

MICHAEL PEACHIN

WHICH PHILIP?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 73 (1988) 98–100

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

WHICH PHILIP ?*

A dedication by the citizens of Pisaurum reads as follows (CIL XI 6325):

Imp(eratori) Caes(ari)
M(arco) Iulio Philippo
Pio Fel(ici) Aug(usto),
pont(ifici) max(imo), tr(ibunicia) p(otestate),
5 co(n)s(uli) et co(n)s(uli)
design(ato), p(atri) p(atriciae),
pro co(n)s(uli),
Pisaur(enses) pub(lice).

The stone was originally dated to 246, and assigned to Philip the Arab. More recently, however, Philip Junior has been advanced as the emperor honored.¹⁾ The new identification rests on two points: a) we are dealing with the first tribunician power of the emperor here in question, and Philip was tr. pot. (I) in 244, but tr. pot. III as cos. (I) et cos. (II) des. in 246; b) Philip Junior was indeed tr. pot. (I) cos. (I) et cos. (II) des. late in 247. Thus the stone would belong to the son, and date to late 247 rather than late 246. But is the titulature here attested truly impossible for the father? And is such a stone even likely for the son?

Tribunicia potestas cannot resolve this problem, for it is now clear that a document which records the tribunician power without an iteration number does not necessarily imply the first period of this power.²⁾ Nor are the other inscriptions with Philip as consul designatus of any help.³⁾ There simply is nothing here to prove that the Pisauenses intended tr. pot. (I), and thus Philip Junior rather than his father. Moreover, we should note that the stone-cutter does not in any way number the consulates, e.g. cos. et cos. II des.

*) This note was produced with the assistance of a Stipendium from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. I thank G.Alföldy for helpful comments on a draft. Thanks also go to Martin Spannagel for help with Umbrian topography.

1) L.Braccési, "Inscriptiones Pisauenses. Tituli imperatorum domusque imperatoriae" SOLiv 17,1969,7 (non uidi), and G.Cresci Marrone and G.Mennella, Pisaurum I. Le iscrizioni della colonia, Pisa 1984, nr.36.

2) See (e.g.) T.V.Buttrey, *Documentary Evidence for the Chronology of the Flavian Titulature*, Meisenheim am Glan 1980, esp. 3-4. I shall argue the same, and in some detail, in a forthcoming book, *Roman Imperial Titulature*, A.D. 235-284.

3) Several stones have Philip as tr. pot. cos. des., and include the son as Caesar: CIL VI 1097/ILS 506; CIL VIII 10049; 22057 (= 10077). These probably belong to the period just before Philip's first consulate, ca. February-December 244; the tribunician power intended would be the first. A military diploma (CIL XVI 152) has for Philip Senior both, tr. pot. IIII cos. III des. and cos. III des. (without a tribunician iteration). Philip Junior is also included, with first tr. pot. IIII cos. des. and then cos. II des. cos. On this document, see most recently D.Armstrong, ZPE 67,1987,215 and also X. Lorient, ANRW 11.2, 790.

This might indicate that he was simply imprecise, hence reducing the lack of a tribunician iteration number to nothing more than imprecision. The father is surely possible - but is he also more probable than the son?

I think it most unlikely that the stone should be in honor of Philip Junior. First of all, he is nowhere epigraphically attested without his father and with the full titulature of an Augustus, i.e. as Pius, Felix, pontifex maximus, pater patriae, proconsul, and with the tribunicia potestas.⁴⁾ Secondly, it is rare to find him even together with his father and with these titles.⁵⁾ On the basis of titulature then, such an inscription seems even less probable for Philip Junior than for his father. Indeed, I should say that the son is here impossible. This text must have been inscribed on the base of a statue of Philip the Arab, and the monument dates to late 246.

On this interpretation, it is also possible tentatively to suggest a context for the Pisauenses' piety. Another inscription, CIL XI 6107 = ILS 509, records a dedication to the goddess Victoria for the well-being of Philip and his family. This stone was set up by Aurelius Munatianus, euocatus ex cohorte VI praetoria pia uindice Philippiana agens at latrunculum, and twenty soldiers under his command. Praesens and Albinus as consuls provide the date, 246; and the stone was found on the Via Flaminia roughly forty-five km west of Pisaurum. Munatianus and his men, who had been recruited from the fleet at Ravenna, must decisively have trounced a gang of brigands.⁶⁾

4) I hope soon to have the documentation in print, *Roman Imperial Titulature*, A.D. 235-284 (forthcoming). A number of coins with obverses of Philip Junior have reverse legends that contain the elements of the titulature that belong properly to an Augustus. It has been argued for those with Latin legends that the titulature of the reverses belongs indeed to the father: RIC III.2, 102 and HCC III xcii. This must be true of the coins with Greek legends as well. The coins are as follows. Latin: RIC IV. 3 no. 262 and HCC III no. 28 (Rome); RIC IV.3 nos. 232 9 and HCC III no. 38 (Antioch). Greek: BMC Syria pp.217-8 nos. 546-63 and Hunter III pp.183-4 and nos. 307-9 (Antioch).

5) The documents in question are: AE (1889) 27/Eph.Epig. viii 772; CIL VII 1178/RIB 2286; CIL VIII 8323/ILS 513; CIL X 8001/ILS 511; CIL XVI 152, 153; D.H.French, ZPE 43 (1981) 153 n.5. It is not, in fact, perfectly clear from these documents that Philip Junior ever officially possessed these titles.

6) G.Henzen, "Iscrizione trovata presso la Galleria del Furlo" MDAI(R) 2, 1887, 14-20 assumes this. Note, though, that he takes the expression agens at latrunculum to indicate a regular post, like (say) agens in rebus. On this interpretation, Munatianus will have been a sort of local marshall, and the twenty soldiers roughly a posse of deputies recruited specifically for this action. On the other hand, local police seem generally to have been stationarii regionarii or beneficiarii. See R.MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, Cambridge Mass. 1967) 259-60. Note also L.Flam-Zuckermann, "A propos d'une inscription de Suisse (CIL XIII 5010): étude du phénomène du brigandage dans l'Empire romain" Latomus 29, 1970, esp. 452-4 with a praefectus arcendis latrociniiis. But whether Munatianus had some kind of regular position, or whether he was called up specifically for this action, the presence of the 20 soldiers from the fleet at Ravenna indicates the unusual nature of this effort.

It may be that this action was ordered by the emperor himself.⁷⁾ If so, we might then read the dedication by the people of Pisaurum in this context. They had been spared the distress caused by a band of robbers, and accordingly remembered the emperor for his concern with their well-being.⁸⁾

Heidelberg/New York

Michael Peachin

7) Perhaps this is indicated by Munatianus' dedication pro salutem Imperatoris. On Philip and the economic troubles of this period, including banditry, L. de Blois, "The Reign of the Emperor Philip the Arabian" *Talanta* 10-11, 1978, 29-32. The suppression of latrones may also have been of special interest to Philip if his father really was the leader of a robber gang (Aur. Vict. Caes. 28.4).

8) It should be noted, however, that in general it is impossible to connect the dedication of a statue of an emperor with a specific event; anything or nothing might have occasioned such. On this, G. Alföldy, *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen*, Heidelberg 1984, esp. 56-7.