoroughfares and communication lines, an appropriate location for what Marina Milićević Bradač called 'Diana outside the walls'.⁹⁰ Diana's representation does not use non-Roman elements nor there are any surprises or unexpected phrases in the inscription, unless we consider the name Messor of a local origin, or of a special meaning to the autochthonous community a century and half after it came under the Roman rule. Džino is of the opinion that precisely such canon representation of Diana was a clear indication of an intent to advertise a certain Romaness of Messor, the dedicator. The dedication, a relief with the inscription,⁹¹ is located at the place which is at best used for very local communication – people who are most likely to see it are the members of his community. A complex engagement of local visual rhetoric and wider imperial iconographic templates provides Messor with a perfect image to adequately express nothing more or nothing less than his local Romaness.⁹² The appearance of the monument, together with the place of its discovery support the assumption of a glocalization element of this monument which served to communicate a Roman identity, what presumably was Messor's intention. As for the monument from Varoš, unfortunately, the circumstances and context of the finding of the relief are not known. It seems to have been discovered by chance, in the locality of Varoš near the castle, but when and how it happened is not known. The Museum of the City of Kaštela took it over in 2011, when it moved into the Archbishop's Castle.⁹³ Its interpretation as a relief representing Diana and not 'the orant', as previously described, is very recent and well documented and argued. The monument is dated from the end of the 2nd to the beginning of the 4th century. The authors assume that less than half of the original monument is missing. It is possible that in the lower part of the relief, under the cult image, there was also a dedicatory inscription, but it is not possible to substantiate this with anything. The material from which the relief is made is local limestone, but its origin so far remains unknown.⁹⁴ The monument shows a female figure with her right hand above her head, and her left hand is almost touching the stag/dear that is also positioned on the goddess' left side. Behind her, also to her left, is a tree. This is a typical representation of Diana the Huntress, as was the previous monument from Proložac Donji. The stag's presence on the monuments of Diana is found geographically limited on the reliefs from Glamočko and Duvanjsko polje, but only in one case was Diana's hand lowered towards the animal's head. Despite the fact that the appearance of deer in the province seems to

87 Maršić, Baraka Perica 2020.

88 E.g. D. Rendić-Miočević 1989b, Cambi 2005: 111.

89 Comprehensive iconographic analysis of Diana's representations in Roman Dalmatia was recently conducted by Glučina in his thesis (Glučina 2012).

90 Džino 2017: 339; Milićević-Bradač 2008.

91 *MAXIMINVS / SCULPET / D(ianae) A(ugustae) S(acrum) / T(itus) AEL(ius) MESSOR / V(otum) L(ibens) M(erito) S(olvit)*.

92 Džino 2017: 340.

93 Maršić, Baraka Perica 2020: 157.

94 Maršić, Baraka Perica 2020: 157–158.

be geographically limited, numerous artistic monuments of the Roman era and ancient literary works clearly connect Diana with the stag, hind or fawn and that they are common in Diana's iconography (also mentioned previously in the text).⁹⁵ Sadly, for this monument, we do not have the exact place where it was found, which also means that we do not have any context for it. All of these missing circumstances diminish the credibility of the interpretation. We tend to judge its style as the work of not so skilled sculptor, since for now we do not have sufficient evidence for a more precise assumption. The 'rustic' and almost flat featureless execution of the monument, which looks like it was performed almost solely by chiselling (or, e.g., with one tool only) and less by plastic processing of the stone is consistent, as already mentioned, with the visual style of so-called Dalmatian 'provincial' portraiture which frequently appear both on Diana's and Silvanus' monuments. Certainly, knowing that Silvanus and Diana, who were especially venerated in Dalmatia, and also how frequently they appear together, this is not surprising. At the same time, more often than not, the votive inscription monuments seemingly leave us with a lot less of the unknown, but simultaneously we are deprived of the visual image of the deity. In that sense, on the *ara Salonitana*, we see a 'completely Roman' Diana. Caius Domitius Valens, as one of the two supreme magistrates of the colony (*duo-vir iure dicundo*), dedicated the altar of Jupiter on October 9, 137. The altar was consecrated, according to Roman customs, by the *pontifex* who at the time was a certain Caius Iulius Severus, who was there to ensure the proper rules and customs were followed in the consecration. It is further stated on the monument that other laws will be equal to the laws displayed on the altar of Diana on the Aventine.⁹⁶ *Lex area Dianae in Aventino* illustrates the way in which Diana supervised the rites of those who had to act together, but did not belong to the same community and as such did not share the civil organization, and thus not even the priestly one, by which the usual dedication was possible. The Colony of Salona, some 170 years after its foundation, decides to apply and adapt this model in order to highlight its privileged position in relation to Rome.⁹⁷

Finally, what began as an investigation into or of divine epithets in order to find glocalization elements, ended with a necessary pivot and expansion of the focus in order to cover the iconographic elements of cults. To summarize, all the examples of epithets and iconographical specificities viewed through the glocalization lens yet again show us that when religion is concerned, taking into account only epithets or only iconographical evidence does not work when trying to create an image of the cult or its general characteristics. This demonstration of applied glocalization framework admittedly yet again discloses that the complexity of religion and its appearance features, whether they are votive inscriptions or figural representations of deities do not function alone, that is, when each of the features is considered individually, the results will be distorted. Into the two visually available features (inscriptions and reliefs), we should also factor in the individuals who erected these monuments, and where did they erect them (the context of the find). The two cults, that of Diana and of Silvanus, presented the most obvious deviation from the Roman norm (only or mostly) in their visual representations and not in their epithets. It appears that the local population complied with the language and linguistical variations of gods and their epithets, but visually or conceptually they had expressed at least some of their own ideas. Perhaps, when looking through the glocalization lens we should even consider the material used for a votive dedication, as is the case with the dedication to Minerva made of clay, albeit from Vinkovci (Cibalea) in Pannonia.⁹⁸ In terms of the similarity in rareness to a clay altar but with reference to the

95 Maršić, Baraka Perica 2020: 163.

96 Giunio 2013: 103–116.

97 Giunio 2013: 106.

98 Perinić 1999–2000: 417–424.

epithets, there are divine epithets or titles that had a cultic significance, since they appear in dedications to gods in other religious contexts, while others are considered as literary-antiquarian mentions of, e.g., builders of temples or dedicators of statues. Sometimes, almost equally rarely to clay votive inscriptions, a monument given to a deity may have been recorded by an epithet coined from an artist's name (e.g., Isis Athenodoria).⁹⁹ There is a possibility that Venus Aronia, from earlier in the text, could possibly fit in this category mentioned by Kajava. Paraphrasing Ittai Gradel, this approach of taking all the sources equally seriously, whether literary, epigraphic, iconographic, or archaeological might resemble the nineteenth-century optimism. Together with the idea that if all the sources be collected and published, some kind of ultimate truth would become attainable.¹⁰⁰ Be it an antiquated optimism or not, time and again we are reminded that the danger of creating conclusions based on an incomplete set of data (e.g., only epigraphic votive monuments) lies not in that the results are going to be necessarily wrong. But the danger lies in that the result is going to be – accidentally correct.

I wish to express my gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive criticism and helpful remarks.

⁹⁹ Kajava 2022: 4, 87–88.
¹⁰⁰ Gradel 2005: 260–261.

LITERATURE / LITERATURA

- Bauman 1998 Zygmunt Bauman, On Glocalization: Or Globalization for Some, Localization for Some Others, *Thesis Eleven* 54, 1998, 37–49.
- Bekavac 2011 Silvija Bekavac, Silvan u Saloni, *VAPD* 104, 2011, 151–166.
- Bert Lott 2014–2015 Jonh Bert Lott, The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside Of Rome, *CJ* 110/2, December 2014 – January 2015, 129–158.
- Bulić 1907 Frane Bulić, Sterro di una chiesa antica christiana del VI sec. nella località detta Crkvina a Klapavice, nel comune censuario di Klis (Clissa), *BASD* XXX, 1907, 117–120.
- Burchett 1918 Bessie Rebecca Burchett, *Janus In Roman Life And Cult, A Study In Roman Religions*, PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1918.
- Cambi 2005 Nenad Cambi, *Kiparstvo rimske Dalmacije*, Split, 2005.
- Cesarik, Štrmelj 2016 Nikola Cesarik, David Štrmelj, An Altar Dedicated to Jupiter Depulsor from Varvaria, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie* 199, 2016, 237–238.
- Demicheli 2011 Dino Demicheli, Neobjavljeni antički natpisi iz Muzeja Cetinske krajine i zbirke Franjevačkog samostana u Sinju, *IzdHAD* 27, 2011, 69–97.
- Demicheli 2016 Dino Demicheli, Nadgrobni natpis iz Klapavica sa spomenom centuriona kohorte *VIII voluntariorum* Gaja Alazinija Valentina, *Diadora* 30, 2016, 109–122.
- Dorcey 1992 Peter F. Dorcey, *The cult of Silvanus. A study in Roman folk religion*, Leiden–New York–Köln, 1992.
- Džino 2012 Danijel Džino, The cult of Silvanus: Rethinking provincial identities in Roman Dalmatia, *VAMZ*, 3. s., XLV, 2012, 261–278.
- Džino 2017 Danijel Džino, Sculptor Maximinus and his images of the goddess Diana and the girl Lupa from the Dalmatian hinterland, *Illyrica Antiqua* 2, Zagreb, 2017, 335–345.
- Fishwick 1976 Duncan Fishwick, Augustus deus and deus Augustus, in: M. B. de Boer, T. L. Edridge (Eds), *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren*, Tome 68, Vol. I–III, Leiden, 1976, 375–380.
- Fishwick 1978 Duncan Fishwick, The Development of provincial ruler worship in the western Roman Empire, *ANRW* II,16,2, Berlin–New York, 1978, 1201–1253.
- Fishwick 1991 Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 2, Leiden, 1991.
- Girardi Jurkić, 2005 Vesna Girardi Jurkić, *Duhovna kultura antičke Istre, knj. I: Kultovi u procesu romanizacije antičke Istre*, Zagreb, 2005.
- Giunio 2013 Kornelija A. Giunio, Ara Salonitana – Salonitanski odjeci kulta Dijane Aventinske, *Tusculum* 6, 2013, 104–113.
- Glavaš 2016 Ivo Glavaš, Konzularni beneficijariji u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji, *Mala biblioteka Godišnjaka zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 17, 2016.

- Glučina 2012 Toni Glučina, *Prikazi Artemide/Dijane u antičkoj Dalmaciji*, unpublished MA thesis, University of Zadar, 2012.
- Gradel 2002 Ittai Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, Oxford, 2002.
- Gradel 2005 Ittai Gradel, The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire: Provincial Cult by D. Fishwick, Review, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 95, 2005, 260–261.
- Gunjača 1968–1969 Zlatko Gunjača, Reljef Silvana Messora iz Ridera, *VHAD* 70–71, 1968–1969, 177–184.
- Hodos 2017 Tamar Hodos, Globalization: Some Basics, in: T. Hodos (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Globalization and Archaeology*, London, 2017, 3–11.
- Hingley 2005 Richard Hingley, *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire*, London, 2005.
- Imamović 1977 Enver Imamović, *Antički kulturni i votivni spomenici na području BiH*, Sarajevo, 1977.
- Johns 1971 Catherine Johns, A Roman Bronze Statuette of Epona, *The British Museum Quarterly* 36/1–2, 1971, 37–41.
- Jelinčić, Perinić Muratović 2010 Kristina Jelinčić, Ljubica Perinić Muratović, New archaeological finds from Postira on the island of Brač, *PIAZ* 27, 2010, 177–216.
- Kajanto 1965 Iiro Kajanto, The Latin cognomina, *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, XXXVI,2, Helsinki, 1965.
- Kurilić 1999 Anamarija Kurilić, *Pučanstvo Liburnije od 1. do 3. st. poslije Kr.: antroponimija, društvena struktura, etničke promjene, gospodarske uloge*, doktorska disertacija, Sveučilište u Zadru, 1999.
- Kurilić 2002 Anamarija Kurilić, Liburnski antroponimi, *Folia onomastica Croatica* 11, 2002, 123–147.
- Linderski 2016 J. Linderski, *Epithets, divine, Roman*, Oxford Classical Dictionary, <https://oxfordre.com/classics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.001.0001/acrefore-9780199381135-e-7198> (retrieved 3 Oct. 2023).
- Linduff 1979 Katheryn M. Linduff, Epona, a Celt among the Romans, *Latomus*, 38/4, 1979, 817–837.
- Mac Mahon 2003 Ardle Mac Mahon, The Realm of Janus: Doorways in the Roman World, 58–73, in: G. Carr, E. Swift, J. Weekes (Eds), *TRAC 2002: Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Canterbury 2002*, Oxford, 2003.
- Marin et al. 1999 Emilio Marin, Marc Mayer, Gianfranco Paci, Isabel Rodà, *Corpus inscriptionum Naronitanarum I, Erešova kula – Vid, Macerata–Split*, 1999.
- Marević 2010 Jozo Marević, *Latinsko-hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, sv. 1, Zagreb, 2010.
- Maršić 1997–1998 Dražen Maršić, Ikonografski tip nimfa sa školjkama, *VAMZ* 3. s., 30–31, 1997–1998, 103–124.
- Maršić, Baraka Perica 2020 Dražen Maršić, Josipa Baraka Perica, Dijana lovkinja na reljefu iz Muzeja grada Kaštela, *IzdHAD* 33, 2020, 157–167.

- Matijević 2009 Ivan Matijević, *Cohors VIII Voluntariorum civium Romanorum* i neki njezini pripadnici u službi namjesnika provincije Dalmacije, *Tusculum* 2, 2009, 45–58.
- Medini 1973 Julijan Medini, *Antički kultovi na prostoru ilirskih plemena Histra, Liburna i Delmata*, magistarski rad, Zagreb, 1973.
- Medini 1976 Julijan Medini, Rimska i orijentalne religije na istočnoj obali Jadrana, *Materijali* 12, 1976, 190–191.
- Migotti 2007 Branka Migotti, Rimska bula u Panoniji, *VAMZ*, 3. s., XL, 2007, 187–219.
- Milićević Bradač 2008 Marina Milićević Bradač, Dijana izvan grada, *AAdr* 2, 2008, 359–366.
- Montoya González 2021 Rubén Montoya González, The Global, the Local, and the Global, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 66, 2021, 92–114.
- Müller 1943 Valentine Müller, The Shrine of Janus Geminus in Rome, *AJA* 47/4, 1943, 437–440.
- Nordh 1949 Arvast Nordh, *Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae*, Curiosum and Notitia Urbis Romae, Lund, 1949.
- Palmer 1976 Robert E. A. Palmer, Juppiter Blaze, gods of the hills, and the Roman topography of CIL VI 377, *AJA* 80/1, 1976, 43–56.
- Patsch 1907 Karl Patsch, Iz rimske varoši u Skelanima, *GZM* 19, 1907, 431–470.
- Perinić 1999–2000 Ljubica Perinić, O zavjetnom natpisu Minervi, *OA* 23–24, 1999–2000, 417–424.
- Perinić 2015 Ljubica Perinić, Različite razine sinkretizma na tri Silvanova spomenika, *PIAZ* 32, 2015, 215–228.
- Perinić 2016 Ljubica Perinić, *The Nature and Origin of the Cult of Silvanus in the Roman Provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia*, Archaeopress, Roman Archaeology 19, Oxford, 2016.
- Perinić 2020 Ljubica Perinić, Silvanus' altar from Prozor, *Monumenta aereque perenniora*, Zagreb, 2020, 424–431.
- A. Rendić-Miočević 1982 Ante Rendić-Miočević, Uz dva Silvanova svetišta u okolini Salone, *ARR* 8–9, 1982, 121–140.
- A. Rendić-Miočević 2003 Ante Rendić-Miočević, Les traditions autochtones dans les représentations culturelles figurées sur le territoire des Dalmates Illyriens, *Romanisation und Resistenz in Plastik, Architektur und Inschriften der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum, Akten des VII. Internationalen Colloquiums über Probleme des provinzial-römischen Kunstschaßens*, Köln, 2003, 407–419.
- D. Rendić-Miočević 1950–1951 Duje Rendić-Miočević, Ilirska onomastika na latinskim natpisima Dalmacije, *VHAD* 53, 1950–1951, 200–253.
- D. Rendić-Miočević 1951a Duje Rendić-Miočević, Onomastička pitanja s teritorija ilirskih Delmata, *GZM*, n.s. 6, 1951, 33–48.
- D. Rendić-Miočević 1951b Duje Rendić-Miočević, Novi ilirski epigrafički spomenici iz Ridera, *GZM*, n.s. 6, 1951, 49–64.
- D. Rendić-Miočević 1989a Duje Rendić-Miočević, Ilirske predstave Silvana na kulturnim slikama s područja Delmata, *Iliri i antički svijet*, Split, 1989, 461–507.

- D. Rendić-Miočević 1989b D. Rendić-Miočević, Dva antička signirana reljefa iz radionice majstora Maksimina, in: Rendić-Miočević 1989a, 559–570 (originally published in *ARR* 4–5 [1967]).
- Robertson 1995 Roland Robertson, Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity, in: M. Featherstone *et al.* (Eds), *Global Modernities*, London, 1995, 25–44.
- Roudometof 2016 Victor N. Roudometof, *Glocalization: A Critical Introduction*, New York–Oxford, 2016.
- Sanader 2008 Mirjana Sanader, O antičkom kultu u Hrvatskoj, *VAPD* 101, 2008, 157–186.
- Sanader 2015 Mirjana Sanader, Der Januskult in den Provinzen des Römischen Reiches unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ikonographie zweier Reliefs aus Dalmatien und Dakien, *Acta des XIII. internationalen Kolloquium: Provinzialrömisches Kunstschaffen*, Cluj–Napoca, 2015, 139–147.
- Sanader 2016 Mirjana Sanader, Janov kult u Dalmaciji, *Diadora* 30, 2016, 123–148.
- Schraudolph 1993 Ellen Schraudolph, *Römische Götterweihungen mit Relief-schmuck aus Italien. Altäre, Basen und Reliefs*, Archäologie und Geschichte, Band 2. Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte, Heidelberg, 1993.
- Suić 1952 Mate Suić, Neobjelodanjeni rimski natpisi iz sjeverne Dalmacije, *VAHD* 54, 1952, 207–214.
- Schmidt Heidenreich 2013 Christophe Schmidt Heidenreich, *Le glaive et l'autel. Camps et piété militaires sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Rennes, 2013.
- Sergejevski 1929 Dimitrije Sergejevski, Dijana i Silvan, *GZM* 41, 1929, 95–99.
- Sinobad 2010 Marko Sinobad, Jupiter i njegovi štovatelji u svjetlu epigrafskih izvora na području Hrvatske, *OA* 34, 2020, 145–229.
- Šašel Kos 2003 Marjeta Šašel Kos, Ananca: Greek Ananke Worshipped At Doclea (Dalmatia), An enigmatic dedication, *Studia epigraphica in memoriam Géza Alföldy herausgegeben von Werner Eck, Bence Fehér und Péter Kovács*, Bonn, 2003, 295–307.
- Škegro 1998 Ante Škegro, Eksploatacija srebra na području rimskih provincija Dalmacije i Panonije, *OA* 22, 1998, 89–117.
- Škegro 1999 Ante Škegro, *Gospodarstvo rimske provincije Dalmacije*, Zagreb, 1999.
- Taylor 2000 Rabun Taylor, Watching the Skies: Janus, Auspication, and the Shrine in the Roman Forum, *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 45, 2000, 1–403.
- Tončinić 2004 Domagoj Tončinić, Votive altar from Tilurium, *OA* 28/1, 2004, 147–157.
- Villaret 2019 Alain Villaret, *Les dieux augustes dans l'occident romain: Un phénomène d'acculturation*, Paris, 2019.
- Vukov 2018 Mirna Vukov, *Između tradicije i modifikacije. Rimski zavjetni žrtvenici u hrvatskoj kao pokazatelji razvoja gospodarstva i društva u provincijama*, PhD dissertation, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, 2018.
- Zović, Kurilić, 2015 Valentina Zović, Anamarija Kurilić, Strukture zavjetnih natpisa rimske Liburnije, *AV* 66, 2015, 399–453.

SAŽETAK

Primjeri globalizacije božanskih epiteta u rimskoj Dalmaciji

U radu se kroz šest kategorija epiteta, koje je definirao J. Linderski, donosi pregled rečenih kategorija koje su, tamo gdje je bilo moguće, poduprte primjerima iz provincije Dalmacije. Cilj rada bio je ustanoviti u kojoj se od šest kategorija mogu pronaći elementi globalizacije odnosno njeni primjeri. Pregledom natpisa ustanovljeno je da se globalizacija može ustanoviti samo kod dva božanstva (Silvan i Dijana), te se kao protuteža njima suprotstavlja Janov kult, koji prema trenutnom stanju nalaza ne pokazuje nikakve elemente globalizacije, odnosno kult je nepromijenjen u odnosu na svoju pojavnost u zemlji porijekla. Konačno, ono što je započelo kao istraživanje božanskih epiteta kako bi se pronašlo elemente globalizacije, završilo je nužnim širenjem fokusa kako bi se pokrili i ikonografski elementi kultova.

Ukratko, svi primjeri epiteta i ikonografskih specifičnosti promatrani kroz leću globalizacije pokazuju nam da, kad je religija u pitanju, uzimanje u obzir samo epiteta ili samo ikonografskih prikaza ne funkcionira odvojeno, odnosno stvaranje slike kulta i njegovih općih karakteristika u tom je smislu manjkavo. Ovakav prikaz promijenjenog globalizacijskog okvira opet i iznova otkriva složenost religije i njene pojavnosti, bilo da je riječ o zavjetnim natpisima ili figuralnim prikazima božanstava. Kada se svaka od značajki pojavnosti razmatra pojedinačno, rezultati će biti iskrivljeni.