

DUNCAN FISHWICK

THE CAREER OF C. TITIUS ANTONIUS PECULIARIS

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 130 (2000) 257–260

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE CAREER OF C. TITIVS ANTONIVS PECVLIVRIS

A

C TIT · ANTONIVS
 PECVLIVRIS · DEC
 COL · AQV · P · DEC · M ^{stn}G ·
 II VIR · FLAM · SACERDOS
 5 ARAE · AVG · N · P · P · INFER · NYMP
 PEC · SVA · FECIT · ET
 AQVAM · INDVXIT

CIL 3, 10496 = ILS 7124

An inscription evidently transported from the ruins of Aquincum to its find-spot at Bath Monaster on the left bank of the Danube records the donation of a fountain with its water supply by C. Titivus Antonivus Peculiaris. On the completions of the Corpus the text reads:

C. Tit(ivus) Antonivus Peculiaris dec(urio) col(oniae) Aq[ui]nci dec(urio) m(unicipii) [Sin]g(iduni), Iivir, flam(en), sacerdos arae Aug(usti) n(ostris) p(rovinciae) P(annoniae) infer(ioris) nymp(haeum) pec(unia) sua fecit et aquam induxit.

With this may be compared an inscription found at Alt-Ofen or O'Buda, the site of Aquincum, recording a second act of generosity on the part of apparently the same individual:

B

C TIT · C · FIL · SERG · ANTONIVS
 PECVLIVRIS · DEC · COL ·
 S E P T · A Q · I T E M · DEC · M ·
 S I N G · O R N A M E N T V M ·
 5 sic F O R V S · R E I · P V B L I C A E ·
 D D

CIL 3, 10495 = ILS 7124a

The Corpus gives the following expanded text:

C. Tit(ivus) C. fil(ius) Serg(ia) Antonivus P[ec]uliaris dec(urio) col(oniae) S[e]pt(imia) Aq(ui)nci item dec(urio) m(unicipii) Sing(iduni) ornamentum forum reipublicae d(ono) d(edit).

Some obvious features of the two records can be quickly passed in review. The longer text (A) omits the filiation but gives every indication of attesting the same individual as the shorter (B) since the cursus begins in both with the office of decurion held by Antonivus Peculiaris at the colony of Aquincum. This provides an immediate indication of chronology given that Aquincum was elevated to the rank of colonia by Septimius Severus, as confirmed by its title Septimia in B. Whether this could reflect the fact that B was inscribed sooner after the promotion of the city than A, where the title is omitted, can hardly be said; as the analysis will make clear, there can be no question that B is the earlier of the two texts. A minor point to be noted in this connection is that, while the reading Aq(inci) is certain in B, the corresponding expansion in A should surely be Aquin(ci), not Aq[ui]nci as given in the Corpus, where the ligatures are overlooked.

As stated explicitly in B (item), Antonivus Peculiaris was also a decurion of the municipium Singidunum. The parallel formula in l. 3 of A plainly invites the same expansion m(unicipii) [Sin]g(iduni) despite the fact that G is the only letter of the name to be preserved. A striking difference between the two texts, however, is that in A the letter P intervenes between dec(urio) col(oniae) Aquin(ci) and dec(urio) m(unicipii) [Sin]g(iduni). Whatever its correct interpretation, the letter is ignored not only in the expanded version of the Corpus and its index but also in Dessau's text of the same inscription, which simply repeats the version of the Corpus while omitting completions as normally (ILS 7124). In fact the only occasion on which the P is otherwise noted seems to be in J. Fitz's

version of A, which reads . . . dec. col. Aqu., p., dec. m. [---]g., . . .¹ Here Aqu. is an improvement on Aq. but still falls short of Aquin., as read above; no expansion of P is proposed but in contrast to the Corpus Fitz does at least recognize its occurrence in the text.

The remaining features of the inscription are uncontroversial. In B only the offices of decurion at Aquincum and Singidunum are mentioned before the text records that Peculiaris has donated some sort of ornamentum forus (sic) republicae. As the inscription was found at Aquincum, his generosity was presumably directed towards the colony. A more extensive cursus is set out in A, a circumstance that to all appearances assigns the text to a later period. In addition to the decurionate at two centres Peculiaris has listed his offices as duumvir, municipal flamen and provincial priest of Lower Pannonia before putting on record his own generosity again, this time in erecting a fountain with its water supply. Since A is also from Aquincum, the nymphaeum like the ornamentum forus must have been located at the colony. It follows that the career of C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris is known from the records of two benefactions he made years apart, both at the colony of Aquincum.

In a recent analysis of the inscriptions of Peculiaris, J. Fitz has nevertheless concluded that the two texts refer not to the same C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris at an interval of several years but rather to two different individuals². He argues that in B Peculiaris was plainly elected decurion at two centres in different provinces, Aquincum in Lower Pannonia and Singidunum in Upper Moesia, a distinction to be explained by the fact that he belonged to the family of Antonii, who had for generations controlled the collection of customs duties in Illyricum³. We already know a C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris, again a member of the Antonii⁴, who on Fitz's view served as conductor before the reorganization of the portorium in the second half of the reign of Marcus Aurelius⁵. As C. Titius C. filius Sergia (tribu) Antonius Peculiaris in B must be placed under Septimius Severus or later by virtue of his post as decurion at the colony of Aquincum, Fitz takes him to be the son of the Antonine C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris rather than the same individual as held by A. Mócsy. In that case the son will in all probability have also been a customs contractor, a profession that would go far to explaining his posts as decurion at two widely separated centres in different provinces. An obvious comparison in this respect is with the career of the conductor T. Iulius Capito, who was accorded a whole range of honours by the local ordo of centres in different provinces: Poetovio, Sirmium, Ratiaria, Oescus, Sarmizegetusa, Romula, Tomi (CIL 3, 753 = 7429). But this interpretation excludes the possibility that the Titius Antonius Peculiaris of A can be the same person as in B. For one thing A records a municipal career that Fitz takes to have unfolded at the second centre recorded in I. 3, our only clue to which survives in the letters M [-]G. This cannot be restored M. [Sin]G(iduni) as in B, he argues, since Peculiaris would never have been elected a provincial priest of Lower Pannonia had he held these offices at a municipium in Upper Moesia. A further objection to the identification with Singidunum is that its leading magistrates were quattuorviri, not duumviri as in A⁶. Furthermore Fitz suggests that there is insufficient room in the gap before G to restore [Sin]g. As only one or at the most two closely grouped letters can have stood there, he proposes that the municipium will have been Gorsium, in which case the text will have read M. [V(lpii)] / [A(elii)] G(orsii).

None of these objections withstands closer examination. While it was certainly a most unusual occurrence, there are nevertheless two instances where it would appear that a resident of Hither Spain

¹ J. Fitz, *Die Verwaltung Pannoniens in der Römerzeit*, Budapest 1993, II, 425.

² O.c. 426f.

³ On the public portorium see Fitz (n. 1) 392–401.

⁴ C(aius) Tit(ius) | Ant(oni)us Peculiaris, colnd(uctor) vect(igalis) oclt(avae) Pann(oni)arum II | ann(o) (conductionis) XII (AE 1968, 423)

⁵ Fitz, o.c. 425, 729f. (no. 409); id., *A concilium provinciae Pannonia Inferiorban*, Alba Regia 11, 1970, 152f.

⁶ Fitz (n. 1) 426, citing A. Mócsy, *Gesellschaft und Romanisation in der römischen Provinz Moesia superior*, Budapest–Amsterdam 1970, 34.

was elected provincial priest of Baetica⁷. But that is a side issue. Since Peculiaris cannot have been duumvir at Singidunum, as Mócsy has shown, the offices listed in the cursus given in A will surely have been served at Aquincum, the place where the stone was in fact found and the city to which Peculiaris made the gifts recorded in both A and B. In that case what A records is surely the fact that Peculiaris was decurion at Aquincum and Singidunum (as in B), then duumvir and flamen (apparently in that order) at Aquincum, a background that would qualify him pre-eminently for election to the high priesthood of Lower Pannonia. It is true that space is restricted in the lacuna before G in l. 3 of A but, as the abbreviation of Aquin(cum) in the same line clearly demonstrates, SIN could be restored if I and N were combined by ligatures. There seems no reason therefore to doubt the restoration of the name [Sin]g(idunum) in A exactly as in B. Attention may be drawn in this connection to the enigmatic P in l. 3 of A, which we have seen to be ignored in the Corpus and Dessau and nowhere explained. As A is the later of the two texts, P is possibly a misreading by the ordinator of a contraction of item (it.) originally written in cursive⁸, in which case A l. 3 will have repeated B ll. 2–4 except for the omission of Sept. before Aquin(cum). As for the fact that Peculiaris is twice recorded as decurion at both Aquincum and Singidunum, Fitz's explanation by no means follows as there is nothing in either inscription to indicate he was a customs farmer by profession. Whether such a system was still in existence or the collection of customs was by now in the hands of financial procurators is in any case a moot question⁹.

If the above argument is correct, everything suggests that A and B do after all refer to one and the same person, C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris, who was elected decurion at both the colony of Aquincum in Lower Pannonia and the municipality of Singidunum in Upper Moesia, by no means an unusual occurrence in itself. It was apparently after donating an ornamentum forus (sic) at Aquincum (B) that he pursued a municipal career at Aquincum until his election as provincial priest with the title of sacerdos arae Aug(usti) n(ostri) p(rovinciae) P(annoniae) infer(ioris). As he is not termed sacerdotalis in A, his donation of a water fountain with its water supply, again to his patria(?) of Aquincum, would appear to have taken place during tenure of this distinguished post.

The formula of the provincial title is of significance for the fact that it shows that the cult of Pannonia Inferior centred on an altar, where the worship was directed to the living emperor; the three other surviving records of provincial priests simply give the title sacerdos/sacerdotalis with the provincial qualification in one form or another¹⁰. Lower Pannonia compares in this respect with Upper Pannonia and Dacia, where the provincial cult is likewise recorded to have been addressed to the living emperor at a provincial altar¹¹. Where precisely the provincial altar was located, raises a whole range of problems which fall largely outside the scope of the present discussion¹². For immediate purposes it is sufficient to note that the long-standing thesis of a provincial altar and temple of the deified Augusti, allegedly located at Gorsium, no longer looks tenable¹³. The complex of buildings in the area sacra of the city in no way corresponds to what one finds at provincial centres elsewhere in the Latin West and rather has the appearance of a cult enclave of Jupiter Dolichenus, whose association with the precinct is in fact epigraphically attested¹⁴, possibly with other deities. A building inscription recording that Septi-

⁷ CIL 2, 3271, 3395. For discussion see D. Fishwick, *The Provincial Priesthood, The Imperial Cult in the Latin West (ICLW)*, III, 2, forthcoming.

⁸ Kindly suggested by G. Di Vita-Evrard. For it. cf. ILS 1634, for example.

⁹ If the reorganization of the portorium under Marcus Aurelius did not end the system of conductores, Mócsy could be right in taking AE 1968, 423 to refer to the same C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris as CIL 3, 10495f.

¹⁰ M. Ulp. [---], sacerdos [pr(ovinciae) Pannoniae inf(erioris)]: CIL 3, 10305; Aurel(ius) Audentius, sacerdotalis provinci(ae): CIL 3, 3485; Ignotus, [sacerdos] p(rovinciae) P(annoniae) in[f(erioris)]: RIU 979.

¹¹ Pannonia Superior: RIU 71; AE 1983, 774. Dacia: IDR 3/2, 108, ?132, 217 (cf. AE 1930, 8), 266; CIL 3, 1209; I. Piso, Potaïssa 2, 1980, 125–127.

¹² D. Fishwick, *The Sacred Area at Gorsium, Phoenix*, forthcoming.

¹³ For an overview of the debate see G. Alföldy, *Die Großen Götter von Gorsium*, ZPE 115, 1997, 225–241 at 229f.

¹⁴ CIL 3, 3343. See in general R. Turcan, *Les Cultes Orientaux dans le monde romain*, Paris 1992, 156–165 especially

mius Severus and Caralla restored a templu(m) D[---] (CIL 3, 3342, l. 3), presumably on the occasion of their visit to Gorsium in A.D. 202¹⁵, could in principle be completed with any appropriate name beginning with D. Dolichenus is out of the question as one would have expected I. O. M. Dolichenus but G. Alföldy has recently proposed D[eorum Magnorum] on the basis of a defective text found in the vicinity and certainly to be restored D[is Magn[is]]¹⁶. In a recent reappraisal Fitz has now suggested that the provincial temple is rather to be identified with a small structure of classic design that excavations have recently uncovered to the south-east of the area sacra¹⁷ and has called attention to various iconographic fragments reflecting imperial themes from the reigns of Antoninus Pius, Septimius Severus and Philippus Arabs; originally from Gorsium, these are now located in a scatter of iconographic vestiges found today at TÁC, Intercisa and Székesfehérvár¹⁸. In practice, however, the temple looks far too small in comparison with what is known of provincial temples in other provinces and the iconographic pieces themselves, of no obvious connection with the provincial cult, could rather derive from funerary monuments¹⁹.

It remains to add a general point to this summary of the current position at Gorsium, namely that the existence of a provincial temple looks impossible in light of the overall development of the imperial cult. Elsewhere in the western provinces, notably at Tarraco, Emerita, Lugdunum, probably at Camulodunum and perhaps at Corduba, a provincial temple is always associated with the cult of deified emperors – either exclusively as originally at Tarraco or Emerita or alongside the living emperor as later at these centres and at Lugdunum²⁰. In Lower Pannonia, however, as indeed in all provinces of the Danube region, the cult of the Divi seems to be totally absent, in which case a provincial temple in these parts looks out of the question. The worship of the living emperor in contrast was throughout the development of western provincial ruler cult associated with an altar, precisely as documented by A and comparable texts in Upper Pannonia and Dacia²¹. As there is no longer any good reason to link the provincial centre of Pannonia Inferior with Gorsium, the likeliest location for such a provincial altar would be Aquincum²², where chance has preserved the inscriptions of C. Titius Antonius Peculiaris. The more important of these is plainly A, which in recording his benefaction of a fountain with its water supply preserves critical evidence on the content of the provincial cult of Pannonia Inferior. On the foregoing analysis the text would read:

C. Tit(ius) Antonius | Peculiaris dec(urio) | col(oniae) Aquin(ci) c[on]s[ul]t[is]t[er]e[m] dec(urio) m(unicipii) [Sin]g(iduni) | Ilvir, flam(en), sacerdos | arae Aug(usti) n(ostri) p(rovinciae) P(annoniae) infer(ioris) nymphaeum | pec(unia) sua fecit et | aquam induxit.

University of Alberta

Duncan Fishwick

161f. For an overview of known Dolichena see P. Merlat, *Jupiter Dolichenus. Essai d'interprétation et de synthèse*, Paris 1960, 129–167. On the sanctuary of Jupiter Dolichenus on the Aventine see F. Coarelli, *Roma. Guide archeologica Laterza*³, Rome–Bari 1983, 344f.

¹⁵ J. Fitz, *Der Besuch des Septimius Severus in Pannonien im Jahre 202 u. Z.*, *AAH* 11, 1959, 237–263.

¹⁶ Alföldy (n. 13) 225–229, 235f. with Abb. 3 ad AE 1972, 432.

¹⁷ J. Fitz, *Area Sacra in Gorsium, Religions and Cults in Pannonia* (Exhibition at Székesfehérvár, Czók István Gallery, 15 May – 30 September 1996), Székesfehérvár 1998, 25–28 with fig., gives no indication that he has changed his identification of the provincial temple, though this is clearly implicit in his account. See earlier J. Fedak, *EMC/CV* 39, 1995, 147–151; 41, 1997, 111–122.

¹⁸ Fitz, o.c. 26.

¹⁹ Information kindly supplied by Prof. G. Alföldy.

²⁰ D. Fishwick, *The Provincial Centre*, *ICLW* III, 3, forthcoming.

²¹ N. 11.

²² J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Vestigia 6), Munich 1965, 117, n. 9 with refs.