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Two Procuratorian Inscriptions from Perge

Abstract: In a recent festschrift Aşkım Özdizbay has published two inscriptions from Perge, which require a revision. An investigation of these inscriptions and a comparison made with some inscriptions published in I.v. Perge showed that these are the bottom sections of two known inscriptions from Perge. Inscription A reads that the honouree was praefectus praetorio during the reigns of Claudius and of Nero. This person can only be the well known Sextus Afranius Burrus, who was the sole praetorian prefect from A.D. 50/1 to 61/2. The information related to this person was identified on a published fragment from Perge (I.v. Perge no. 222), further it is shown that Inscription A is the lower part of this already published Perge fragment. The honouree in Inscription B was a prefect in ala Piacentiana later became procurator of provincia Galaticae et Pamphyliae in the reigns of Claudius and Nero. The individual having these two qualifications was Lucius Pupius Praesens, who was honoured in Iconium (CIG 3991 = IGR III 263), and is known from a fragmentary inscription published in I.v. Perge no. 24. The dimensions and content of this fragmentary inscription entirely correspond with Inscription B. Therefore, Inscription B should be the lower part of I.v. Perge I, no. 24.

Aşkım Özdizbay has recently published two inscriptions from Perge in the festschrift compiled for Haluk Abbasoğlu.¹ These inscriptions contain important – but also expected – information that provides the organization date of provincia Lyciae et Pamphyliae that is still considered for some a dilemma, as Özdizbay rightly emphasized. However, an epigrapher or ancient historian would no doubt feel the necessity of revising these inscriptions, since there are epigraphic problems and deficiencies in his work in respect to the identification of the honourees and in the decipherment, translation and commentary.

According to his notes, these inscriptions were uncovered «on the west of the colonnaded street, in front of insula 9» in the excavation campaigns of 2004-2005 at Perge, and they were placed on a profiled base at a later date. Though what is meant by «insula 9» is obscure in his text, it is shown at a distance of 160 m north of the Hellenistic towers, in a plan of the colonnaded street given by Heinzelmann.² Özdizbay refers to his unpublished doctoral thesis concerning these inscribed bases, of which the measurements and descriptions are unspecified.³ He read them as follows:

³ Özdizbay, ibid., 860 with fn. 197.
Inscription A (inv. no: Ja.04.119.a-e)

Divi Claudi pro[-vin-]
ciae Galatiae [et]
Pamphyliae et pr[ae]
fecto praetori Di[vi]
Claudi et Neronis
Claudi Caesars
Aug(usti) Germanici
Plocamus amico
suo h(eres) c(uravit)

Inscription B (inv. no: Ja.05.212.a-e)

centiae procu-
rae Divi Claudi
et Ne]ronis Claudi
[Caes]aris Aug(usti) Germa-
nici provinciae Ga-
litae et Pamphy-
liae et ALORICATA
Ti(berius) Claudius Divi Clau-
di L(ibertus) et Sacerdos
camus amico suo
h(eres) c(uravit)

The mistakes in both deciphering and translation\(^4\) indicate these inscriptions were not understood properly, and the epigraphical and prosopographical relationships and connections couldn’t be reported on. A short investigation and comparison of its results with some inscriptions published in I.v. Perge I (IK 54) showed that these are the bottom sections of two known inscriptions from Perge:

Inscription A reads: the honouree, whose name cannot be read since it would have been on the upper section, was praefectus praetorio during the reigns of Claudius and Nero. This person can be no one other than Sextus Afranius Sexti filius Voltinia Burrus (PIR\(^2\) A 441), who was the sole praetorian prefect from A.D. 50/1 to 61/2 and is well known from literary sources and from an inscription from Gallia Narbonensis.\(^5\) Therefore, the missing upper part of the inscription should include the name and other attributes of this praetorian prefect. Thus, the information related to this person was identified on a published fragment from Perge (I.v. Perge I, no. 222), further it is shown that Inscription A is the lower part of this already published Perge fragment:

---

\(^4\) The Turkish translations by Özdizbay are:

Inscription A: «Tanrılaştırılmış Claudius’a, Galatia ve Pamphylia eyaletlerine ve tanrılaştırılmış Claudius ve Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus’ün muhafız birlüğü komutanına, tanrılaştırılmış Claudius’un azatısı ve rahibi Tiberius Claudius Plocamus arkadaşlarına, onun varisi olarak (bu payeyi/kaideyi) dikirdi».  
Inscription B: «Tanrılaştırılmış Claudius’a ve Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus’u, Galatia ve Pamphylia eyaletlerine, tanrılaştırılmış Claudius’un azatısı ve rahibi Tiberius Claudius Plocamus arkadaşına, onun varisi olarak (bu payeyi/kaideyi) dikirdi».

\(^5\) CIL XII 5842: Vasiens(es) Voc(ontiorum) patrono Sex(to) Afrani Sex(ti) f(ilio) Volt(inia) Burro trib(uno) mil(itum) proc(uratori) Augustae proc(uratori) Ti(beri) Caesar(is) proc(uratori) divi Claudi praef(ecto) pra[e]tori(o) ornament(nt)is consular(ibus).
The honouree in Inscription B was a prefect in the *ala Picentiana* and later became *procurator* of the *provincia Galatica et Pamphyliae* in the reigns of Claudius and Nero, as the inscription records. The individual having these two qualifications was Lucius Pupius Luci filius Sabatina Praesens, who was honoured at Iconium as the *procurator* of the province Galatia after his prefecture in the *ala Picentiana* and is known from a fragmentary inscription published in I.v. Perge I, no. 222:

I.v. Perge I, no. 222

| H. | 0,32 m; |
| L. | 0,20 m; |
| D. | 0,22 m; |
| Lh. | 0,04 m. |

Right, bottom and rear of the fragment are incomplete.

Photo: I.v. Perge, no. 222, Pl. L.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Özdizbay, Inscription A (revised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| H.: | ca. 0,90-1 m; |
| L.: | ca. 0,55-56 m; |
| D.: | ; |
| Lh.: | 0,04 m. |

(The measurements are estimated through the ruler in the photo).

Photo: Özdizbay 2008, 871, fig. 8)

The honouree in Inscription B was a prefect in the *ala Picentiana* and later became *procurator* of the *provincia Galatica et Pamphyliae* in the reigns of Claudius and Nero, as the inscription records. The individual having these two qualifications was Lucius Pupius Luci filius Sabatina Praesens, who was honoured at Iconium as the *procurator* of the province Galatia after his prefecture in the *ala Picentiana* and is known from a fragmentary inscription published in I.v. Perge I, no. 222:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Özdizbay, Inscription A (revised)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| H.: | ca. 0,90-1 m; |
| L.: | ca. 0,55-56 m; |
| D.: | ; |
| Lh.: | 0,04 m. |

(The measurements are estimated through the ruler in the photo).

Photo: Özdizbay 2008, 871, fig. 8)
lished in I.v. Perge I, no. 24. The dimensions and content of this fragmentary inscription, which has only the first three lines giving the name of Lucius Pupius Praesens and some of his equestrian commissions, entirely correspond with Inscription B. Therefore, Inscription B should be the lower part of this fragmentary inscription:

**I.v. Perge I, no. 24**

H.: 0,32 m;  
L.: 0,57 m;  
D.: 0,63 m.;  
Lh.: 0,04 m.

Photo: I.v. Perge, no. 24, Pl. VI.

**Özdizbay, Inscription B (revised)**

H.: ca. 0,85 m;  
L.: ca. 0,57 m;  
D.:  
Lh.: 0,04 m

(The measurements are estimated from the ruler in the photo).

Photo: Özdizbay 2008, 871, fig. 9.

Although these inscriptions haven’t been seen by the author, their content confirms that both were statue-bases, which supported statues of Sextus Afranius Burrus and Lucius Pupius Praesens at a place on the colonnaded street of Perge. Both inscriptions seem to have been by the same hand and time. In both inscriptions the shapes and dimensions of the letters, the spacing of lines and words, and the abbreviations display similar features. The av-

---

7 L. Pupio L. f. Sab. Praesenti, trib. milit., praefecto equitum alae | [Picentinae, proc.] | [Caesari ad ripas] | [Tiberis, proc. Tiberi] | [Claudii Caesaris] | [Augusti Germaniae] | ⋯ | [Tiberis, proc. Tiberi] | ⋯. Şahin restored the missing section through the inscription from Iconium (see fn. 6).
erage number of letters per line is 16 and the line spacing is ca. 1 cm. Both inscriptions were carved carefully and some letters were shaped such as M S A. The letters A and V were ligatured in five places as N (no. 1 l. 9, 10 and 12; no. 2 l. 11). The sign for abbreviations and word endings was carved as ♠. In accord with these observations, we can examine the inscriptions under the titles below:

**No. 1: Plocamus honours his friend Sextus Afranius Burrus**

[Sex(to) Afranio] Sex(ti) f(ilio) Vol(tinia) 2 [Burro, tr(ibuno) mil(itum), proc(uratori) 2 [Augustae, procurat(or)] 4 [Ti(beri) Caesaris, procurat(or)] 6 ciae Galatiae et Pamphyliae, et pr[aec]- 8 fecto praetori Di[vi] Claudii et Neronis 10 Claudii Caesaris Aug(usti) Germanici, 12 Ti(berius) Claudii Divi Claudii l(ibertus) et sacerdos 14 Plocamus, amico suo h(onoris) c(ausa).

**No. 2: Plocamus honours his friend Lucius Pupius Praesens**


To Sextus Afranius Burrus, son of Sextus, (from the tribe of) Voltinia, military tribune, procurator of Augusta, procurator of god Claudius of the province Galatia and Pamphylia, praetorian prefect of god Claudius and Nero Claudius Cæsar Augustus Germanicus (dedicated) Tiberius Claudius Plocamus, freedman of god Claudius and priest, to his friend for the sake of his honour.

To Lucius Pupius Praesens, son of Lucius, (from the tribe of) Sabatina, military tribune, prefect of knights of Picentine Squadron, procurator of god Claudius and Nero Claudius Cæsar Augustus Germanicus of the province Galatia and Pamphylia, a loricate, (dedicated) Tiberius Claudius Plocamus, freedman of god Claudius and priest, to his friend for the sake of his honour.

**no. 1, l. 2-4:** The section is restored on the base of the inscription from Gallia Narbonensis, CIL XII 5842: ... Sex(to) Afranio Sex(ti) f(ilio) Volt(inia) Burro trib(uno) mil(itum) proc(uratori) Augustae proc(uratori) Ti(beri) Caesar(is)...

**no. 2, l. 5:** On stone PROC[URA]TORE. An erratum, but considering that the inscription was painted, the mistake might have been corrected by leaving the horizontal lines of E unpainted.
Sextus Afranius Burrus

This individual was the famous praetorian prefect of Nero and is well known from Suetonius, Tacitus, and Cassius Dio. An inscription from Gallia Narbonensis was dedicated to him (above fn. 5). Various inscriptions are known relating to him or to his family, but these do not provide information on his cursus honorum. Burrus was born in Vasio, probably in ca. 10 BC, of the tribe of Voltinia. He had already been praetorian prefect for four years when Claudius died. During the accession of the new emperor and on later occasions he played an important role together with Agrippina. When Nero acceded to the throne, Burrus took him to the praetorian soldiers to obtain their loyalty and made each soldier give the oath of allegiance. He and Seneca were the most influential pair in Nero’s court. One was his counsel- lor, the other was his sole praetorian prefect and they both had remarkable influence on the imperial decisions, also because of Nero’s insouciance towards statecraft. Cassius Dio mentions both as they were consistently together and took all the power into their hands. When Burrus, following an argument in A.D. 62, was poisoned by Nero, who noticed his growing...


9 CIL XII 1309 (Vasio): matrabus v(ota) (solvit) (libens) m(entor) Euenos, Sex(ti) Afrani l(iberus); CIL XI 1531 (Al-to): Sex(to) A[r]iano Burri l(iber) An[i]o viuit annis XXXV diebus XLVII [II] fecit A[r]ania Mus(a), mater pro filio; CIL VI 16963 (Via Salaria): Cn. Domitius Primigenius et Arania Burri lib(era) C(a)enis coniuges vivi facerunt sibi et libertis libertibus(ue) posterisque eorum in fronte p(edes) XXXV. h(oc) m(omentum) h(eredes) n(on) s(sequer). One inscription from Cos contains a part of a coin with a name of Sextus Afranius, which doesn’t have an exact clue to associate with Burrus, see. Iscr. di Cos ED 126: [...] Κρισ[ίον] [... Άρκεσιλα[s] του Λευκου... JOYATINBAOYE. [... Σεμάχων] του Μάρκου [... Σέιξιου Αφραίνου [...] Ιασον του Ιουλιον [...] MINI[N] [... ΜΙ...] [... E...] [...]

10 McDermott, ibid., 234 deemed 10 B.C. – A.D. 7 suitable to the birth of Burrus. However, 10 B.C. is more appropriate for military tribune at the beginning of A.D. 1st century.


12 Cassius Dio 61.3-4: ὥστε ὁ Πόλλας συνὸς τῇ Ἀρμήπισσῃ πάντα φορτικὸς καὶ ἐπόθησα ἢ...ὡς δὲ ἔπι πολὺ τοῦτο ἐγένετο, ἐνυκρίθησαν ὁ τε Σένεκας καὶ ὁ Βοῦρρος, φρονιμώτατοι τε ἣμα καὶ δικαιότατοι τῶν περὶ τὸν Νέρωνα ἀνδρῶν ἀντί, ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπάρχος τοῦ δορυφορικοῦ ἢν, ὁ δὲ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔπασαν τὸ γνωσμένον τοῖς ἀφόρμης λαβόμενοι...καταργύσαμεν δὲ τοῦτο αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπεσάνον παρέλαβον, καὶ διώκησαν ἐφ᾽ ὅσον ἤνηθησαν ἀριστή καὶ δικαιότατα, ἵνα ὑπεαναθησόντας ὑπὸ προσπαθητὴ συνέπαινθησαν, ὁ γάρ Νέρων οὔτ᾽ ἄλλους προσπαθητής ἢν καὶ ἔχαρεν ἐν ὁμορρία διόγκοι, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα τῇ ἐπὶ μὴρ πρῶτον ὑπεπετπείκει, καὶ τότε ἠγάπα ἢν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἐν ἀριστής ἢν καὶ ἁγεμονὶ οὐκ ὦν ὑπὸ διήγητο...καὶ ἐκεῖνοι συναναθησάντες αὐτοῦ μὲν πολλὰ τὰ μὲν μετερράγησαν τῶν [δὲ] καθεστηρίσαντων, τὰ δὲ καὶ παντελῶς κατέλεκαν, ἄλλα τα καινὰ προσεπαθητήσαντον, τὸν δὲ τὸΝέρωνοι προμᾶς εἰς, ὡς ὑπὸ διακορής, ἀνένε Μᾶλλοι τῶν κοινῶν πάντων κακῶς, ὧν ἐπεθύμησε γνωσμόν μεταβῆσαι, ὃστε οὐκ εἰσῆτο ὡς φυσική νά ἡ καὶ αὐθανάς ἐν τῷ τροφή ἀνεπαλήξετο καὶ ἐν ἐξοφυς αὐτοτελεῖ τραφέως οὐκ οὐκ ὠραν αὐτῶν ἤσθη, ἄλλα καὶ εἰ αὐτῶν τοῦτον προσοδιαφθείρετα; ibid. 61.20.1-3: παρῆβη τε καὶ αὐτός ὁ Νέρων ἐς τὸ θέατρον... καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ Βοῦρρος καὶ ὁ Σένεκας, καθάπερ τινὲς διδάσκαλοι, ὑποβάλλοντες τι παρειστήσαζαν, καὶ αὐτῶν τὰς τε χεῖρας καὶ τὰ ἵματα, ὡποτε ἡθενάτω τι, ἀνέκνησαν, καὶ τούς άλλους προσεπαθῆναν.

strength, Seneca stood alone and so was weakened.\textsuperscript{14} McDermott remarks the probability of that Burrus, whose ability and uprightness were unquestioned as he had no personal ambitions, was poisoned indirectly attacking Seneca through this action.\textsuperscript{15} According to these two inscriptions, by which his career can be followed, his \textit{cursus honorum} should be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIL XII 5842 (Gallia Narbonensis)</th>
<th>Inscription no. 1 (Perge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribunus militum</td>
<td>1 Tribunus militum (Perge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurator Augustae</td>
<td>2 [Procurator Augustae]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurator Tiberi Caesaris</td>
<td>3 [Procurator Tiberi Caesaris]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurator Divi Claudi</td>
<td>4 Procurator Divi Claudi provinciae Galaticae et Pamphyliae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consularia Ornamenta</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. At the beginning of A.D. 1\textsuperscript{st} century he was military tribune (probably in a legion). Presumably, during this service he gained both his «excellent military fame» (\textit{egregiae militaris fanae}) and his disfigured hand (\textit{debilis … trunca scilicet manu}) that Tacitus records (\textit{Ann.} 12.42 and 13.14).\textsuperscript{16}

2. Then he became procurator for the private properties of Livia Augusta until A.D. 29.

3. He was procurator of Tiberius till A.D. 37, then probably procurator of Caligula until A.D. 41.

4. Presumably up to A.D. 50/1, he was procurator of Claudius. While the inscription of Gallia Narbonensis is less forthcoming, the Perge inscription informs (perhaps only some) by revealing his procuratorship for Claudius of the province of Galatia and Pamphylia.

5. He was promoted by Claudius to the highest equestrian position, \textit{praefectus praetorio}, in ca. A.D. 50/1. He remained in this position during the reign of Nero till his death in A.D. 62, so that he held this high office alone for twelve years. Tacitus reports that Agrippina appointed him as praetorian prefect to be able to arrange her own dispositions and to render the discipline of the Praetorian Guard stricter coming under one

\textsuperscript{14} Tacitus, \textit{Ann.} 14.52.1: \textit{Mors Burri infregit Senecae potentiæ, quia nec bonis artibus idem virum erat altero velut dace amoto, et Nero ad deteriores inclinat. hi variis criminationibus Senecam adoriantur, tamquam ingentes et privatum modum evertas opes adhuc augeat, quoque studia civium in se vereter, hortorum quoque amoentat et villarum magnificentia quasi principem supergeredereret.} Syrme, ibid., 591; B. W. Henderson, \textit{The Life and the Principate of the Emperor Nero}, London 1903, 136.

\textsuperscript{15} McDermott, ibid., 253: cf. Malitz, ibid., 12.

\textsuperscript{16} McDermott, ibid. 232.
hand.\textsuperscript{17}

6. Sometime after Nero succeeded, Burrus was given the honorary rank of consul, wearing *consularia ornamenta*. McDermott remarks that Burrus might have been given the consular insignia in late 54,\textsuperscript{18} but in the Perge inscription this honorary rank doesn’t appear, as this is this case, the Gallia Narbonensis inscription should be of a later date than the inscription from Perge which probably dates from the early years of Nero. So the date he gained consular insignia seems to be somewhat later than Nero’s accession.

**Lucius Pupius Praesens\textsuperscript{19}**

Praesens honoured in no. 2 was already known through an inscription from Iconium (see fn. 6), a series of inscriptions containing the boundary arrangements between Sagalassus and Tymbrianassus\textsuperscript{20} and the aforementioned fragmentary Perge inscription that is examined here under No. 2 (see p. 4). According to both honorific inscriptions, his *cursus honorum* was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ILS 8848 (Iconium)</th>
<th>Inscription no. 2 (Perge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χειλίαρχος</td>
<td>1 Tribunus militum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπαρχὸς ἵππων ἄλης Πεικεντεινῆς</td>
<td>2 Praefectus equitum alae Picentianae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπίτροπος Καίσαρος πρὸς ὑθαις Τιβέρεως</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπίτροπος Τιβ. Κλαύδιου Καίσ. Σεβ. Γερμ. καὶ Νέρωνος Κλ. Καίσ. Σεβ. Γερμ. Γαλατικῆς ἐπιρχείας</td>
<td>4 Procurator Divi Claudi et Neronis Cl. Caes. Aug. Germ. provinciae Galatiae et Pamphyliae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a loricata</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. He was military tribune (probably in a legion) in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century A.D.

2. In his second military service, he was a prefect (probably at least as a *decurio*) in the *Ala Picentiana*.\textsuperscript{21} Tacitus reported that this squadron acted conjunctly with the legion XVI

\textsuperscript{17} Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.42.1: Nondum tamen summa moliri Agrippina audebat, ni praetoriarum cohortium cura exolverentur Lusius Geta et Rufius Crispinus, quos Messalinae memoris et liberis eis devincitos credebat. igitur distraha cohortis ambitu duorum et, si ab uno regem tur, intenientem fore disciplinam asseverante uxor, transfertur regimen cohortium ad Burrum Afranium, egeriae militari famae, gnarum tamen eias sponte praefeceretur.

\textsuperscript{18} McDermott, ibid., 233.

\textsuperscript{19} PIR\textsuperscript{2} P 1807; Pflaum, ibid., 58-63 no. 24.


\textsuperscript{21} For *Ala Picentiana* see: C. Cichorius, *Ala*, in: *RE* I, 1257 ff.; Michael G. Jarrett, Non-Legionary Troops in Roman Britain: Part One, the Units, Britannia 25, 1994, 41.
Gallica against rebels of the Batavian riot in A.D. 70, but before long gave up resisting the rioters and returned to Mogontiacum.\(^{22}\) The squadron was attested in several diplomas\(^{23}\) at Germania Superior in A.D. 74-82 and later in Britannia around A.D. 82-90.\(^{24}\) Its presence in Britannia continued until at least A.D. 122-4 according to a diploma\(^{25}\) and was included in a Hadrianic list of troops from Pannonia Superior.\(^{26}\)

3. Later, according to the inscription of Iconium, Praesens appears to have been ἐπίτροπος πρὸς ὄχθαις Τιβέρεως (procurator ad ripas Tiberis),\(^{27}\) namely the procurator who was responsible for the elevation and strengthening the banks of Tiber in Rome against floods. There were several officials for the problems of the river Tiber and especially in times of deluges or mudslides by the river they were active in the maintenance and renovations of ports.\(^{28}\) In the first century there were serious initiatives taken for the problems of the Tiber and of a board to be established against them.\(^{29}\) As we learn from Suetonius, the first commissions relating to the surroundings of the Tiber damaged by floods was done by Augustus.\(^{30}\) In A.D. 15, there were damaging deluges intensified by earthquakes and storms causing loss of life and property and Tiberius commissioned five senators in order to oversee the situation of the Tiber and to establish a permanent board for the supervision of the river.\(^{31}\) Though procurator ad ripas Tiberis is not known as to have worked with them\(^{32}\), probably he was responsible of protecting the properties of the emperor by the river, while the senators continued in their aforementioned tasks. Praesens

---

\(^{22}\) Tacitus, Hist. 4.62: non tulit ala Picentina gaudium insultantis vulgi, spretisque Sancti promissis aut minis Mogontiacum absunt.

\(^{23}\) AE 1910, 211; AE 1962, 290; CIL XIII 6277 and 11869.

\(^{24}\) AE 1975, 559; CIL XVI 65 and VIII 1195.

\(^{25}\) F. N. Fryce, A New Diploma for Roman Britain, JRS 20, 1930, 16; An undatable inscription was found in bathhouse in Malton, see D. R. Wilson, R. P. Wright ve M. W. C. Hassal, Roman Britain in 1970, Britannia 2, 1971, 252 and 291.

\(^{26}\) AE 1930, 37 = CIL XVI 69 = AE 1931, 79; AE 1930, p. 28 no. 88.

\(^{27}\) Pflaum, ibid., 59 ff.

\(^{28}\) DAGR 1623 f., s.v. Curatores Alvei Tiberis et Riparum et Cloacarum Urbis.

\(^{29}\) G. S. Aldrete, Floods of the Tiber in Ancient Rome, Maryland 2007, 199 f.

\(^{30}\) Suetonius, Augustus 30.1: adversus in cendia excubias nocturnas uigilesque commentus est; ad coercendas inundationes aluum Tiberis laxauit ac repurgauit completum olim ruderibus et aedificiorum prolationibus coartatum.

\(^{31}\) Cassius Dio  57.14.7- 8: τοῦ τε ποταμοῦ τοῦ Τιβέριδος πολλὰ τῆς πόλεως κατασχόντως ὥστε πλευσθῆναι, οἱ μὲν άλλοι ἐν τέρατος λόγῳ καὶ τοῦτο, ὡσπερ που τὸ τε μέγεθος τῶν σεισμῶν ὡφ’ ὄν καὶ μέρος τοῦ τέχνης ἐπέσε, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κεραυνῶν ὡφ’ ὃν καὶ οἶνος ἐξ ἀγγείων ἀθραύστως ἠξέτακε, ἐλάμβανος, ἐκείνος δὲ δὴ νομίσας ἐκ πολυπληθίας ναμάτων αὐτὸ γεγονέναι πέντε ἀεὶ βουλευτὰς κληρωτοὺς ἐπιμελεῖσθα τοῦ τοσοῦτον προσετάζει, ἵνα μὴ τοῦ χειμῶνος πλεονάζῃ μὴ τοῦ θέρους ἔλλειψη, ἀλλ’ ἵσος ὅτι μάλιστα ἀεὶ ῥέῃ; the name of these five senators is recorded in CIL VI 1237 = ILS 5925: C. Vibius C. f. Rufus / Sex. Sotidius Sex. f. Strabo / Lubuscid(ius) / C. Calpetanus C. f. Statius Rufus / M. Claudius M. f. Marcellus / L. Visellius C. f. Varro / curator(es) riparum et alvei Tiberis / ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) termin(averunt).

might have taken responsibility during the great flood of A.D. 36 reported by Cassius Dio.33 There is no information on how long he held this office or what was/were his task(s) afterwards, if there was any.

4. Praesens was commissioned as procurator in the province of Galatia and Pamphylia, most probably directly following Sextus Afranius Burrus who was also procurator of the same province as the honouring by Plocamus of both at the same time shows there was no other procurator between them. The senate and people of Iconium honoured Praesens for his aid in reconstruction and foundation, renaming the city Claudiconium (see fn. 6). He presumably took this commission of 100,000 sestertii34 around A.D. 50/1 when Burrus became praetorian prefect, after Claudius died he continued in this position in the reign of Nero. In this period, according to some dubious inscriptions, Nero might have constructed the scene and sub-scene of the theatre at Iconium through his procurator Lucius Pupius Praesens.35 Again under Nero, Lucius Pupius Praesens took his place in the boundary arrangements between Sagalassus and Tymbrianassus alongside the governor of Galatia, Quintus Petronius Umber and his presence was due to Tymbrianassus, which belonged to the imperial patrimonium (τὰ μὲν ἐν δεξιᾷ οἰκεῖαι, τὰ δὲ ἐν ἀριστερᾷ οἰκεῖαι κώμης Τυμβρίας ἐν Νέρωνος).36 As we know of that Umber’s term of office was around A.D. 54-5, so he must have been continued his procuratorship of the province Galatia at least till A.D. 55.

5. His last position recorded in the inscription of Perge is a loricata. There are not many inscriptions containing the word loricata. Certain individuals are known to us as procurator a loricata from some inscriptions from Rome.37 These inscriptions date from A.D. 1st to 2nd centuries, those which have the expression of Augusti liberti are more probably from the early first century. Then, some Ephesian inscriptions record the career of a procurator of Trajan, Lucius Vibius Lentulus who was denoted ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων λωρεικάτης namely a

---

33 Cassius Dio 58.26-27: Σέξτου δὲ δὴ Παπινίου μετὰ Κύντωνος Πλατύντος ὑπατεύσαντος ὁ τε Τίβερις πολλὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐπέκλυσεν ὡστε πλεονεξίαν, καὶ περὶ πολὺ πλέων περὶ τε τον ἰππόδρομον καὶ περὶ τὸν Ἀουεντῖνον ἐφθάρη, ὡστε τὸν Τιβέριον διοχλίας καὶ πεντακοσίων μυρίδας τοῖς ζημιωθεῖσι τι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ δοῦναι; Pflaum, ibid., 59 f.

34 Pflaum, ibid., 62.

35 IGR III 262 = SEG XXXIV 1326; transcriptions differ. M. Horster (Bauinschriften römischer Kaiser: Untersuchungen zu Inschriftenpraxis und Bautätigkeit in Städten des westlichen Imperium Romanum in der Zeit des Prinzipats, Stuttgart 2001, 194 fn. 16) remarks that the restoration of the emperor’s name is just on account of the name of Pupius read on the inscription, and however, this is not enough for any restoration and this emperor might have been Augustus and Pupius a legatus augusti.


37 CIL VI 8688: C. Iulio Basso Aemiliano actori Caesaris ad Castor(em) et ad loricata(m) ad auctoritatem Helodorous l(iberti) fecit; 8689: T. Fl(auius) Aug(usti) lib(erti) Martiali proc(uratoris)/ Augusti ad Castor(is); 8690: Gami Aug(usti) l(iberti) proc(uratoris) a loricata; 8691: Hechi Aug(usti) l(iberti) pro(curatorii) a loricata ex ration(е) peculiar; 8692: Orthri Aug(usti) l(iberti) proc(uratoris) a loricata. Werner Eck didn’t include a loricata in his book containing his articles on Roman administration (Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit 1: Basel 1995; 2: Basel 1998) at all. Likewise, he doesn’t give it in his another paper in CAH X12, Part II. Government and Civil Administration, p. 195-266.
Loricata. Pflaum examining the Ephesian inscriptions observed that Lentulus became responsible for treasure (μονήτης – e.g. cashier) in Rome as a centenarius, then he firstly became procurator of Pannonia et Dalmatia and secondly of Asia as a ducenarius; later, he was back in Rome and appointed a loricata (probably accountant of fiscal revenues). Likewise, Praesens returned to Rome after his procuratorship in the provincia Galatiae et Pamphyliae and was assigned a loricata by Nero. It was suggested that this office indicates a special task relating to the imperial treasury, or was a title given to fiscal officials collaborated by ad castorem and defined by a cuirassed statue. The word loricata in the inscriptions of CIL VI was not related to a statue by Mommsen, but later interpreted as «the bars on the podium of temple which surrounded the fiscus». Pflaum referring to a certain section from the letters of Pliny the Younger and relating the cuirassed statue of Julius Caesar in front of the temple of Divus Iulius with a loricata remarked that this official might have been involved in the management of precious metals. Corbier revised all the related documentation and the position of M. Antonius Pallas, who was freed by Antonia and granted honours in A.D. 52 by the Roman Senate (these honours were displayed ad statuam loricatam divi Iulii, see fn. 44), in her recent publication. She identified the statua loricata divi Iulii mentioned by Pliny the Younger with a cuirassed statue placed in the Forum of Caesar and referred in Pliny the Elder: the financial office of imperial administration was near this statue. She concluded that Pallas in Claudian period and Lentulus in the Trajanic period were charged with imperial finances. Pallas

38 AE 1924, 81 = I.v. Ephesos, no. 3046 = Smallwood, NTH 286: Λ(ουκίου) Οὔειβον Γαΐου ὦν Αἰμιλία Λέντουλον ἐπίτροπον Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρβα Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Δακικοῦ, ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων λωρεικάτης. Άσιας, Παννονίας, Δαλματίας, μονήτης, ἔπαρχον ἐδὴς Φλαουίας β’ πολειτῶν Ῥωμαίων, χιλιάρχων λεγίωνος ζ’ Γεμίνως Φιδήλεώς, ἐπάρχον τεκτών, βοηθῷ Λ(ουκίου) Πομπηΐου Οὐοπείσκου Κατελλίου Κέλερος ὁδῶν ναῶν ἱερῶν τόπων τε δημοσίων. Κλαύδιος Στρύμων, Κλαύδιος Ἐπίγονος, Κλαύδιος Εὐήμερος, Κλαυδίου Στρύμωνος υἱοὶ ἀπελευθέρου Κλαυδίου Ἀριστίως, τὸν ἰδίον εὐεργέτην. For other parallel texts, see Pflaum, ibid., 156 ff. (no. 66, L. Vibius Lentulus); I.v. Ephesos nos. 736, 2061.

39 Pflaum, ibid., 157.
40 Dictionnaire des antiquités Grecques et Romaines, p. 812, s.v. Ratio, Rationalis.
42 T. Mommsen, commentary for CIL VI, 8688-8692.
44 Plinius, Epistulae 8.6.13: Finem existimas? Mane dum et maiora accepis: 'Vtique, cum sit utile principis benignitatem promptissimam ad laudem praemiaque merentium industriæ ubique et maxime is locis... ea quæ s x kal. Februarias quæ proximae fuisse in amplissimo ordine optimus princeps recitasset senatus consultâ de is rebus facta in aere incidenterunt... idque æstigeretur ad statuam loricatam divi Iulii.'

46 For a detailed account on M. Antonius Pallas see: S. I. Oost, The Career of M. Antonius Pallas, AJPh 79/2, 1958, 113-139.
47 M. Corbier, Donner à voir, donner à lire - Mémoire et communication dans la Rome ancienne, Paris 2006, 147-162 (For an older version of this study by the same author was published under the title «Pallas el la statue de César. Affichage et espace public à Rome», Revue numismatique 152, 1997, 11-40).
48 Plinius, Nat. Hist. 34.18: Caesar quidem dictator loricitam sibi dicari in foro suo passus est.
49 Corbier, ibid. 156.
was dismissed from service by Nero in A.D. 55 and Praesens seems to have been given this office following the dismissal of Pallas. Apparently, a loricata was an official who maintained the imperial accounts. The word loricitas (a form of loricatis) on some papyri of military pay records from the A.D. second century is also believed to be connected to such a statue that probably stood before a chest where cash accounts were kept.50

**Tiberius Claudius Plocamus**

The person, who erected the statues of his friends Burrus and Praesens, is already known from another Perge inscription.51 On that inscription, the senate and people of Perge honour Plocamus, who was once priest of the imperial cult in Iconium, because of his piety towards emperors (Claudius, Nero and perhaps later?). In order to understand the reason for Plocamus’ presence in Perge, one should first consider the well directed determinations of Şahin concerning him in the commentary to I.v. Perge I, no. 35. According to Şahin, his nomen gentilicum and letter styles show that the date of honouring should be by the time of Claudius and Nero. After his liberation Plocamus went to his probable homeland, Claudiconium, whose name was changed in honour of Claudius and became imperial priest. Likewise, the scope of his habitation in Perge should also be related to the imperial cult that is clearly derived from the inscription that reads διὰ δὲ τὴν εἰς τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς κόσμιον ἀναστροφὴν. The duration of his residence in Perge coincided with the time when Galatia was inclusive of Pamphylia (during the reigns of Claudius and Nero) and the when imperial cult was initiated at Perge. Perhaps, Plocamus was sent by the emperor in person (Claudius or Nero) to Perge for the preparations for establishing the imperial cult. The information relating to the imperial cult in Perge belongs to the period of Flavians and later. That the relations between Claudiconium, where Plocamus was formerly the priest of imperial cult, and the family of Iulii Cornuti were well-established might have played a role in presence of Plocamus in Perge for this purpose.

The connection Şahin made between the presence of Plocamus at Perge and the family of Iulii Cornuti can be built on firmer grounds from new inscriptions. It is already known that the family of Iulii Cornuti defrayed the cost of some remarkable constructions at least from the reign of Nero onwards.52 The best known of these is the gymnasium-palaestra complex constructed by C. Iulius Cornutus in the northwest section of Perge.53 C. Iulius Cornutus was honoured by the people of Ariassus and Etenna in Perge,54 so the family had affiliation

---


51 I.v. Perge I, no. 35: [ὁ δῆμος] ὁ Περγαμῖος καὶ ἡ βουλή τῇ ἱεραίᾳ τὸς Κλαυδεικονίῳ, Πλόκαμον διὰ δὲ τὴν εἰς τοὺς Σεβαστοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς κόσμιον ἀναστροφὴν.

52 For details see: I.v. Perge I, p. 30 ff.


with other Galatian cities. The wealthy family of Iulii Cornuti took the initiative during the period of establishing the imperial cult in Perge; this is clearly understood because the first priest of the cult was from the same family. It makes sense that they took Iconium as an example, which already had the imperial cult, and Plocamus might have taken an important role during the foundation of the cult. Plocamus was both the priest of Claudius in Iconium (even perhaps initiated the imperial cult in Iconium by the order of Claudius following his liberation), and became amicus with praefectus praetorio Sextus Afranius Burrus and a loricata Lucius Pupius Praesens, who were rather influential men at court. Plocamus most probably became friend to them while he was priest of the imperial cult in Iconium when they were the procurators of the province. This clearly shows his strong relations with the Roman central authority. Therefore, the wealthy Iulii Cornuti family seems to have implemented the establishment of the imperial cult in Perge through the experience and effective mediation of Plocamus. After Plocamus concluded the preparations for the imperial cult, C. Iulius Cornutus Bryoninus, son of C. Iulius Cornutus, probably became the first priest of the cult. 55 Bryoninus was also honoured by his brothers and the people of other Galatian cities like Claudiconium and Conana as the priest of emperors.56

One of the most remarkable conclusions deduced from inscriptions is the definite evidence for that Lycia and Pamphylia were not joined until Vespasianus, an idea that was firstly asserted by Brandt and later constantly argued by Şahin and Adak.57 In both inscriptions, both procurators who were in charge by the times of Claudius and Nero, were commissioned in the provincia Galatica et Pamphyliae, so it has undoubtedly been proved that Pamphylia was joined with Galatia by the reigns of Claudius and Nero, as Özdizbay also remarked.58

58 Özdizbay, ibid., 861.
Özet
Perge’den iki Procurator Yazısı