

# AN EMENDATION TO THE PROSOPOGRAPHY OF ROMAN CORINTH

(PLATE 17)

ON JUNE THIRD, 1977, one fragment of a Latin inscription, I-1977-17a,<sup>1</sup> was uncovered during excavation in a late Roman level in the southwest corner of the forum at Corinth.<sup>2</sup> To its left edge has been joined a previously published inscribed fragment, I 2098 (Kent no. 182). On June 16, 1977, I-1977-17b was recovered not more than six meters from I-1977-17a, this one built into the foundations of a Byzantine wall.<sup>3</sup> It joins at the bottom edge of I 2098; to the top of these three was added a group of four already joined and published fragments, I 1443, that had been found in the southeastern part of the forum in 1934 and 1935.<sup>4</sup> Although these last four pieces do not join along the inscribed face of the first three, a snug fit is demonstrable along the interior break line of the marble. The seven joining fragments together are now catalogued as I 1443.

Inscribed marble pedestal or base.

Pl. 17

Rectangular block of gray marble, made up of seven joining fragments. No finished surface on top, bottom, or back. Portions of original surface are preserved on both sides. Band of anathyrosis 0.015 m. wide, preserved on left side, runs down front edge, anathyrosis executed with flat chisel. Surface behind band finished with claw chisel, perhaps first worked with point. This face was intended to abut stone, either a wall or a second monument. Front face and right side are smoothly finished.

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank C. K. Williams, II, Director of Excavations at Corinth, for permission to publish this inscription and for his helpful editorial and substantive suggestions. G. Houston, Associate Professor of Latin at the University of North Carolina, and Dr. A. Spawforth were also kind enough to read and comment on the ideas presented in this paper. My appreciation goes also to Dr. N. Bookidis for her assistance in providing information on the two previously published inscriptions from the excavation notebooks. Needless to say, I bear full responsibility for any imperfections that may exist in this paper.

The following abbreviations will be used throughout this paper:

West = A. B. West, *Corinth*, VIII, ii, *Latin Inscriptions, 1896-1926*, Cambridge, Mass. 1931.

Kent = J. H. Kent, *Corinth*, VIII, iii, *The Inscriptions, 1926-1950*, Princeton, N. J. 1966.

<sup>2</sup> The latest fine wares found in the fill were two fragmentary North African red-ware plates. These were dated to the period A.D. 300-360. My thanks to K. S. Wright for the reference in J. W. Hayes, *Late Roman Pottery*, London (The British School at Rome) 1972, Form 50, type A, no. 46, pp. 69-73 and Form 45, type C, pp. 62-65.

<sup>3</sup> The north wall of the Byzantine "Silk Factory"; see H. S. Robinson, "Excavations at Corinth, 1960," *Hesperia* 31, 1962, pp. 95-133; see also C. K. Williams, II, "Corinth 1977, Forum Southwest," *Hesperia* 46, 1977, pp. 63-66.

<sup>4</sup> See Kent no. 196.

Max. pres. H. of pedestal 0.802, W. 0.444, max. pres. Th. 0.224 m. H. of letters: line 1, *ca.* 0.055-0.060; lines 2-3, 0.048; line 4, 0.039-0.040; line 5, 0.038, tall I's, *ca.* 0.056; line 6, *ca.* 0.035; line 7, 0.035, tall I's, 0.051; line 8, 0.032-0.035; line 9, 0.030-0.032; lines 10-11, 0.030 m.

Inv. No. I 1443

C·C[URTIO]

C·FIL·(tribu)

BENIG[N]Q

IVVENTIANO·THEOCOLO·

5 [IOV]IS·CAPIT[OL]INI·S[A]CER

[DOTI·NE]PTUNI [·AUG·ISAG·AGON(?)]

[OTH(?) prae., nomen].REITICI·ET·TI·C[L·ATT]ICI·

AEDILIC·ET·II·VIR·ET·QUINQ·ET·AGONOTH;

ORNAMENT·HONORATO[·A]B·ORDINE·

10 C·CURTIUS·BENIGNUS·ET·IV[VENTIA·] HAGNE·

PARENTES·D[EDIC(?)]

#### TRANSLATION

Gaius Curtius Benignus and Iuventia Hagne erected (this monument) to their son, Gaius Curtius Benignus Iuventianus [of the tribe ---], (who was) *theocolus* of Jupiter Capitolinus, Imperial priest of Neptune, *isagogeus* to the agonothetes, praenomen, nomen, --- reiticus and Ti. Claudius Atticus and who was honored by the *ordo* with the perquisites of *aedilis*, *duovir*, *duovir quinquennalis*, and *agonothetes*.

#### COMMENTARY

Lines 1-4. O. Broneer restored the *nomen* of the recipient of this dedicatory inscription

as Orfidius on the basis of the circular shape of the incomplete first letter.<sup>5</sup> In fact the first letter is a C, not an O, which the new bottom fragment (line 10) citing his father's name, C. Curtius Benignus, proves. The restoration CURTIO is secure. This inscription is the only evidence for the Curtius family in Corinth,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> "An Official Rescript from Corinth," *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 189, note 7; accepted by Kent (no. 196, pp. 87-88).

<sup>6</sup> In a fragmentary, partially joining inscription (no. 198), Kent restores the *nomen* CUTIO (the letters CU and IO are certain) and the complete *tria nomina* as C. CUTIO LESBICO. Although Kent rejects CURTIO because it seems to require more space than was available (p. 88), he does admit earlier the possibility of five or six letters for the *nomen*. This inscription, after all, may bear witness to another member of the Curtii in Corinth.

and I have not found any other indisputable family member elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> Thus the information concerning a certain C. Orfidius Benignus who died in the civil war between Otho and Vitellius in A.D. 69 and who was proposed to have been either the adoptive father or grandfather (see Kent, p. 88) of the Corinthian "Orfidius" can no longer be included in the prosopography of Corinth.

In line 2, as Kent proposed on the basis of numerous Corinthian inscriptions, some tribal name, either Roman or Corinthian, should follow C·FIL.

Lines 4-5. The priestly office of *theocolus*<sup>8</sup> of Capitoline Jupiter is attested in other Corinthian inscriptions: Kent nos. 152, 195, 198, and possibly 194.

Lines 5-6. If my restoration is correct, we now have the second occurrence in Corinth of the office of priest of Neptune. For the first, see Kent no. 156, pp. 73-74. Although the top strokes of the five letters P, T, U, N, and I have been broken off, the identification of the U and the N is certain. The N cannot be an IV because the diagonal stroke is clearly less vertical than the left diagonal of the preceding V, and for that matter of every other V in this inscription. The T, I, and especially the P are more problematical because of the difficulty in this inscription of distinguishing between the letters E, F, H, I, L, P, and T when only the lower vertical strokes are visible. We know, however, that Iuventianus was *sacerdos* of *some* cult and that it is likely that SACER in line 5 continues on line 6 with DOTI since there is no punctuation mark following SACER. The stonemason was consistent throughout the rest of the inscription with his use of the *interpunct* to mark the end of a word or its abbreviation. The spacing from the left-hand margin permits the restoration of DOTI·NE. Therefore I have followed Kent's suggested restoration of DOTI (see no. 193). For the *comparandum* for the restoration of AUG, see Kent no. 156. We do not know for sure whether Iuventianus was priest of Neptune in the city of Corinth proper or performed his duties at the Isthmian sanctuary.<sup>9</sup> On this last, see comment on Line 10.

Lines 6-7. Following the AUG, I would restore either ISAG or ISAGOG, the acceptable abbreviations for ISAGOGI, Kent nos. 156 (restored), 212, 213, and 214 (restored). The shorter form ISAG is demanded if there is another word following it at the end of line 6. The *isagogeus* was a young man, probably chosen by the agonothete (see comment on Lines 8-9) to assist him in the adminis-

<sup>7</sup> A C. Curtius Iustus, proconsul of Achaëa (?), *ca.* A.D. 152, seems to have been a native of Italy: *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1613.

<sup>8</sup> The office of *theocolus* is attested also in Elis, Aetolia, Locris, and Phocis: L. Ziehen, *RE*, s.v. *θεόκολος*, col. 1998. Whether the *theocolus* at Corinth exercised similar powers, e.g., supervisory, punitive, and sacral, as the *theocoli* at Olympia did, is not known. The Olympian *theocoli* were not assigned to specific deities, but "hatten eine allgemeine staatliche Stellung" (col. 1999). At Corinth, the *theocolus* did administer to the cult of specific deities, i. e., Jupiter Capitolinus and *Κρόνος* (see Kent no. 207).

<sup>9</sup> Kent (no. 156, p. 74) cited these two possibilities and chose the latter because of the mention of Hieromnemones. These officials apparently served as priests of Poseidon at Isthmia, see West, p. 66. Our inscription contains no such helpful information.

tration of the Isthmian games in that year. Kent no. 156 provides us with the closest parallel to line 6 of our text, although ISAGOG is restored there. Kent no. 212, however, offers us the complete formula for the restoration of lines 6 (end) and 7. That formula reads: (a) *isagogeus*, followed by (b) the title agonothete, then (c) the holder of this office in the genitive case. I believe our inscription has an added feature: the names of two *agonothetai*. For an example of two agonothetes in one year, see Kent no. 212: CONAGON. We cannot be sure whether Iuventianus was *isagogeus* in two different years or in one year only, but noting Kent no. 212, I am inclined to believe that Iuventianus performed his duties for two agonothetes in one year. The names of the two agonothetes are to be placed in line 7. In that line, it is possible to restore AGONOTH and the *praenomen* and *nomen* of the first agonothete whose *cognomen* ends in REITICI. The letter space is admittedly tight, but possible. For instance, the distance from the left-hand margin of the text (assuming it to be approximately that of the existing margins for lines 4, 8, and 9) is 0.092 m. Measuring the same distance from the letter R in the same line comfortably allows the placement of nine letters, including punctuation. Of course, which letters are included makes a difference, e. g., an N taking up more space than an I. If AGONOTH is restored, it could use a TH ligature (cf. line 8), followed by a *praenomen* and *nomen*, both abbreviated, e. g., TI·CL(AUDI) or better T·FL(AVI). The letter preceding the R has to be an E, F, H, I, L, P, or T; H and L are unlikely. I have not found attested any of the others as a first letter (and it may not be the first letter) to a *cognomen* ending in REITICI. But there is always much variation in nomenclature especially in the provinces. If, however, some letters of AGONOTH, e. g., AGON (as in our restored text) are shifted to the end of line 6, the possibilities for *tria nomina* become greater. Due to the varying right-hand margins, additional letters could have been inserted.

What of the second agonothete? Measuring from the first letter following ET in line 7 to the end of the line one gets a distance of *ca.* 0.097 m. Although the letters are incomplete I can clearly detect ten bottom strokes of letters. I would restore the name TI·CL·ATTICI after the ET. The third letter is clearly a C; the first letter can be an L, T, I, or P, less plausibly an E or F, because of the vertical stroke. The second letter can be an L, T, I, P, F, or E. The most reasonable combination is consonant-vowel-C. For a *praenomen* and *nomen*, that combination narrows the possible abbreviations to TI·CL(AUDI). After the C, I detect four faint bottom strokes of letters.<sup>10</sup> The last three letters of the word are ICI. Kent, when he examined no. 182 as a single fragment, restored the *cognomen* [FEL]ICI. Tiberius Claudius Felix is attested as a name else-

<sup>10</sup> The stonemason usually terminated the bottom of the right leg of the A's (as well as the R's) slightly higher than the strokes of the bottom serifs; see, e. g., the A's in lines 8, 9, and 11. Thus the faint second stroke visible after the bottom serif of the L in CL is the beginning of the bottom serif of the first T. The right leg of the preceding A is no longer visible on the stone.

where in the Empire, see Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, nos. 1181, 4271, 4272, 4337, etc., but if my restoration for lines 6 and 7 is correct, the name has to be in the genitive case, not the dative. Furthermore, a Tiberius Claudius Atticus is attested in Corinth; he is none other than the father of Herodes Atticus, the Athenian philanthropist and sophist of the 2nd century after Christ (see West no. 58, pp. 40-42).<sup>11</sup> The wealth of Ti. Claudius Atticus was proverbial<sup>12</sup> and it would not have been inappropriate for Corinth to have enlisted a man of such wealth to administer the expensive Isthmian games. We know that Atticus was honored in other cities besides Athens and Corinth, e. g., Sparta, Gytheion, and Megara.<sup>13</sup> Of course, the possibility also exists that another *cognomen* with the same number of letters can be restored here,<sup>14</sup> or that, even if Ti. Claudius Atticus is correct, it is not the famous one.

Whatever one restores in line 7, the association of line 7 with lines 4-6 is close. First of all, line 7 leaves the widest right-hand margin of any line on the stone, indicating a compositional break. Secondly, the interlinear distance from line 7 to line 8 is 0.030 m. For the rest of the lines, except between lines 5 and 6 where it can only be approximated, the distance varies between 0.020 m. and 0.025 m. Lines 4-7 read as a priestly *cursus honorum* in descending order (see Kent no. 212 for an example of a priestly career in ascending order), while lines 8-9 present Iuventianus' honorific titles, his *ornamenta* (see below, comment on Lines 8-9). I believe the stonemason deliberately spaced the lines with this division in mind.

Lines 8-9. The *ordo* of Corinth granted to Iuventianus the titular honors, the *ornamenta*, of every major magistracy of the colony, including the most prestigious office at Corinth, that of agonothete, administrator of the Isthmian festivals.<sup>15</sup> For epigraphical *comparanda*, see Kent nos. 152, 166, 168, etc. The recipient was neither elected to the actual offices, nor did he serve in them. To warrant such honors, Iuventianus (or perhaps his family, see footnote 30 below) must have provided some bountiful munificence to the colony, or executed his religious offices with noteworthy distinction. The fact that the *ordo* bestowed these honors

<sup>11</sup> For an apparent "twin" to this inscription, see T. Martin, "Inscriptions at Corinth," *Hesperia* 46, 1977, no. 5, pp. 184-186; for other inscriptions concerning Herodes' family connections in Corinth, see Kent nos. 128, 129 (this last disputed by L. Robert, *RevEtGr* 79, 1966, pp. 742-743) and pp. 21, 22, 79, and 136. The most comprehensive treatment still remains P. Graindor, *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode et sa famille*, Cairo 1930.

<sup>12</sup> See Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists*, 547-549.

<sup>13</sup> See E. Groag, Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, s.v. Claudius, no. 71, col. 2678.

<sup>14</sup> Dr. Spawforth suggested the possibility that -- ]REITICUS and -- ]ICUS might be the same *cognomen*. He adds that it would come as no surprise to find two homonymous members of the same family sharing a *conagonothesia*. The letter space seems too tight, however, to permit this restoration unless the third stroke after the ET really belongs to an R and not to a C. A comparison of the R's and C's elsewhere on the stone has convinced me that the letter to be restored is C.

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion of the position of the agonothete in the municipal *cursus honorum*, see Kent, p. 30, note 30.

makes this inscription unique among Corinthian inscriptions of this type. As a rule, the formula is D(ECURIONUM) D(ECRETO): by the decree of the *decuriones*, see Kent no. 152. Whether or not in this instance the *ordo* was intended to be differentiated in some way from the *decuriones* (members of the city council) cannot be determined.<sup>16</sup> For a discussion of the *aediles*, *duoviri*, *duoviri quinquennales*, and *agonothetai*, see Kent's introduction, pp. 23-30.<sup>17</sup>

Note the use of TH ligature at the end of line 8 and IN ligature at the end of line 9. In the case of line 8, the stonemason presumably realized the rapidly diminishing distance to the edge of the stone and inserted the TH ligature to complete the syllable cleanly. For other TH ligatures, see Kent no. 154 and p. 27. As for line 9, the stonemason had the space to avoid the use of the IN ligature, but I assume that he used it because he did not want to repeat the squeezing of letters as was necessary in AGONOTH in line 8.

Line 10. The *nomen* of the mother begins with IV. The space between the V and the H of her *cognomen* Hagne is ca. 0.067 m., allowing room for five or six letters. Possible feminine names include Iustinia, Iustina, Iuliana, Iuniana, and Iulitta. More likely choices are Iuvenia or Iuennia. I prefer, however, to restore IVVENTIA. Quite frequently, a father bestowed his *tria nomina* on his eldest son, while a younger son was given a *cognomen* with the suffix -anus or at other times the *gentilicium* of his mother in the appropriate masculine form.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps Iuventianus was a younger son and received his second *cognomen* from his mother, Iuventia. That he might however, have been the eldest or only son and that he might have simply received the second *cognomen* in deference to his mother is also possible.

A parallel to this name transfer may exist in Corinth in the person of P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus; see West no. 70.<sup>19</sup> West inferred from the *cognomen* Iuventianus that his mother was named Iuventia "since it was customary at this time for a son to take his mother's name in this form." West associated a Iuventius Proclus, agonothete of the Isthmian games in A.D. 41, with Licinius.<sup>20</sup> Licinius was a generous benefactor of the Isthmian sanctuary.<sup>21</sup> West, therefore, reasoned that the Licinii and the Iuventii belonged to the same social class, and that Iuventius Proclus was probably the grandfather of Iuventianus (p. 55).

<sup>16</sup> For specific information on the *ordo* in the cities of the Roman Empire, see W. Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967, repr. of Leipzig edition, 1900), pp. 226-227.

<sup>17</sup> For detailed discussion, see Liebenam, *op. cit.*, pp. 263-265 (*aediles*), 255-263 (*duoviri* and *duoviri quinquennales*), and pp. 373-374 (*agonothetai*).

<sup>18</sup> A. Mau, Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, s.v. *cognomen*, col. 228.

<sup>19</sup> Broneer joined this with another Corinthian inscription (West no. 111, I 293) and published them together in *Hesperia* 8, 1939, pp. 188-189. See Kent no. 199 for text and further commentary.

<sup>20</sup> See West, "Notes on Achaean Prosopography and Chronology," *ClassPhil* 23, 1928, pp. 258-269; Dittenberger (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup>, 802) argues for an A.D. 46 date.

<sup>21</sup> *IG* IV, 203 and now Broneer, *Hesperia* 8, 1939, pp. 181-190 (= Kent no. 306).

This genealogical stemma relied in part on the belief that the repairs that Licinius made to walls and buildings ὑπὸ σεισμῶν καὶ παλαιότητος διαλελυμένα<sup>22</sup> referred to the earthquake that hit Corinth in A.D. 77/78.<sup>23</sup> Both Broneer and Kent have argued, however, that Licinius' activities belong to the 2nd century after Christ, in great part on the basis of letter forms.<sup>24</sup> If their arguments are sound, the identification of Iuventius Proclus as the grandfather of P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus must be abandoned. In its stead I cautiously submit the suggestion that Iuventius Proclus may have been the grandfather of our C. Curtius Benignus Iuventianus. First, West could only infer the name Iuventia; I can restore it with good probability. Secondly, as *sacerdos Neptuni*, he may have served at the Sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia (see above, comment on Lines 5-6). If he was in fact an *isagogeus*, he had obvious connections with the Isthmian games (see above, comment on Lines 6-7). To have gained his *ornamenta*, he (or his family) surely must have expended much wealth for the benefit of the colony, perhaps at the Isthmian sanctuary, as did P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus.

Line 11. After the *interpunct* following PARENTES, a D rather than an F is restored because the diagonal cut off the vertical stroke appears to extend too far to the right to be simply a bottom serif. Therefore, some form of *dare*, *donare*, or *dedicare*, probably abbreviated, completed the line. I restore the abbreviation DEDIC only on the assumption that the stonemason desired some symmetry for the last line since he chose to indent PARENTES so deeply; other restorations can, however, be defended.

## DISCUSSION

What light can the date assigned to our inscription throw on the genealogical question discussed under the comment on Line 10? Kent dated the original I 1443 by letter forms to the first half of the 2nd century after Christ. Broneer discusses the Licinius inscriptions and assigns an Antonine date to them but refers to I 1443 as seeming to be "considerably earlier."<sup>25</sup> For the bottom right fragment of our inscription, I 2098, Kent offers, with some hesitation (p. 31), a date in the reign of Antoninus Pius (A.D. 138-161). A fair bit of latitude exists between the dates assigned by Broneer and those by Kent. My examination of the letter forms suggests that they closely resemble Kent no. 212, pl. 17 (*ca.* A.D. 90), no. 100, pl. 12 (A.D. 114-116), and no. 135, pl. 13 (*ca.* A.D. 114). Yet the cursive style and diagonal flourishes of

<sup>22</sup> IG IV, 203, lines 22-23.

<sup>23</sup> For specific literary testimonia, see John Malalas, *Chronogr.* X, p. 261, lines 19-21 (Bonn) and [Plutarch], *Ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Χαιρωνέως*, frag. 215, no. 1 (Teubner). For the date, see West no. 20, pp. 18-19 and no. 70, p. 54.

<sup>24</sup> Broneer (*Hesperia* 8, 1939, pp. 189-190) thought that the period of the Antonines was most historically appropriate to such lavish spending. Kent narrowed down the date to the third quarter of the 2nd century after Christ; see no. 306, p. 121, no. 199, p. 89, and no. 200, p. 89.

<sup>25</sup> *Hesperia* 8, 1939, p. 189, note 7.

the serifs are also paralleled in West no. 54, reasonably dated by West to A.D. 52-53.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, the cursive style of West no. 54 seems somewhat wilder than the style of our inscription and I do not think much can be made of the fact that the engraver of West no. 54 had a predilection for tall T's and our engraver for tall I's.<sup>27</sup> After all, Kent no. 212 has two tall I's (both long in quantity) in line 6 and Kent no. 135 a tall I (short in quantity) in line 7. The tall T in line 8 of our inscription is part of a ligature made necessary by lack of space on the right side of the stone; see comment on Lines 8-9. Therefore, strictly by a comparison of letter forms, I favor a date more consistent with the first three examples, i. e., a date closer to the end of the 1st century after Christ, and the beginning of the 2nd.

If Iuventianus is to be associated as an *isagogeus* with Ti. Claudius Atticus as an agonothete and if we accept the story by Philostratus concerning Atticus' newly found treasure and his subsequent correspondence with the Emperor Nerva (A.D. 96-98),<sup>28</sup> then the inscription cannot be much earlier than the mid-90's. The office of agonothete demanded great wealth, which Atticus did not possess prior to his lucky find. Furthermore, a Corinthian inscription citing Ti. Claudius Atticus as the recipient of the *ornamenta praetoria* is dated to the reign of Nerva or the early years of Trajan.<sup>29</sup> This honor should also post-date the acquisition of his new wealth. Iuventianus, then, should have been a young man in the 90's; this is implied in the office of *isagogeus*. It is also quite possible that Iuventianus was still a young man at the time of the dedication of the monument.<sup>30</sup> Backed by substantial family wealth, he might have advanced quickly through the priestly offices and continued on to the grant of the municipal *ornamenta*. My suggested date for the inscription, then, keeps alive the possibility that Iuventius Proclus could have been the maternal grandfather of C. Curtius Benignus Iuventianus.

To sum up, we have added a new name, C. Curtius Benignus Iuventianus, and a new family (unless C. Cutius Lesbicus is really C. Curtius Lesbicus) to the prosopography of Roman Corinth, but in so doing have removed another, C. Orfidius Benignus Iuventianus. Iuventianus apparently aspired to no imperial career, although he lived at a time when distinguished men from the provinces were gaining admission to high

<sup>26</sup> The only other defensible date is Augustan, which West rejects, see pp. 31-35.

<sup>27</sup> The use of tall I's, consistently signifying a long quantity to the vowel, offers a no more concise range of dates than approximately the 1st century after Christ to the early 3rd: A. E. Gordon and J. S. Gordon, *Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions*, Berkeley 1957, no. 3, pp. 187-188. The tall I in ORDINE in line 9 of our inscription is short in quantity, but was inscribed tall for the sake of the IN ligature.

<sup>28</sup> *Lives of the Sophists*, 548.

<sup>29</sup> See West no. 58, p. 42 and T. Martin, *Hesperia* 46, 1977, pp. 185-186.

<sup>30</sup> I am indebted to Dr. Spawforth for this suggestion. He comments that "this might be a fair inference from his office of [*isagogeus*] combined with the appearance of his parents as dedicators of the monument. Thus the honors granted to him may reflect the esteem in which his parents were held by the colony." To be sure, family wealth is certainly the reason why a N. Popidius N. f. Celsinus, *age six*, was adlected into the *ordo* at Pompeii when he (i. e., his parents) rebuilt the Temple of Isis destroyed by the earthquake in A.D. 62: *CIL* X, 846.



imperial positions. Perhaps the choice was not his own. That he was quite wealthy is demonstrated by his distinguished priestly career. His city profited from his services and his grateful peers rewarded him with the titles of all the important municipal offices. To be sure, Iuventianus' family and his possible familial ties with another prominent Corinthian citizen, Iuventius Proclus, may have played a significant part in his municipal success. Finally, he may even have assisted Ti. Claudius Atticus, a man destined for imperial recognition.

GLENN R. BUGH

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND  
COLLEGE PARK



I 1443

GLENN R. BUGH: AN EMENDATION TO THE PROSOPOGRAPHY OF ROMAN CORINTH