Jörg Rüpke

Divine Names and Naming the Divine in Livy

Abstract: Analyses of the practices of addressing and naming the divine based only on inscriptions run the risk of only partially grasping religious communication. The same holds true for analyses of literary texts as proposed here. This chapter will analyse a large corpus of text, Livy's History *Ab urbe condita*. Although the text is the product of just one author, it includes a variety of direct and indirect speech and refers to a vast range of historical situations and agents. The focus will be on two questions: How are deities invoked by the authors and their protagonists in open discourse, either in the form of invocations or by speaking about the divine and divinities? And how is such discourse reported in these genres which (unlike in the epic genre, for instance) generally do not grant agency to the divine? Methodically, Livy's narratives are read as a reflection on those of other people and as instances of the author's practices of naming the divine.

1 Introduction

Gods do not have names, but gods are created by being addressed in a specific type of communication that we call "religious". It is characterized by involving addressees beyond those who are unquestionably plausible within a given situation like human agents.[1] On such a conceptual basis, divine names can be analysed as signs in social strategies rather than indications of some essence of referents that have some continuing existence beyond the acts of referring to them. Here, the "Lived ancient religion" approach and the conceptual tools of "Mapping ancient polytheism" overlap.[2] Both are concerned with a more precise description and understanding of the use of divine names. How do ancient religious agents employ and continue a strategy that suggests a plurality of divine addressees to the practitioners and their audiences? The question, then, is not, "What is ancient (or rather, Mediterranean[3])

1 Thus Rüpke 2015. – I am grateful to Maria Pätzold, Erfurt, for her careful reading of the first draft of this text. I enjoyed working on this text in the framework of the Graduate School "Resonant self-world relationships" (DFG, IRT 2283).

2 See Rüpke 2012b; Bonnet *et al.* 2019; Bonnet 2019; Galoppin *et al.* (eds.) 2022; Rüpke 2021, 66–83; for the constructionist approach at the basis, see Belayche/Pirenne-Delforge (eds.) 2015; Bonnet *et al.* (eds.) 2017.

3 Given the multiple renaissances and ongoing practices (see, *e.g.*, Barbera/Contessa/Barbera 2021 for an account of and invitation to contemporary Roman polytheism; and Gladigow 1998; Gladigow 2002), the purely temporal definition, implying a claim about the irrevocable end of the practices analysed, seems rather out of place.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111326511-007

polytheism?"[4] Instead, we need to ask how polytheism is done and for which purposes.

Against this wider background, the task envisaged in this chapter becomes much smaller, focusing on polytheistic strategies in Latin texts and on the Italian peninsula. Latin, admittedly, is rather on the margins of the MAP project and its database. The textual remnants of the ancient Mediterranean and circum-Mediterranean world consist mainly of Greek and cuneiform texts rather than Latin letters. Yet, in a comparative perspective on naming practices in religious communication, the Latin material is interesting as it not only shares the geographical space but also many cultural traditions, and it developed in a world pre-formatted by near-Eastern and Greek and Hellenistic practices and ideas.

Texts are bound to situations and their generic traditions, even if we allow for flexibility and a critical and innovative engagement of speakers with predecessors and traditions. Thus, analyses of the practices of addressing and naming the divine based only on inscriptions run the risk of grasping only one segment of religious communication, albeit the one that has been particularly overlooked in systemic reconstructions that were built on a few canonical texts like Homer or Varro. Of course, the same critique holds true for analyses of literary texts as proposed here. Thus, I do not claim to offer a better view but simply complementary evidence. To avoid such an addition being based on too small a foundation, my analysis is rooted in a multi-volume text, Livy's History *Ab urbe condita*. The text, although it is the product of just one author, includes a variety of direct and indirect speeches and refers to a vast range of historical situations and agents.

The focus will be on a twofold question: How are deities invoked by the authors and their protagonists in open discourse, either in the form of invocations or by speaking about the divine and divinities? And, how is such discourse reported in a genre, historiography, which (unlike in epic, for instance) generally does not grant agency to the divine? Methodically, I take Livy's narrative to be as much a reflection on other people's narratives as well as instances of the author's practices of naming the divine. It is in a close reading and contextualising interpretation of relevant passages against the overall practices statistically graspable in the extant books that these aspects have to be disentangled. The analysis is carried out using the tools of TUSTEP, allowing a search for complex and varying strings and displaying contexts of a defined size.[5] It is embedded in a sketch of the text's origin and communicative situation. To summarise the relationship of such data with epigraphic sources: Whereas the latter are typically consciously designed and extremely abbreviated and selective reports on, or continuations of, rituals, with Livy, we are in the realm of invented or reported rituals within the non-religious speech acts of historiography.

4 Brelich 1960; Detienne 1986; Scheid 1987; Ahn 1993; Rüpke 2012a; Van Andringa 2014; Miano 2019; cf. Rüpke 2013.

5 For further information, see http://www.tustep.uni-tuebingen.de (accessed 20th February, 2023).

2 Livy

Little is known about the life of Titus Livius.[6] There is no ancient biography of Livy. He was presumably born in 59 BCE, or at least Jerome gives Livy's birth under this year – together with Valerius Messalla whom, however, we know for sure was born in 64 BCE. According to Jerome's *Chronicle*, Livy died in 17 CE, so he would have lived for seventy-five years. As an Italian, he consciously experienced the civil war between Caesar and Pompey when he was young and gathered his formative impressions in the subsequent conflict between Octavian and Marcus Antonius.

Livy was born in Patavium, today's Padua, which at the time of his birth was not yet part of Italia but Gallia Transpadana. Patavium only became a municipality in 41 BCE but was a large town by ancient standards. There are ancient, albeit disputed, reports that he wrote philosophical texts, but they may have veered heavily into the historical sphere. None of these texts have survived. However, Livy had educational deficits in many areas that are noticeable in his historical work. Above all, he did not belong to the Roman elite and had no political experience whatsoever, not even military experience.

It is this Livy who, after the conclusion of the civil wars, began his account of Roman history in about the year 29 or 28 BCE. Since he was dedicated to his work throughout his life, he must have written about three to four history books per year. He composed a work that has become canonical for Roman history[7] and that in this respect is comparable to Vergil's *Aeneid,* also an outsider, originating from Mantua. Literary texts and the relationship of such texts with the places that they thematised were much more mobile than inscriptions. However, Livy wrote most of his history in Rome, where he had the necessary sources at his direct disposal. He died at Padua, which means that he must have moved back to Padua some, perhaps even several, years before his death, leaving the court where he had become acquainted with Augustus, who described him as a Pompeian, a friend of the Republic, and where he seems to have had an influence on the later emperor Claudius, awakening historical interests in him. Livy was writing for a society that had just survived a civil war and seemed to be moving on to another epoch.

Livy's main achievement is not that he thoroughly examined the sources available to him and thus made them available to us, but rather that he made history readable, sometimes telling it quickly, covering long stretches of time in a few sentences. Yet, time and again he also vividly shaped individual episodes and thus in many ways provided the material for stories – now clearly in the plural – that shaped the image of Rome for two millennia to come.

6 The following introduction is based on Rüpke 2014.

7 Cf. Grandazzi 1997; Liou-Gille 2003; 2004.

Livy was not concerned with pragmatic historiography, *i.e.*, he was not writing for politicians who were supposed to see how the Roman Republic works and how to deal with the Senate and the People's Assembly in a successful way. In his urban history, Livy was more interested in what we can perhaps call "human interest". He was concerned with individual fates, moral probation in history, and at times also with the victims of history and what people went through and experienced. He wanted to make history tangible, and his way of presenting it was geared towards this end. That is why he wrote speeches and dialogues covering all phases of Roman history and easily crossing the borderlines of history and myth.[8] *Enargeia*, meaning vividness in representation, or *evidentia*, vividness,[9] were Livy's central representational goal.

We cannot turn to Livy's treatment of naming the divine without acknowledging that Livy, despite his geographical and social distance to most of the Roman actors he portrayed, had astonishing insights; insights that one might refer to the fields of psychology, social science and economics, but which can always be traced back to insights into basic psychological mechanisms, that is, into how human beings function. One example is how he observed and reflected on price increases in crisis situations: Whenever international relations worsened, prices went up, he noticed, even though antiquity and Livy, too, had no knowledge of market theories where prices are understood to be the result of supply and demand; prices were rather assumed to be a given. In such situations, too, the number of observations regarding signs, prodigies, *omina,* went up. This, again, is an observation that is not made by a critic of religion, but by a Livy who concluded his preface with the invocation of gods and who also repeatedly made it clear that he felt quite at home in traditional religion, in traditional cults. Nevertheless, Livy analysed religion. From a psychological perspective, he repeatedly showed how religion is subject to manipulation attempts and can also be successfully used to manipulate soldiers and civilians.

3 Naming the Divine

Subsequently, how are practices of naming addressees in communication with the divine represented in such a text and in such perspectives? Clearly, Livy did not offer a theology or a philosophy of history that attributes substantial agency to divine powers.[10] Nevertheless, religious practices and the divinities that are addressed and attributed agency in said practices make up important elements of Roman traditions, institutions and political procedures. Accordingly, they loom large in narratives of Roman history, in

8 Mineo 2010; Khariouzov 2013; cf. Ortoleva 2019 for less dramatized daily myth as a widespread communicative tool.

9 See *ibid*.

10 Cf. Stübler 1941; Walsh 1961; Liou-Gille 1998.

Republican and later accounts as much as in Livy himself. Livy is a reflective observer of the technicalities but above all of the political importance and emotional implications of what we would summarise as "religion".[11] In such a role, religious rituals and gods have a substantial presence in his narrative.

Methodologically, I will start with the use of divine names and analyse their forms and modes of employment. Against the background of a general attempt to better understand ancient polytheism, I am particularly interested in the strategies for individualising the divine and will contrast that with collectivising practices of naming.

3.1 Individual Deities

I will start with a simple case, Mercurius.[12] This name is used six times in the extant books 1–10 and 22–45. The dedication of a temple (*aedes*) to him in Rome is mentioned in 2.21.7; this action is again referred to in 2.27.5, depicting a competition between the two ruling consuls as to who should perform the dedication. The Senate delegates the decision about the issue to the people, connecting the role of dedication with the administration of the grain distribution (*annona*) and the foundation of a guild of merchants (*mercatorum collegium*) and organisation of the whole ritual, instead of to a *pontifex*, typically employed as master of such ceremonies. Later, a "hump which they call 'that of Mercury'" (*tumulum quem Mercuri uocant*) is mentioned as the aim of a movement by Scipio during the assault on Carthage (26.44.6), evidently thus referring to a Punic deity. Apart from that, the name is only used to refer to an individualised divine figure twice more. In both cases, it is in the description of a *lectisternium*, a banquet for several, in the second instance, twelve gods represented in the form of busts (this information is given by Livy only in 40.59.7), narrated in 5.13.6 (399 BCE) as well as 22.10.9 (217 BCE). Both passages are prominent due to the names of the gods all listed in each instance as recipients of cult. This is the first one:

> *Duumuiri sacris faciundis, lectisternio tunc primum in urbe Romana facto, per dies octo Apollinem Latonamque et Dianam, Herculem, Mercurium atque Neptunum tribus quam amplissime tum apparari poterat stratis lectis placauere* (5.13.6).
>
> In the form of the first 'Lectisternium' ever at Rome, the Two-men for rituals appeased Apollo and Latona and Diana, Hercules, Mercury and Neptune on three couches as luxurious as could be provided for in those days, for eight days in a row.

It is the specialists on foreign cults that are prominent in this instance. They react after the Senate has ordered them to inspect the verses of the "Sibylline books" to find a rit-

11 See Scheid 2015; for the concept of religion employed here, see Rüpke 2021; Rüpke 2007.

12 On the contemporary images associated with that name in Italy, Combet-Farnoux 1980; Combet Farnoux 1981; Miller 1991; MacRae 2019.

ual solution to an ongoing epidemic connected to a heat wave (5.13.4–5) that Livy describes as being caused by an imbalanced, "excessive" climate or "some other reason" – the historiographer offers a rationalist explanation on the same footing as less transparent ones. The ritual is described in a summarily manner but leaving space for historical imagination without supplying anachronistic details: The busts (these details must be provided by the readers, relying on their own knowledge) are placed "on three couches as luxurious as possible in those days". The six gods placed in pairs clearly indicated by a *-que*, an asyndeton after *et* and a pair connected by *atque* are all addressed by name tags of one element each without any indication of the provenance of the busts or connection to temples. The opening triad, headed by Apollo who had already been introduced as a deity related to pestilences (4.25.3), clearly referred to genealogical connections known to contemporary readers (but hardly any fourth-century Roman ones) from Greek mythology as reflected in late Republican and Augustan cult.[13] In contrast to the version given in the slightly later text by Dionysios of Halikarnassos but representing the earlier version of L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi's annals from the last third of the second century BCE, where the second couch is occupied by Herakles and Artemis, Livy inverts the sequence and creates two triads rather than three pairs.

The reader is left to speculate on the relations of the remaining gods. Hercules had been presented as an important figure in early Roman history (the killer of the cattle thief, Geryon) and a figure of Greek-style ritual at the beginning of book 1 (1.7.3–7). Mercurius had been introduced before, as indicated above, as referring to divine power related to merchants (2.27.5) but is now somehow drawn into a Greek context, perhaps suggesting a Hermes. In the same vein, Neptunus might also be intended to be read as Poseidon rather than as an abbreviation of the Neptunus Equestris given that the festival of Consualia already existed in the time of Romulus (1.9.2). Livy shortens the account of Piso when reporting on the private forms of the same celebration but adds a theological reason for the loosening of chains, namely that there was a scruple (*religioni deinde fuisse*) surrounding keeping that person in chains to whom the gods brought help (*quibus eam opem di tulissent,* 5.13.7–8). Here, Livy switches to the generic terms of *religio* and *di*. Subsequently, this extended and far-reaching ritual was repeated several times. Counting the cases, Livy names the third to fifth occasions (7.2.2 for 364, 7.27.1 for 349, and 8.25.1 for 326), implying on the last occasion that the divine name and probably also the ritual procedures used remained the same (*iisdem quibus ante placandis*).

When the ritual is named again after the lacuna of books 11–20, the number of names and bust employed had been extended, the period shortened:

> *Tum lectisternium per triduum habitum decemuiris sacrorum curantibus: sex puluinaria in conspectu fuerunt, Ioui ac Iunoni unum, alterum Neptuno ac Mineruae, tertium Marti ac Veneri, quartum Apollini ac Dianae, quintum Volcano ac Vestae, sextum Mercurio et Cereri* (22.10.9).

13 Latte 1960, 242–3, referring to Plin. *Nat.* 36.34 and *CIL* 6.32.

> Then a Lectisternium for three days was held, organised by the Ten-men for rituals: six cushioned couches were in full sight, for Iuppiter and Iuno one, another for Neptune and Minerva, a third for Mars and Venus, a fourth for Apollo and Diana, a fifth for Volcanus and Vesta, a sixth for Mercury and Ceres.

As in Livy's earlier source, Piso, the couches are numbered. Thus, six pairs of a male and a female name are generated. Again, all the names are tags of a single element each and contain no further topographical indication. Diana, for instance, is included again. Cult to a deity including that theonym had been mentioned before only once, in 1.45.2–7, an aetiology of the sanctuary of the federal deity of the Latins being placed at Rome and hence acknowledging the hegemonic position of that city:[14]

> *iam tum erat inclitum* Dianae Ephesiae fanum*; id communiter a ciuitatibus Asiae factum fama ferebat. eum consensum deosque consociatos laudare mire Seruius inter proceres Latinorum, cum quibus publice priuatimque hospitia amicitiasque de industria iunxerat. saepe iterando eadem perpulit tandem, ut* Romae fanum Dianae *populi Latini cum populo Romano facerent.*
>
> *(3) ea erat confessio caput rerum Romam esse, de quo totiens armis certatum fuerat. id quamquam omissum iam ex omnium cura Latinorum ob rem totiens infeliciter temptatam armis uidebatur, uni se ex Sabinis fors dare uisa est priuato consilio imperii reciperandi. (4) bos in Sabinis nata cuidam patri familiae dicitur miranda magnitudine ac specie; fixa per multas aetates cornua in uestibulo* templi Dianae *monumentum ei fuere miraculo. (5) habita, ut erat, res prodigii loco est, et cecinere uates cuius ciuitatis eam ciuis* Dianae immolasset*, ibi fore imperium; (6) idque carmen peruenerat ad antistitem* fani Dianae *Sabinusque ut prima apta dies sacrificio uisa est, bouem Romam actam deducit ad* fanum Dianae *et ante aram statuit. ibi antistes Romanus, cum eum magnitudo uictimae celebrata fama mouisset, memor responsi Sabinum ita adloquitur: "quidnam tu, hospes, paras?" inquit, "inceste* sacrificium Dianae *facere? quin tu ante uiuo perfunderis flumine? infima ualle praefluit Tiberis." (7) religione tactus hospes, qui omnia, ut prodigio responderet euentus, cuperet rite facta, extemplo descendit ad Tiberim; interea Romanus* immolat Dianae *bouem. id mire gratum regi atque ciuitati fuit.*

> Already in those days the *sanctuary for the Ephesian Diana* was famous; it was thought to be jointly constructed by the polities of Asia. This unanimity and the combining of the gods was in a remarkable manner commended by Servius in front of the leading heads of the Latins, with whom he had assiduously formed an alliance in public and private forms of mutual hospitality and friendship. By frequent repetition of this discourse he finally reached that *at Rome a sanctuary of Diana* was realized by the Latin tribes together with the Roman people.
>
> (3) It was generally admitted that Rome was the *hegemon*, a role about which so many times had been fought with arms. This seemed to have been stopped already by the zeal of all Latins as the issue has been so often vainly tried by arms; yet an individual from the Sabines was of the opinion that good fortune was offering herself to him in a private plan to recover domination. (4) A cow was born to some head of family in Sabine territory, it is said, of amazing size and shape (for long years the horns of that animal were fixed in the forecourt of the *temple of Diana* and served as a monument to that miracle). (5) The matter was taken, what in fact it was, as a prodigy and the soothsayers sang that with that polity of whom a citizen would ritually *slaughter* her *to Diana* domination would rest. (6) And the text of this prophecy had also reached the person responsible for the *sanctuary of Diana*. And the (abovementioned) Sabine when the first day suit-

14 On Diana and Diana Nemorensis, see Pairault 1969; Grazia/Cecere 2001; Green 2007.

> able for a sacrifice appeared led the cow, which he had driven to Rome, to the *sanctuary of Diana* and presented it in front of the altar. There, the responsible, a Roman, as the size of the victim, praised by the rumour, had affected him, now remembering the prophetic saying, addressed the Sabine as follows: "What, tell me, are you preparing for, visitor? To perform a *sacrifice to Diana* in unclean state? Why not bath in the living water before? At the bottom of the valley the Tiber flows by." (7) Impelled by the religious scruple, the visitor, who wanted to do everything in the correct way, so that the outcome corresponded to the prodigy, immediately descended to the Tiber; meanwhile the Roman ritually *slaughtered* the cow *to Diana*. That was in a remarkable manner welcome to the king and the polity.

The naming, marked in the quotations, brings together toponyms, theonyms and sanctuaries. Only within such a clearly defined context could rituals addressed to the deity be described by the isolated tag *Diana*. A further temple is mentioned in 39.2.8: *aedem Dianae uouit* ("he vowed a temple to Diana"); all other references (13) refer to the *aedes Dianae* as a spatial reference; twice, a festival (*diem festum, sacrum anniversarium*) is mentioned, once for Rome (25.13.14) and once for Eretria (35.38.3). A passage in 10.27.9 is best understood in a metonymic sense (hunting).

Volcanus figures only in one of the Lectisternia (22.10.9); thrice he is mentioned as a recipient of a vow (1.37.5; 8.10.13; 23.46.5 in 215 BCE), apart from that his name is part of a toponym.[15] The short notices about the vows are worth looking at in some detail. In the first instance, Livy reports the burning of arms after a victory and comments in parenthesis: *id uotum Volcano erat*, "this was a promised gift for Volcanus" (as I have shown elsewhere, the use of the concept of "vow" is anachronistic for the early and middle republican period and even more so for the regal period narrated here[16]). In the next instance, the famous *se deuouere* ("devote himself") of the M. Decius Mus, it is again arms on the topographically underdefined battlefield that are considered objects of a vow: *Volcano arma siue cui alii diuo uovere volet ius est* ("has the right to dedicate his arms to Vulcan, or to any other god he likes",[17] 8.10.13). This is bordering on a metonymic use similar to the previous one: It is fine to either burn the weapons or display them as war trophies in whatever sanctuary. Marcellus makes the choice in 23.46.5 (*spolia hostium Marcellus Volcano uotum creamuit* – "Marcellus burnt the spoils taken from the enemies as a promised gift to Volcanus") and by Scipio in 30.6.9 (. . . *magna uis armorum capta; ea omnia imperator Volcano sacrata incendit* – ". . . a large amount of weapons was seized; the general alighted them all as consecrated to Volcanus"). At the temple on the Campus Martius, a statue is mentioned as the place of prodigies (24.10.9; 32.29.1; 34.45.6) without any further elaboration.

15 *E.g.*, 9.46.6 *area Volcani*, 24.10.9: the temple on the Campus Martius. On the figure and the *volcanal* in the Roman forum, Capdeville 1995; Carafa 2005.

16 Rüpke 2018b.

17 Transl. B.O. Foster (*LCL*).

Such a pattern is repeated on a slightly larger scale for Venus.[18] Usually, she is mentioned as part of the name tag of a temple (*e.g.* 10.31.9, *prope Circum*, "near the Circus"), the Sicilian Venus Erycina being most prominent (six times); three times she figures as a metaphor for sex as an ethnic characterisation. Such metaphorical prominence is shared with Mars, appearing thirteen times standing for "luck in war" or "fight between both parties".[19] In the genitive, he nearly always refers to a statue or temple, providing precise locations in eleven of twelve instances. As a recipient of ritual or cultic institutions in the dative, he is mentioned for receiving a priest of his own (1.20.2), twelve Salian priests (dancers, 1.20.4: for Mars Gradivus),[20] a vow (22.9.9), a complex sacrifice (*suovetaurilium*, 8.10.14) or – again – a *lectisternium* (as part of the list of twelve). Against this background, it is worth noting that name tags including *Mars* are used as addressees in prayers three times and always in a name made up of two elements, namely, twice for Mars Pater, once for Mars Gradivus (3.61.5 in indirect speech; 5.52.7 and 8.9.6 in direct). In the last instance, Mars Pater figures in one of the few long lists of deities opening a speech, or more precisely a prayer in direct speech, behind Ianus and Iuppiter and before Quirinus, Bellona, Lares, Divi Novensiles, Di Indigetes, and the even more vague *Diui quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque* ("gods in whose power are both we and the enemies"[21]) and *Di Manes*, a list uttered by the consul Decius immediately before his famous military self-sacrifice, imploring the gods to help him to "vow himself down" to the Deified dead (*dis manibus*) and Tellur (8.9.4–10), an incidence dated by Livy to 340 BCE, but an antiquarian invention in all its details:[22]

> *In hac trepidatione Decius consul M. Valerium magna uoce inclamat. "deorum" inquit, "ope, M. Valeri, opus est; agedum, pontifex publicus populi Romani, praei uerba quibus me pro legionibus deuoueam." (5) pontifex eum togam praetextam sumere iussit et uelato capite, manu subter togam ad mentum exserta, super telum subiectum pedibus stantem sic dicere: (6) "Iane, Iuppiter, Mars Pater, Quirine, Bellona, Lares, Diui Nouensiles, Di Indigetes, Diui, quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque, (7) Dique Manes, uos precor ueneror, ueniam peto feroque, uti populo Romano Quiritium uim uictoriam prosperetis hostesque populi Romani Quiritium terrore formidine morteque adficiatis. (8) sicut uerbis nuncupaui, ita pro re publica Quiritium, exercitu, legionibus, auxiliis populi Romani Quiritium, legiones auxiliaque hostium mecum Deis Manibus Tellurique deuoueo." haec ita precatus lictores ire ad T. Manlium iubet matureque collegae se deuotum pro exercitu nuntiare; (9) ipse incinctus cinctu Gabino, armatus in equum insiluit ac se in medios hostes immisit, (10) conspectus ab utraque acie, aliquanto augustior humano uisu, sicut caelo missus piaculum omnis deorum irae qui pestem ab suis auersam in hostes ferret.*

18 On the Roman deity, Schilling 1954; Castelli 1988; Elm von der Osten 2007.

19 In general, Arnold 1950; Petruševski 1967; Scholz 1970; Croon 1981; Hobbold 1995.

20 For further details, see Guittard 2008.

21 Transl. O.B. Foster (*LCL*), modified.

22 See Guittard 1988; Rüpke 2019, 157–162. Cf. on the formation of the tradition also Jocelyn 2000.

> Amid this perturbation the consul Decius called upon Marcus Valerius in a loud voice: "We need the help of the gods, Marcus Valerius. Come, public pontiff of the Roman people, recite the formula with which I can dedicate myself instead of the legions!" (5) The pontiff ordered him to put on his purple-broidered toga and to speak thus, with the head veiled and the hand extended to the chin below the toga and standing on a spear with his feet: "(6) "Ianus, Iuppiter, Mars Pater, Quirinus, Bellona, Lares, Divi Novensiles, Di Indigetes, Gods who you are commanding ourselves and our enemies, (7) ancestral gods, all of you I implore, solicit, and ask for the favour and bring the entitlement for that favour that you further the power and victory of the Roman people of Quirites and affect the enemies of the Roman people of Quirites by fear, horror and death. (8) As I put it literally, so for the commonweal of the Quirites, the army, legions, and the auxiliaries of the Roman people of Quirites, I devote the legions and auxiliaries of the enemies together with me to the ancestral gods and the Goddess Earth." Thus spoken, he ordered the lictors to go to Titus Manlius in order to quickly inform his colleague that he has dedicated himself for the sake of the army. (9) He himself girded himself in Gabine fashion [that is, gathering his garment], jumped in full armour onto his horse and threw himself into the centre of the enemies: (10) in full sight of both battle lines, somewhat more majestic than a human figure, like an atonement sent from heaven of all the wrath of the gods that carried the destruction averted from his own fellows onto the enemies.

This is the longest list of gods presented by Livy as part of a prayer. Praying people, politicians and generals in particular – Livy is fully realising the impact of religious performances by military leaders on their audiences and subsequently their career[23] –, are all part of Livy's narrative but their reported prayers rarely include long lists of the deities implored. Such addresses are introduced by *precor* eleven times, a few of them turning to (situationally) superior humans. Among the divinities addressed, we find: Tiberinus Pater (2.10.11); Pythian Apollo and Iuno Regina (5.21.3; see also 23.11.3; 29.10.6); Ceres Mater and Proserpina and the other local "celestial and infernal deities", *ceteri superi infernique di* at Sicilian Henna, recalling the pair from Eleusis (24.38.8). Scipio calls upon "gods and goddesses who care for the seas and lands", *divi divaeque qui maria terrasque colitis* (29.27.2), clearly thinking of a Roman empire that now, in 204 BCE, includes vast parts of the Mediterranean Sea in addition to the coastal countries around it. The same Scipio addressed just *deos* ("gods") earlier (28.36.6.), similar to Spurius Postumius calling upon *di immortales* ("immortal gods", 9.8.8) in 320 BCE. Attention must be directed to such collectives, too. Admittedly, I have left out several important deities, among them Iuppiter and Apollo, in the various tags including them that feature around 75 and 25 times.[24] In both cases, around half of all instances refer to these deities' temples (and occasionally statues); festivals as temporal determinations even accrue, in particular for the "games of Apollo". It is telling that the two instances in which Apollo figures in a triadic list with other likewise named deities in one-element tags, refer to rituals situated either in Greece

23 A detailed analysis in Albrecht 2020. On Roman prayer in general Chapot/Laurot 2001; Cottier 2006; Scheid 2007; Scheid 2008; Patzelt 2018.

24 Cf. for the importance of Apollo, Mineo 2013.

(Achaia in 32.25.5: Iuppiter, Apollo, Hercules) or derived from the Sibylline Books consisting of Greek verses and "foreign" rituals (40.37.2: Apollo, Aesculapius, Salus).

These data do not change the image obtained so far. In direct speech, the divine addressees typically carry a tag made up of two elements. Such two-element tags are even more frequently used as toponyms, now typically combing a theonym and a generic term of a sacralised place, mostly *aedes* or *fanum*. Occasionally, when speaking about a place outside of Rome, a three-element toponym might also include the name of a city, the sanctuary of Diana at Ephesus or of Diana at Rome being examples. Otherwise, simple theonyms are frequently used in the sense of general and geographically unspecified forces, ubiquitously at work: War, Erotic, Fire.

3.2 Collectives

The collective "gods" – typically *dei* respectively *di*, only rarely *divi*, and occasionally gendered as *di deaeque* ("gods and goddesses", *e.g.*, 3.17.3; 6.16.2) or *divi divaeque* ("divine ones of both sexes", 23.11.1; 29.27.1)[25] – figure prominently, about 300 times in the extant books. If we set aside the mentioning of specific temples, Livy has the narrator, and even more so his protagonists, speaking in direct or indirect speech referring to and directly hailing the divine in the plural collective form. The very few instances of Di Manes (*e.g.*, 10.29.4) or Di Penates (*e.g.*, 1.1.9; 1.47.4; 5.30.6) – special types of divine powers addressed in plural form – do not challenge the general findings.

Against the background of the use of individual names sketched above, it is noteworthy that there are only very few instances in which the plural *d(e)i* is used as an obvious shorthand for a longer list of individual names or an attempt to deal with identification issues. Such is clearly the case when the creation of individual rituals and priesthoods by Numa is reported, who acted on the advice of Egeria: *eius se monitu quae acceptissima dis essent sacra instituere, sacerdotes suos cuique deorum praeficere* ("on her advice he would establish those rituals that are the most welcome to the divinities and install individual priests to every single god", 1.19.5). In further instances, the use of a partitive genitive *deorum* suggests that one out of a group of individualised agents is envisaged (1.55.4; 3.25.8; 5.11.14; 8.30.9; 10.13.6; 23.9.3). Rituals like the *lectisternia* and their literary representation in the form of a list support such images.[26] The rarely used gendered pairing of "gods and goddesses" (references are given above) could have worked on comparable lines. Likewise, *multa deorum mentio*

25 On the phenomenon of gender uncertainty, see Galoppin/Grand-Clément/Bonnet 2021.

26 Cf. also the earthquake during such an event, 40.59.7: *terra mouit; in fanis publicis, ubi lectisternium erat, deorum capita, quae in lectis erant, auerterunt se, lanxque cum integumentis, quae Ioui apposita fuit, decidit de mensa* ("the earth trembled; in the public shrines where the lectisternia was held, the busts of the gods, that were positioned on couches, turned around, and the covered bowl that was put in front of Iuppiter fell down from the table"). For *lectisternia*, Berg 2008; Estienne 2011.

("frequent mentioning of the gods", 5.30.7) might suggest a similar imagination, yet as a shorthand for cult in general it might also just point to multiple occasions of addressing the collective divine. Without a doubt, investing in religion requires practices of individualisation, as exemplified in 41.20.8–9 by Seleucid Antiochus (addressing such individualised gods in his own speech with two-element names respectively speaking about three-element toponyms):

> *Magnificentiae uero in deos uel* Iouis Olympii templum Athenis*, unum in terris incohatum pro magnitudine dei, potest <testis> esse; (9) sed et Delum aris insignibus statuarumque copia exornauit, et* Antiochiae Iouis Capitolini magnificum templum*, non laqueatum auro tantum, sed parietibus totis lammina inauratum, et alia multa in aliis locis pollicitus, quia perbreue tempus regni eius fuit, non perfecit.*[27]
>
> Of his generosity towards the gods the temple of Iuppiter Olympius at Athens, if you like, might give testimony, the only one on earth started to be built in proportion to the size of the god. (9) But [to turn to projects completed] he ornated Delos with noteworthy altars and a lot of statues and at Antiochia a wonderful temple for Iuppiter Capitolinus, of which not only the ceiling but also all walls were covered with sheets of gold; and much else in other places he promised but could not finish because the duration of his reign was very short.

Evidently, the synecdochical use of "gods" for statues invokes a similar set of individual elements (*e.g.* 6.41.9; 26.39.9; 34.4.4; 38.43.5; 45.27.11; perhaps also in 5.11.16: *deos ipsos admouere . . . manus*, "the gods themselves . . . brought their arms closer"). The same is clearly not the case when groups of gods conceptualised along local, political or ethnic lines are spoken about (in fact, they are never *addressed* as such). This is mostly concentrated in the narrative about the Romans' idea to transfer their whole urban society and their gods to neighbouring Veii after the Gallic sack in book 5: Can one say farewell to the "Roman" or "the public and private" gods (5.52.3, 4)?[28] But speakers might also address human audiences and refer to "your" gods (29.18.2; 45.22.1) or to *deos patrios* ("the paternal gods", 1.25.1) in other contexts, thus marking differences of We and the Other in situations of conflict (cf. also 1.31.3).

In the overwhelming majority of cases, the use of the plural works very differently. The gods are seen as a coherent agent, hardly ever stressing that this is about "all" the gods (thus as indirect speech in 27.45.8). This is rarely as explicitly conceptualised as in the phrase of the *magnum deorum numen* ("the mighty will of the gods", 1.23.4; see 7.26.3; 8.32.7; 10.36.12; 39.16.7). Typically, it is simply the undifferentiated "care", "concern", "providence", "benevolence", "might", or even "eyes" of the gods or their performing of these abstract services, helping, occasionally also with the negative connotation of wrath or wavering support (*e.g.* 7.3.2).[29] Thus, Camillus encourages his people: *Iam uerterat for-*

---

27 Cf. the preceding summary expression . . . *in urbium donis et deorum cultu* (". . . by gifts for cities and the veneration of gods", 41.20.5).

28 For the background rivalry, Hubaux 1958; Massa-Pairault 1986; Guittard 1989; Cancik 1995.

29 It should be noted that *ira* and *pax* are very rare.

tuna, iam deorum opes humanaque consilia rem Romanam adiuuabant ("Luck had already changed, the support of the gods and human plans are already supporting the Roman cause", 5.49.5). *Dis iuvantibus* ("while the gods were supportive", *e.g.* 35.32.10) is a phrase Livy uses throughout his narrative into the second century BCE.

Formulations such as these account for nearly a third of all instances. Correspondingly, it is this undifferentiated plural that is employed for activities on the human side, addressing the divine in the form of prayer, asking for advice or pleas (*consulere, precare, rogare, vovere, vota solvere, placare, vereri*) and the abstracts based on that (*cultus, preces, templa,* but also negative actions and emotions like *neglegentia, metus, allere, spernere, timere*). Sometimes, the expression "to stretch out the hands" (*manus tendere*, *e.g.* 6.20.10; 25.1.7; 35.31.13) gives graphic content to the rather abstract wording. Together with the ritual action of invoking gods as witnesses, these phrases also account for nearly a third of all instances.

The indifferent summing up of divine power(s) is naturalised in a surprising way. In about 45 instances, it is not gods acting upon humans or humans acting upon gods, but the parallel pairing of both, "gods and humans" (*deorum hominumque,* etc.), which figures in the text. Typically, it is misconduct judged to be directed at both groups and thus ostracising individuals or groups that are in the background of such phrases.

4 Conclusion

The polytheism displayed and performed in Livy's text is presupposing and reinforcing, never problematising or questioning a plurality of divinities. Yet, it is not a "system", a pantheon organised along the lines of a division of labour, that is narrated here.[30] Rarely, if ever, does misidentification or a faulty selection of the addressee loom around the corner. It is at the very margins of the system, in the case of international treaties, twice bringing together groups of partial divinities, that problems are acknowledged by Livy's protagonists. It is Hasdrubal who, upon the defeat of Carthage, deplores that fact in indirect speech, turning into direct speech immediately afterwards (30.42.19–20):

> *Urbem quoque ipsam ac penates ita habituros si non in ea quoque, quo nihil ulterius sit, saeuire populus Romanus uelit. (20) cum flecti misericordia patres appareret, senatorum unum infestum perfidiae Carthaginiensium succlamasse ferunt per quos deos foedus icturi essent cum eos per quos ante ictum esset fefellissent.*
>
> Even the city itself and the household deities will they keep with the reservation that the Roman people does not wish to rage against that beyond which they do not have anything. (20) When pity seemed to move the first row of the senate, one of the senators is reported to have shouted

30 On the notion of pantheon, see Rüpke 2003; Rüpke 2018a. For a different view, see Prescendi 2022.

> in reaction to the falsehood of the Carthaginians, by appeal to which deities would they conclude a treaty when they had cheated on those by appeal to which they had previously agreed.

It is not metaphysics, but rather human action in space and time that engages the divine with said space and time. Temples, altars, groves, occasionally priesthoods and holidays, are given to individual gods, or even more precisely: individualise the divine. Their spatial (but also temporal) "fix"[31] constitutes the gods themselves and maps them within cities and across the Mediterranean world; topographical adjectives figure prominently here as they do in the Greek and Semitic inscriptions analysed by "Mapping Ancient Polytheisms".[32] Such spatial individualisation finds its linguistic expression in two-element tags on the model of *aedes Apollinis*. It is also normally two-element tags that are used to address individualised gods in direct (and often also in reported) speech: *Apollo Pythicus*. Only when the probability of misidentification is high are the two strategies combined to form three-element tags serving as toponyms: *aedes Iunonis Reginae*. I suggest that it is this spatial and material ontology of individualised deities that limits the use of one-element tags when naming gods in ritual language as reported or imitated by Livy. I feel confident in claiming that his is a linguistic reality beyond that specific author, who is in the privileged position of being an educated, sympathetic but also external observer of Roman religious affairs and its Latin language components.

This, however, has consequences. The relationship between Iuno and Iuno Regina or Mars and Mars Gradivus is neither that of short and full name nor of genus and species. It is – in Livy perhaps with the single exception of Iuppiter, the supreme political and monopolistic philosophical god, anyway – the relationship between some loosely specified form of super-human agency that is barely distinguishable in its religious and metaphorical usage (hence, we had better do away with the very distinction, a production of subsequent systematisations and a persistent false interpretation of ancient worldviews) on the one hand and a situationally, historically and topographically materialised deity on the other hand. The rhetorical figure of *congeries*, the "heaping" of one-element theonyms, is present in ritual practice, yet, it is marked out as "foreign" or "Greek". This includes both the notion of prestigious as well as that of conceptually difficult. As a result, neither Livy, nor us for that matter, can be sure to what extent it was meant to be a very graphic construction of specific (and hence especially powerful) divine compounds or rather an ordered system following some in-transparent logic. The very use of busts, that is, parts of fragmented bodies, might have pointed to the first interpretation.

Unlike the authors of this volume, Livy was not interested in analysing such conceptual connections, even though he did sketch out some of the underlying material

31 On this notion, see Urciuoli 2022, in general Herod 2019.

32 See Galoppin/Bonnet 2021 and Galoppin *et al.* (eds.) 2022, 1–723 (= vol. 1), in particular Bonnet 2022, 100–101.

history. Yet, these concepts provided a substantial part of the map onto which his narrative was projected. Surprisingly, however, the localised and materialised gods are only very loosely – by rare rituals and even more occasionally, self-afflicted prodigies[33] – connected to the divine sphere invoked, operated, and hence constituted by Livy's protagonists. As political actors and, above all, as speakers, they perform "gods" and appropriate "cult" in a summarised form that provides a background and justification for all the religious investment reported for the republican history and witnessed by Livy's Augustan-period audience (and later generations, too). "Religion" (in our sense) is about the collective divine, the "gods". Naming is a second-order activity, left to religious specialists and people demonstrating religious competence in their textual and visual choices when bringing the divine into human business, when "doing religion".

Let me stress again, Livy is only a case study. My initial impression is that things are similar in Cicero. However, it would be difficult to argue for a wide generalisation, even on that basis. But this is not my aim here anyway. In the comparative enterprise of this volume, it is more important to register the range of cultural possibilities and transform it into questions for other corpora.

Bibliography

Ahn, Gregor (1993), "Monotheismus' – 'Polytheismus': Grenzen und Möglichkeiten einer Klassifikation von Gottesvorstellungen", in: Manfried Dietrich / Oswald Loretz (eds.), *Mesopotamica – Ugaritica – Biblica. Festschrift für Kurt Bergerhof zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 7. Mai 1992* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 232), Kevelaer, 1–24.

Albrecht, Janico (2020), *Die Religion der Feldherren. Vermittlung und Inszenierung des Krieges in der späten römischen Republik* (Schriften zur Alten Geschichte), Berlin.

Arnold, Paul (1950), "Le mythe de Mars", in: *Cahiers du Sud* 37, 93–108.

Barbera, Giuseppe / Contessa, Ilenia / Barbera, Gianfranco (2021), *Pietas. An Introduction to Roman Traditionalism* (Second edition), Wilmington.

Belayche, Nicole / Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane (eds.) (2015), *Fabriquer du divin. Constructions et ajustements de la représentation des dieux dans l'antiquité* (Collection Religions: Comparatisme – Histoire – Anthropologie 5), Liège.

Berg, Christopher van den (2008), "The *Pulvinar* in Roman Culture", in: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138, 2, 239–273.

Bonnet, Corinne (2019), "« De l'inattendu, le dieu a découvert la voie »: La polyonymie comme mode de connaissance des dieux", in: *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 2019, 2, 595–619.

Bonnet, Corinne (2022), "Naming and Mapping the Gods in Cyprus: A Matter of Scales?", in: Thomas Galoppin *et al*. (eds.), *Naming and Mapping the Gods in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin / Boston, 89–102. doi: 10.1515/9783110798432-005.

33 See Clark 2007.

Bonnet, Corinne *et al*. (2019), “Mapping Ancient Gods: Naming and Embodiment Beyond ‘Anthropomorphism’. A Survey of the Field in Echo to the Books of M.S. Smith and R. Parker”, in: *Mediterranean Historical Review* 34, 2, 207–220. doi: 10.1080/09518967.2019.1664524.

Bonnet, Corinne *et al*. (eds.) (2017), *Puissances divines à l’épreuve du comparatisme: constructions, variations et réseaux relationnels* (Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses 175), Turnhout.

Brelich, Angelo (1960), “Der Polytheismus”, in: *Numen* 7, 123–136.

Cancik, Hubert (1995), “Militia perennis: Typologie und Theologie der Kriege Roms gegen Veji bei T. Livius”, in: Heinrich von Stietencron / Jörg Rüpke (eds.), *Töten im Krieg*, Freiburg, 197–212.

Capdeville, Gérard (1995), *Volcanus: Recherches comparatistes sur les origines du culte de Vulcain* (Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 288), Rome.

Carafa, Paolo (2005), “Il Volcanale il Comizio” in: Andrea Carandini / Emanuele Greco (eds.), *Workshop di archeologia classica*, Pisa, 135–151.

Castelli, Maurizio (1988), “Venus Erycina e Venus Hortorum Sallustianorum”, in: *Bolletino d’Arte* 73, 53–62.

Chapot, Fréderic / Laurot, Bernard (2001), *Corpus de prières grecques et romaines. Textes réunis, traduits et commentés* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 2), Turnhout.

Clark, Anna J. (2007), *Divine Qualities. Cult and Community in Republican Rome*, Oxford *et al.*

Combet Farnoux, B. (1981), “Mercure romain, les ‘Mercuriales’ et l’institution du culte impérial sous le Principat augustéen”, in: Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW)* 17, 1, Berlin / Boston, 457–501.

Combet-Farnoux, Bernard (1980), *Mercure Romain. Le culte public de Mercure et la fonction mercantile à Rome, de la Répubique archaïque à l’époque augustéenne* (Bibliothèque des Écoles française d’Athènes et de Rome 238), Rome.

Cottier, Jean-François (2006), *La prière en latin de l’Antiquité au XVI^e^ siècle. Formes, évolutions, significations* (Collection d’études médiévales de Nice, 6), Turnhout.

Croon, Johan H. (1981), “Die Ideologie des Marskultes unter dem Prinzipat und ihre Vorgeschichte”, in: Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW)* 17, 1, Berlin / Boston, 246–275.

Detienne, Marcel (1986), “Du polythéisme en général”, in: *Classical Philology* 81, 1, 47–55.

Elm von der Osten, Dorothee (2007), *Liebe als Wahnsinn. Die Konzeption der Göttin Venus in den* Argonautica *des Valerius Flaccus* (Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 20), Stuttgart.

Estienne, Sylvia (2011), “Les dieux à table : lectisternes romains et représentation divine”, in: Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge / Francesca Prescendi (eds.), *« Nourrir les dieux? » Sacrifice et représentation du divin* (Kernos Supplément 26), Liège, 443–457.

Galoppin, Thomas / Grand-Clément, Adeline / Bonnet, Corinne (2021), “Que fait le genre aux dénominations divines, entre mondes grecs et sémitiques ?”, in: *Archimède* 8. 1–16. doi: 10.47245/archimede.0008.ds1.01.

Galoppin, Thomas / Bonnet, Corinne (eds.) (2021), *Divine Names on the Spot. Towards a Dynamic Approach of Divine Denominations in Greek and Semitic contexts* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 293), Leuven.

Galoppin, Thomas *et al*. (eds.) (2022), *Naming and Mapping the Gods in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin / Boston. doi: 10.1515/9783110798432.

Gladigow, Burkhard (1998), “Polytheismen der Neuzeit”, in: Bärbel Köhler (ed.), *Religion und Wahrheit. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien. Festschrift für Gernot Wießner zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, 45–59.

Gladigow, Burkhard (2002), “Polytheismus und Monotheismus – Zur historischen Dynamik einer europäischen Alternative”, in: Manfred Krebernik / Jürgen van Oorschot (eds.), *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in der Religionen des Vorderen Orients* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 298), Münster, 3–20.

Grandazzi, Alexandre (1997), *The foundation of Rome, Myth and History*, Ithaca.

Grazia, Maria / Cecere, Granino (2001), “A nemi una Diana non nemorense”, in: *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung* 108, 287–292.
Green, C.M.C. (2007), *Roman Religion and the Cult of Diana at Aricia*, Cambridge.
Guittard, Ch. (1988), “Naissance et développement d’une légende: les *Decii*”, in: D. Porte / J. P. Néraudau (eds.), *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec. Res Sacrae*, Bruxelles, 256–266.
Guittard, Charles (1989), “Rome et Véies : Les trois oracles concernant le prodige du Lac d’Albe”, in: *Secondo congresso internazionale etrusco. Firenze 26 Maggio-2 Giugno: Atti 3*, Roma, 1237–1246.
Guittard, Charles (2008), “« La lance » ou « les lances » de Mars?”, in: Guillaume Bonnet (ed.), *Dix siècles de religion romaine. À la recherche d’une intériorisation? Hommage à Nicole Boëls*, Dijon, 76–92.
Herod, Andrew (2019), “Spatial Fix”, in: Anthony Orum (ed.), *Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies*, Philadelphia. doi: 10.1002/9781118568446.eurs0309.
Hobbold, Susanne (1995), *Das Bild des Mars. Untersuchung zum römischen Kriegsgott*, PhD thesis, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Bonn.
Hubaux, Jean (1958), *Rome et Véies. Recherches sur la chronologie légendaire du moyen âge romain* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l’Université de Liège 145), Paris.
Jocelyn, Henry David (2000), “Accius’ *Aeneadae aut Decius*: Romans and the Gallic Other”, in: Gesine Manuwald (ed.), *Identität und Alterität in der frührömischen Tragödie* (Identitäten und Alteritäten 3), Würzburg, 325–361.
Khariouzov, Astrid (2013), *Prodigien in der römischen Königszeit. Eine motivgeschichtliche und narratologische Analyse im 1. Buch des Livius* (Klassische Philologie 5), Berlin.
Latte, Kurt (1960), *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 5, 4), München.
Liou-Gille, Bernadette (1998), *Une lecture « religieuse » de Tite-Live I. Cultes, rites, croyances de la Rome archaïque* (Études et commentaires 105), Paris.
Liou-Gille, Bernadette (2003), “Comment cinquante années de découvertes archéologiques ont permis une interprétation plus riche et plus précise de la tradition annalistique concernant la Rome archaïque (1ère partie)”, in: *Euphrosyne* 31, 167–182.
Liou-Gille, Bernadette (2004), “Comment cinquante années de découvertes archéologiques ont permis une interprétation plus riche et plus précise de la tradition annalistique concernant la Rome archaïque (II partie)”, in: *Euphrosyne* 32, 243–263.
MacRae, Duncan E. (2019), “Mercury and Materialism. Images of Mercury and the Tabernae of Pompeii”, in: John Frederick Miller / Jenny Strauss Clay (eds.), *Tracking Hermes, Pursuing Mercury*, Oxford, 193–208.
Massa-Pairault, Françoise-Hélène (1986), “La rivalité Rome-Véies et la mantique. Quelques réflexions”, in: *La divination dans le monde étrusco-italique* (Caesarodunum Supplément 52), Tours, 68–89.
Miano, Daniele (2019), “Divinités conceptuelles et pouvoir dans le polythéisme romain”, in: *Pallas* 111, 95–111.
Miller, Paul Allen (1991), “Horace, Mercury, and Augustus, or the Poetic Ego of *Odes* 1–3”, in: *American Journal of Philology* 112, 3, 365–388.
Mineo, Bernard (2010), “Légende et histoire dans le Livre I de Tite-Live”, in: Marie-Role Guelfucci (ed.), *Jeux et enjeux de la mise en forme de l’histoire. Recherches sur le genre historique en Grèce et à Rome* (Dialogues d’histoire ancienne. Supplément 4, 2), Besançon, 495–508.
Mineo, Bernard (2013), “Tite-Live et la politique apollinienne d’Auguste”, in: Dominique Côté / Pascale Fleury (eds.), *Discours politique et Histoire dans l’Antiquité* (Dialogues d’histoire ancienne. Supplément 8), Besançon, 39–64.
Ortoleva, Peppino (2019), *Miti a bassa intensità. Racconti, media, vita quotidiana*, Torino.
Pairault, Françoise-Hélène (1969), “Diana Nemorensis: Déesse latine, déesse hellénisée”, in: *Mélanges d’Archéologie et d’histoire* 81, 2, 425–471.
Patzelt, Maik (2018), *Über das Beten der Römer. Gebete im spätrepublikanischen und frühkaiserzeitlichen Rom als Ausdruck gelebter Religion* (RGVV 73), Berlin.

Petruševski, M.D. (1967), “L’évolution du Mars italique d’une divinité de la nature à un dieu de la guerre”, in: *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientarum Hungaricae* 15, 417–422.
Prescendi, Francesca (2022), “La *plebs* des dieux. Réflexions sur la hiérarchie et la spatialité des dieux romains”, in Thomas Galoppin *et al*. (eds.), *Naming and Mapping the Gods in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin / Boston, 629–644. doi: 10.1515/9783110798432-033.
Rüpke, Jörg (2003), “Pantheon”, in: Hans Dieter Betz (ed.), *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, Tübingen, 857.
Rüpke, Jörg (2007), “Roman Religion – Religions of Rome”, in: Jörg Rüpke (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Religion*, Malden, Mass., 1–9.
Rüpke, Jörg (2012a), “Wie funktioniert Polytheismus? Götter, Bilder, Reflexionen”, in: *Mediterraneo Antico* 15, 1–2, 233–246.
Rüpke, Jörg (2012b), “Lived Ancient Religion: Questioning ‘Cults’ and ‘*Polis* Religion’”, in: *Mythos* n.s. 5, 191–203.
Rüpke, Jörg (2013), “Polytheismus und Monotheismus als Perspektiven auf die antike Religionsgeschichte”, in: Christoph Schöbel (ed.), *Gott – Götter – Götzen. XIV. Europäischer Kongress für Theologie* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 38), Leipzig, 56–68.
Rüpke, Jörg (2014), *Römische Geschichtsschreibung*, Marburg.
Rüpke, Jörg (2015), “Religious Agency, Identity, and Communication: Reflecting on History and Theory of Religion’, in: *Religion* 45, 3, 344–366. doi: 10.1080/0048721X.2015.1024040.
Rüpke, Jörg (2018a), *Pantheon. A New History of Roman Religion*, Princeton.
Rüpke, Jörg (2018b), “Gifts, Votives, and Sacred Things: Strategies, not Entities”, in: *Religion in the Roman Empire* 4, 2, 207–236.
Rüpke, Jörg (2019), *Peace and War at Rome. The Religious Construction of Warfare*. *With an afterword by Federico Santangelo*, trans. David M. B. Richardson, Stuttgart.
Rüpke, Jörg (2021), *Religion and Its History. A Critical Inquiry*, London.
Scheid, John (1987), “Polytheism Impossible; or, the Empty Gods: Reasons Behind a Void in the History of Roman Religion”, in: *History and Anthropology* 3, 303–325.
Scheid, John (2007), “*Carmen* et prière. Les hymnes dans le culte public de Rome”, in: Yves Lehmann (ed.), *L’hymne antique et son public* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 7), Turnhout, 439–450.
Scheid, John (2008), “Le carmen dans la religion romaine”, in: *Mythos* n.s. 2, 17–24.
Scheid, John (2015), “Livy and Religion”, in: Bernard Mineo (ed.), *A Companion to Livy*, Malden, Mass., 78–89.
Schilling, Robert (1954), *La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu’au temps d’Auguste*, Paris.
Scholz, Udo W. (1970), *Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen Marskult und Marsmythos*, Heidelberg.
Stübler, Gerhard (1941), *Die Religiösität des Livius* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 35), Stuttgart.
Urciuoli, Emiliano Rubens (2022), “Jumping Among the Temples: Early Christian Critique of Polytheism’s ‘Spatial Fix’”, in: Thomas Galoppin *et al*. (eds.), *Naming and Mapping the Gods in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Berlin / Boston, 989–1009. doi: 10.1515/9783110798432-050.
Van Andringa, William (ed.) (2014), *La fin des dieux. Les lieux de culte du polythéisme dans la pratique religieuse du IIIe au Ve s. apr. J.-C. (Gaules et provinces occidentales)* (Gallia 71, 1), Paris.
Walsh, P. G. (1961), *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge.