



An Honorific Inscription from Pisidian Antioch

Barbara Levick

Anatolian Studies, Vol. 8. (1958), pp. 219-222.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0066-1546%281958%298%3C219%3AAHIFPA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q>

Anatolian Studies is currently published by British Institute at Ankara.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/biaa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AN HONORIFIC INSCRIPTION FROM PISIDIAN ANTIOCH

By BARBARA LEVICK

ONE OF THE few inscribed stones which still remain on the hilly site of Pisidian Antioch is a large and impressive block, 0·564 m. by 1·091 m. by 0·475 m., with an inscription cut in elegant letters into the face which now lies uppermost. This stone has probably been moved only a few yards from its original position, for otherwise it would have been taken to the neighbouring town of Yalvaç for building purposes. Such a stone, perhaps originally the basis of a statue, would have been set up in a prominent place in the colony, probably in or near the main square, the Tiberia Platea, and its present position is not far from that square. It is surprising that so fresh-looking a stone should have escaped the notice both of the inhabitants of Yalvaç and, apparently, of epigraphists. It has, however, been somewhat defaced, and the hole in the centre of the inscription indicates that it has been used for something other than its original purpose : see Plate XXXV(b).¹

	IVLIAE AGRIPP	
	NAE·IVLI PAVLLI	
	SENATORIS·PRE	
	TORI·IIIVIR·FIL·	
5.	VXOR·SERVI·CORNE	
	LI DOLABELLAE POM	
	PEI MARCELLI·PAT[ris	
	CONSVLAR[is Flaminis	
	QVIR[inalis Auguris (?)	
10.	DEC·I[unius	
	IIIVIR·II·ET·I[iVir Quinq(uennalis)	
	ET·MVMMI[a	
	VXOR·EIVS·SA[cerdos (?)	
	ET·D·IVNIVS RV[finus (?)	
15.	ET·IVNIA MAXIMA [D (?)	
	I] VNI FRVGI·OB·MERI	
	TA·EIVS	
	D.	D.
H.		C.

3-4. PRE/TORI for PRAE/TORII.

4. IIIVIR(I) is evidently an engraver's error for VIIIVIR(I).² If Paullus had been *Triumvir Monetalis* that fact would hardly be important enough for it to appear on this stone. Only one of Paullus' more important *honores* would be selected for mention along with the praetorship.

¹ For help in the restoration of this stone I am much indebted to the kindness of Professor R. Syme.

² For the form *VIIIVir* see, e. g., *ILS*. 2929 ; for this priesthood mentioned with one other post (the consulship), see *ILS*. 921.

The persons mentioned on this stone are less distinguished than their names would suggest. Only one of them is known from other inscriptions, and the stone adds a little to our knowledge of him. Ser. Cornelius Dolabella Metilianus (the stone omits this name) Pompeius Marcellus³ was suffect consul in 113 A.D.,⁴ a date which is thus the *terminus post quem* for the inscription under discussion. His name is given more fully in a dedication set up in his honour by the people of Corfinium,⁵ for whom he had erected a bath at his own expense and on his own property.⁶ Cornelius himself put up an inscription near Rome, in honour of an old family servant, Ser. Cornelia Sabina, Ser. l(iberta), *nutrix et mammula eius*.⁷

From the first of these inscriptions, *ILS.* 1049, it appears that Cornelius, who may well have belonged to a family already consular,⁸ had been *Triumvir Monetalis*, *Salus Palatinus*, Quaestor under Trajan, *Sevir Equitum Romanorum Turmae III*, Praetor and Consul, *Flamen Quirinalis* and Patron of Corfinium.

Of all these offices only a few are selected for mention in the Antiochian inscription, but, according to Professor Syme's suggested restoration, a new one emerges: as well as *Flamen Quirinalis*, Cornelius appears to have been Augur—an unusual combination of priesthoods, but one which would, perhaps, be permissible at this time. The omission of the augurship from all the other inscriptions relating to Cornelius would indicate that this is the latest of the series, and should be put some years after 113 A.D.

Cornelius died childless;⁹ the dedication at Antioch shows that this was not due to his dying a bachelor. Of his wife, pretentiously named, and her father, nothing is known beyond what the inscription itself reveals.

It was this woman, Iulia Agrippina, whom one of the more distinguished colonial families honoured with their dedication. The head of the family was Dec. Iunius, twice *Duovir* of the colony and once *Duovir Quinquennalis*. Neither he nor any member of his family is mentioned in any other extant inscription from Antioch—a fact which serves as a warning of the incompleteness of the evidence which remains available to us through inscriptions. The Iunii, with their pseudo-aristocratic names, holding the highest offices the colony could offer, must have been responsible for more than one single inscription. D. Iunius Ru[finus]¹⁰ was probably the brother of the *Duovir*, and Iunia Maxima his niece, the child of another brother, D.(?) Iunius Frugi (deceased?).

The relationships would have been clearer if line 15 had contained

³ See *PIR.*² II, C 1350.

⁴ *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1932, 192, tav. 2, line 50.

⁵ *ILS.* 1094; cf. *CIL.* IX, 3153.

⁶ *ILS.* 5676. *PIR.* is undoubtedly right in identifying the Ser. Cornelii Dolabellae of *ILS.* 1049 and 5676, rather than regarding them as brothers (so Mommsen) or as father and son (so Klebs).

⁷ *ILS.* 8532.

⁸ If *ILS.* 3673 refers to his father.

⁹ *ILS.* 5676; the consuls of 122 A.D. became *bonorum possessores*.

¹⁰ The cognomen is restored *exempli gratia*; the name is a common one and the number of letters missing is certainly five.

the word FIL(IA). It would of course be possible to take Iunius Rufinus, as well as Iunia Maxima, as the child of Iunius Frugi, and to identify the latter with the Iunius of line 10. In that case, however, it would be necessary to insert some other office or offices held by Iunius into line 10, perhaps that of AED(ILIS).¹¹ This interpretation would yield a married couple and their two children.

Mumma, the wife of the *Duovir*, is mentioned as being a *Sacerdos*, evidently because that office was considered to add lustre to the family. Several *Sacerdotes* are known at Pisidian Antioch. There was a *Sacerdos Iovis Optimi Maximi*,¹² a *Sacerdos Augusti*,¹³ and a *Sacerdos Imperatoris Caesaris Vespasiani Augusti*.¹⁴ All these were men. The only female *Sacerdos* known at Antioch, except, perhaps, for the Paullina mentioned in *CIL*. III, 6842, is Caristania Frontina Iulia, who was, if Ramsay's restoration¹⁵ of a damaged inscription is correct, *Sacerdos Deae Iuliae Augustae* during the reign of Claudius. Mumma may well be one of her successors in this priesthood.

In the present case, however, the title is not qualified by the name of the cult. This is strange, but not unparalleled: both at Cartima in Baetica and at Naronia and Epidaurus in Dalmatia there are *Sacerdotes* of unspecified cults.¹⁶ At Antioch itself there are two other apparent cases. One, that of a male priest, occurs on a stone which has been badly damaged,¹⁷ and there is ample space for the name of the deity to be restored. The other stone is almost complete.¹⁸ L. Calpurnius Frugi is described as *Duovir*, *Sacerdos*, *Praefectus Fabrum* and *Praefectus Alae*.

What was the link between Iulia Agrippina, a member of the senatorial order and the wife of a patrician, and the colonial family of the Iunii? The nomenclature betrays the fact that the difference in their origin may not have been very great, and by this time at least one Antiochian family, that of the Caristanii, had shown that the tenure of a leading position in the colony, combined with a judicious marriage, might afford a means of entering the senate.¹⁹ Iulius Paullus may himself have been of Antiochian origin. If so, he must be added to the list of 1st century senators who belonged to the colony. There is no evidence for this, however, nor for connecting Cornelius with Asia Minor, and the answer may be that Iulia was a landowner in the district. It was common amongst the Roman upper class of the 1st century to own land in Asia Minor,²⁰ and Iulia Agrippina would not be the only woman from a family which possessed

¹¹ For this office at Pisidian Antioch, see, e.g., *CIL*. III, 6833.

¹² *CIL*. III, 301 = 6848.

¹³ *CIL*. III, 6838.

¹⁴ *JRS*. II (1912), 102, no. 34.

¹⁵ *Anatolian Studies presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, 206 ff.

¹⁶ *ILS*. 5512 and 7159, respectively; the latter post-dates the death of Titus.

¹⁷ *CIL*. III, 6841.

¹⁸ *CIL*. III, 6831.

¹⁹ Cheesman, *JRS*. III (1913), 253 ff.

²⁰ Livia (*IGR*. IV, 1204, 1213) and Rubellius Plautus (Tacitus, *Annals* XIV, 22); cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, LXV (1934), 217 ff.

Anatolian estates to marry a patrician at this time. The Sergii Paulli, the family into which C. Caristianus Fronto had married, evidently owned land near Kurd Sinanlı in the Axylon. One of them, Sergia Paullina, became the wife of a suffect consul of 112, the patrician Cn. Pinarius Cornelius Severus.²¹

As a wealthy landowner, Iulia Agrippina may have provided the colony with buildings, money or games. If she did so, it is strange that the honorific decree was moved by four members of the same family, only two members of which are said to hold colonial office. It is more likely that the Iunii had a special connection with Iulia, and that that connection consisted in some benefit unspecified which she had conferred on them ; what her exact *merita* were we can only guess.

²¹ For the Sergii Paulli and Cornelius Severus, see *JRS.* XVI (1926), 202 ff., cf. *Klio* XXIV (1931), 59, and *PIR.*² II, C 1453.