## C. IULIUS SPARTIATICUS, "FIRST OF THE ACHAEANS"

## **A CORRECTION**

IN A RECENT ARTICLE, discussing the imperial cult instituted by the Achaean League in the mid-1st century after Christ, I made misguided use of the words primo Achaeon in line 9 of a Latin inscription from Corinth (Corinth VIII, ii, no. 68) to argue that the honorand, C. Iulius Spartiaticus of Sparta, was the first high priest of the cult. In fact, primus Achaeon, or  $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau$ 0ς 'Αχαι $\tilde{\omega}$ ν, was no more or less than an honorific title bestowed by the League, comparable to  $\pi\rho\tilde{\omega}\tau$ 0ς 'Ελλήνων, a title conferred by the koinon of Asia, and so primo Achaeon cannot be taken, as I thought, with the immediately preceding (lines 8–9) archieri domus Aug. [in] perpetuum. The chronological priority of Spartiaticus as high priest, however, is conclusively established by the Athenian inscription (Dittenberger, SIG 790) describing him (lines 2–7) as ἀρχιερέα Θε| $\tilde{\omega}$ ν Σεβαστ $\tilde{\omega}$ ν ×[αὶ | γέ|νους Σε| $\tilde{\beta}$ |αστ $\tilde{\omega}$ ν | ἐχ το $\tilde{\nu}$  χοινο $\tilde{\nu}$ 0 τη[ς] | 'Αχατας διὰ  $\tilde{\beta}$ 1ου πρ $\tilde{\omega}$ 1 τον τ $\tilde{\omega}$ ν ἀτ αἰ $\tilde{\omega}$ 1 ατο του επροιοτισι to become officially divi and that the title therefore indicates a date after the deification of the second (Claudius) in 54, would suit my argument but is not, unfortunately, conclusive.  $\tilde{\nu}$ 1

Antony J. Spawforth

Newcastle-upon-Tyne University Department of Classics Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE1 7RU United Kingdom

- <sup>1</sup> "Corinth, Argos and the Imperial Cult: Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198," Hesperia 63, 1994 [pp. 211-232], pp. 218-220.
- <sup>2</sup> See P. Veyne, "Augustal de l'an I.—Premier pontarque," *BCH* 90, 1966 [pp. 144–155], p. 150. Nigel Kennell kindly drew this reference to my attention.
  - <sup>3</sup> Veyne, loc. cit.
- <sup>4</sup> See P. Veyne, "Les honneurs posthumes de Flavia Domitilla et les dédicaces grecques et latines," *Latomus* 21, 1962 [pp. 49–98], pp. 59–60, and note 2 on p. 60.

Hesperia 64.2, 1995