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Contrary to the views of many modern scholars there is no evidence that during the first century of the Principate the imperial fiscus emerged as a second treasury of state alongside the old aerarium Saturni. It can be shown, also, that the imperial civil service began to expand and assume systematic control over the administration of the public finances only from the time of the Flavian emperors and Trajan. Again, in the early imperial period 'imperial' and 'senatorial' administrative spheres frequently overlap. This makes it appear unlikely that the general tendency of the first century was for two separate financial organizations - one controlled by the emperor and one by the senate - to emerge.

The status of the imperial fiscus did change in the period between the Julio-Claudian emperors and Trajan's reign. By Trajan's time the fiscus is treated in contemporary literature as a financial institution which is attached to the emperor as such, and which could be contrasted with the aerarium, but in general no longer as the personal chest of the emperor as an individual. The changing status of the fiscus reflects the fact that even the Julio-Claudian emperors had acquired special judicial privileges for their fiscus, which had formerly been the prerogative of public institutions. Therefore, by Trajan's time the fiscus was no longer strictly a private chest. Moreover, due to the large financial resources the emperors had at their disposal personally, they were able to contribute more than the
aerarium itself to supporting the costs of some public services. Nevertheless, although the nature and status of the fiscus undoubtedly changed during the first century, under Trajan the aerarium was still regarded as the sole central treasury of the Roman state.

For the typing of this thesis I required the services of two typists. I apologize for the resulting variations in the appearance of the typeface and some of the conventions used.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Précis</th>
<th>page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 The Modern Controversy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 The Imperial Financial Administration in the Provinces</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 The Administration of the Indirect Taxes</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 The Administration of the Roman Grain Supply</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 The Organization of the Urban Curae</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 The Function of the Aerarium Administration under the Early Principate</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 The Imperial Financial Administration in Rome</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 The Emperor and the Senate</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9 The Term 'Fiscus' in the Sources of the Early Principate</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10 Conclusion</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction Footnotes</th>
<th>157</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 Footnotes</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 Footnotes</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 Footnotes</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 Footnotes</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 Footnotes</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 Footnotes</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 Footnotes</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Footnotes</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9 Footnotes</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10 Footnotes</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

This thesis was begun with the aim of defining the nature of the fiscus in the early imperial period. It soon became apparent that a study of how the term fiscus is used in the literary sources can provide only a limited answer to the problem. For it is, in fact, often difficult to decide what an author actually means by the term in a given context, as the divergence in modern scholarly opinion on the subject demonstrates. (A brief discussion of the main lines of the controversy will be given in Chapter 1). Therefore I began to study the problem as an aspect of the broader question of the role of the imperial bureaucracy in the administration of the Empire from Augustus to Trajan, in order to discover (a) just what revenues and expenses came under the direct administrative control of the emperor within that period, and (b) whether these revenues and expenses were regarded as separate from the financial organization of the senate and Roman people. In other words, were revenues and expenses for which administrative responsibility was assumed by the emperor and his officials no longer regarded as accountable to the aerarium?

One proceeds from question (a) to (b) because there is, indeed, a fairly impressive body of evidence (drawn mainly from inscriptions) which indicates that in the period under consideration the imperial bureaucracy (which consisted both of slaves and freedmen of the familia Caesars and equestrians acting in the capacity of imperial
agents) was expanded to the point where it was no longer concerned solely with the management of the emperor's private property (the patrimonium or res familiaris), or only with administering the tribute from the imperial provinces. From the time of Augustus' settlement of 27 B.C., in those provinces where the emperors retained full imperium they used their own procurators for public financial duties, in place of the traditional senatorial magistrates (quaestors) who, however, continued to be sent out to the provinces formally entrusted to the senate (Dio LIII. 12-4).

But in the late first century and early second century A.D., imperial officials concerned with the administration and collection of the revenues drawn from indirect taxes and customs duties are found in Italy and senatorial provinces as well as in imperial provinces. Again, other developments, which date from the Julio-Claudian period, indicate a blurring of distinctions between nominally 'senatorial' and 'imperial' areas of government. For instance, in the public administration at Rome, imperial authority began to be exercised quite overtly over the management of the aerarium itself, and also over the various curae which had been set up under the guidance of Augustus and Tiberius in the form of boards of magistrates selected by the senate (for which see Chapter V).

It is, however, this apparent breaking down of distinctions, both in theory and in practice, between imperial and senatorial spheres of authority, which seems to point away from the conclusion that, either in the late Julio-Claudian or Flavian periods, or immediately after, there was a formal division of the financial organization
of the Roman state into two branches controlled by the emperor and the senate respectively.² Again, to show that a separate public chest, the fiscus, had already emerged alongside the old state treasury, the aerarium Saturni, surely depends not only on demonstrating that de facto control of public funds had been assumed by the imperial bureaucracy, but also on the more abstract question of just how long the emperors continued to concede the principle that they might be held accountable by the senate for the management of funds which belonged properly to the res publica - even if such a principle amounted only to a polite fiction. Indeed, the discrepancy between effective imperial control of public funds and vestiges of a formal theory of senatorial authority is pointed up in a well-known passage of Dio (ept. LXXI. 33. 2): according to him, the emperor Marcus Aurelius asked the senate to vote him funds from the public treasury for a proposed war against the Scythians. Dio states here that such conduct on the emperor's part was not necessary, since the public funds were already under his control; but it does seem significant that at the time Marcus reportedly expounded the principle that all the funds, both those in the public treasury and others, belonged to the senate and the people.

In Chapter VIII of this thesis, therefore, the respective roles of emperor and senate in the government of the Empire will be discussed, with emphasis on the senate's authority (both theoretical and actual) over financial affairs, in the hope that this may throw some light on the question of how far the principle of accountability to the senate may - or may not - have been observed under
particular emperors. Although there is not a great deal of evidence which bears directly on this point, with the help of the literary sources it is possible to reconstruct to some extent the attitudes of the emperors from Augustus to Trajan towards the corporate role of the senate as the highest council of state, both in general and with respect to financial policy-making in particular.

Finally, the specific problem of the definition of fiscus in the terminology of the ancient sources will be examined in the light of the conclusions which emerge from a study of the imperial financial administration, on the one hand, and from an analysis of what formal authority was retained by the senate over the public finances, on the other. Such an approach to the problem may help to explain, for example, why the emperor Trajan - who was actually responsible for greatly extending the control of the imperial bureaucracy over the revenues of the Empire - apparently wished to project, officially, an image of his financial management which would recall the Augustan example; for, as with Augustus and his patrimonium, the fiscus under Trajan appears in one inscription as a private chest from which the emperor subsidized public expenditure.\(^3\) This, in turn, helps to explain how it is that Pliny the Younger, in the Panegyricus, can distinguish between the fiscus, which is Trajan's, and the aerarium, which is the public treasury.\(^4\)

It appears, nevertheless, that the character of the fiscus changed in the period between the Julio-Claudian emperors and the reign of Trajan. For although the fiscus is not treated as a second public treasury in the literature
of Trajan's time, it is regarded as a financial institution
which could be compared or contrasted with the aerarium. It
will be argued that this view of the fiscus emerged
because the fiscus was no longer, in fact, the personal
chest of a particular emperor, as it is viewed in the
literary sources of the late Julio-Claudian period: it
had become a treasury possessing a special legal status
which the emperor controlled in virtue of his possession
of the imperial office.

It is probable that it was this change in the
character of the fiscus, in combination with the gradual
assumption of complete imperial administrative control of
the major financial resources of the Empire, which led to
the eventual emergence of the fiscus as the principal
treasury of the Roman state, superseding the aerarium.
Also, from Hadrian on, new constitutional and legal factors
relating to the very basis of the imperial office and its
authority began to emerge. These factors, I feel, should
form the basis of a separate study incorporating the period
from Hadrian to the Severan emperors.
CHAPTER I
THE MODERN CONTROVERSY

The modern controversy over the fiscus originated in the debate between Mommsen and Hirschfeld. In Mommsen's view, the revenues of the fiscus (consisting chiefly of the tribute drawn from the imperial provinces) belonged to the emperor in the same way as a Republican general could dispose of his manubiae. According to his thesis the fiscus in this sense existed under Augustus, so that from the beginning of the Principate the finances of the Roman state were divided into two sections, one belonging to the emperor and the other to the senate.

Hirschfeld, however, rejects as unsound Mommsen's theory of the origin and juridical status of the fiscus. In the first place, Hirschfeld emphasizes that Augustus distinguished carefully between the public funds and his private moneys, which seriously weakens Mommsen's contention that the emperor was equally proprietor of his patrimonium and the public funds he administered. Secondly, against Mommsen's assumption that the fiscus dates from the reign of Augustus, Hirschfeld points out that the earliest reference to the fiscus as the emperor's treasury occurs later, in the writings of Seneca: 'Caesar omnia habet, fiscus eius privata tantum ac sua, et universa in imperio eius sunt, in patrimonio propria'. Hirschfeld considers that by these terms, which are used synonymously here, Seneca means all the moneys administered by the emperor.
In Hirschfeld's view, the emergence of the *fiscus* was the result of the gradual separation of the public funds administered by the emperor from the funds in the *aerarium*. He argues that once the funds which fell to the emperor had been separated from those in the *aerarium*, they came to constitute a 'kaiserliche Zentralkasse', which stood in contrast to the *aerarium*. But, contrary to Mommsen, Hirschfeld holds that the revenues held apart from the *aerarium* in the *fiscus* continued to belong to the *res publica*.

Hirschfeld's views were developed by Rostovtzeff. This scholar acknowledges that the term *fiscus* is sometimes used in contexts which show that it refers to the private chest of the emperor, but he considers that as a rule *fiscus*, in the writings of Tacitus, Suetonius and the two Plinys, is used to denote the imperial financial administration as opposed to the *aerarium*. In looking at the historical origins of this usage of the term, Rostovtzeff emphasizes that in inscriptions *fiscus* appears for the first time in the sense of a provincial chest. Since the revenues of the imperial provinces were administered by imperial agents, the term *fiscus* acquired more and more the meaning of a chest administered by the emperor through his officials. Next, Rostovtzeff argues, due to the establishment in Claudius' reign of a central imperial financial administration under the management of the emperor's financial minister (the *a rationibus*), the concept of 'fiscus' was broadened. From that point on, Rostovtzeff maintains, the administration of some public revenues became identified with that of the emperor's private revenues; and in the same way, some public
expenditures were handled as palace expenses. Rostovtzeff concludes that all this necessarily led to the use of a more general term to denote the whole complex of chests which constituted the imperial financial administration, and this term was fiscus.\textsuperscript{14}

An article published by U. Wilcken in 1931, on the impensae of Augustus as enumerated in the Res Gestae,\textsuperscript{15} furnished a basis for further debate on the origin and nature of the fiscus. In his article, Wilcken argues that all Augustus' expenditures recorded in the Res Gestae were extraordinary in character, and were paid for out of the private means at his disposal.\textsuperscript{16} From this Wilcken deduces that, by contrast, the cost of the regular public expenditures for which Augustus assumed responsibility (the army, the provinces, the curae he established) was presumably borne by the funds in the fiscus.\textsuperscript{17} But although in the context of his discussion the fiscus cannot be the private chest of the emperor, Wilcken fails to define more precisely what he means by the term.\textsuperscript{18}

Soon after the publication of this article, Tenney Frank criticized Wilcken's constant reference to the fiscus in connection with Augustus' financial administration.\textsuperscript{19} While he accepts Wilcken's emphasis on the private and extraordinary character of the impensae recorded in the Res Gestae,\textsuperscript{20} he argues convincingly that the only central treasury of state in existence under Augustus was the aerarium Saturni: 'Since Velleius, who knew Augustus personally, speaks of the annual revenues of Egypt as flowing to the Aerarium ("in aerarium reditus contulit", Vell. ii, 39), it is the part of prudence to omit the
word "Fiscus" in speaking of Augustan finances; for certainly, if there was a Fiscus, the Egyptian revenues might be expected to lodge there. Frank agrees that Augustus' own financial secretaries would have kept provincial ledgers and handled public moneys under Augustus' direct supervision, but that 'these departmental offices seem to me to have been only clearing houses that balanced their accounts with the treasury (the Aerarium)'.

To support his conclusions that we ought to assume a single state treasury for the Augustan period, Frank furnishes an analysis of the probable income and expenditure of the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Principate. On the basis of the figures he arrives at, Frank argues that the aerarium could easily have supported the normal level of expenditure on the armies, the corn-dole, and the provincial administration from its annual income. Since Frank's estimate of the aerarium's income depends on his assumption that it continued to receive the revenue from all the provinces, it must be admitted that his argument does not exclude the existence of a second treasury of state under Augustus. Nevertheless, in the absence of direct evidence that a central imperial treasury (the fiscus) already existed under Augustus, combined with Velleius' testimony that the Egyptian revenues went to the aerarium, Frank's general conclusion in this article seems sound. On the other hand, similarly to Hirschfeld, Frank holds that by Claudius' reign the concept of the fiscus as the central imperial treasury had emerged. Frank is also of the opinion that under Claudius the fiscus became a second public treasury vis-à-vis the aerarium Saturni.

In particular, he concludes that changes introduced by
Claudius in the administration of the corn dole 'threw directly on the emperor the military charges, the cost of the dole, and the cost as well as the profit of the annona, and also permitted the emperor to keep in his Fiscus all revenues from the imperial provinces, plus the tribute in kind from Egypt, Africa, Sardinia and Sicily'.

In an article published in 1944, Last, however, returns in some respects to the position of Mommsen in attempting to define the origin and nature of the fiscus. He defines the term fiscus (where it occurs without qualification) as 'that part of the financial system of the Roman Empire which was controlled by the Princeps, together with the assets of that part in so far as they did not belong to the patrimonium or res privata'. He continues that it also follows from this definition that, as the emperor was in at least immediate charge of the finances of the imperial provinces from the establishment of the Principate, a fiscus whatever it may have been called in those days by the Romans themselves, must have existed from 27 B.C. Fundamentally Mommsen was right in arguing against Hirschfeld...that from the beginning of the Principate there must have been what he calls 'eine kaiserliche Central-kasse'(sic). So too it can be said with confidence that at no time after 27 B.C. could Augustus have carried on his financial work without a fiscal office; for only with the help of such an institution could he have published periodical accounts (Suet. Caligula 16, 1) or produced documents like that mentioned by Cassius Dio in 53, 30, 3 (23 B.C.) or like that described by Suetonius in the last words of Divus Augustus (104, 4) - a 'breviarium totius imperii' which set out, among other things, 'quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis et uectigaliorum residuis'.

Last continues, however, that to say that the fiscus and the fiscal office are both as old as the Principate itself must not be taken to imply that there is no element of truth in Hirschfeld's contention that the history of
the fiscus as he understood it began with Claudius, or that Tenney Frank was wholly unjustified in protesting against U. Wilcken's use of the word fiscus in connection with the financial system of Augustus, and in himself treating the public finances of the whole Roman Empire in the Augustan age under the single head aerarium. In Last's view, the main question to be resolved is whether the assets of the fiscus are to be regarded as the property of the Roman people or the Princeps, and on this question he rejects Mommsen's conclusions. Against Mommsen, Last maintains that the correct analogy for the relationship of the Princeps to the public funds he administered is not that of a general to his manubiae, but that of a proconsul to the revenues produced by the taxation of the province or provinces under his command. And just as under the Republic proconsuls could not be considered as 'owning' the revenues they administered, when in 27 B.C. Augustus became proconsul of seven major provinces for ten years, the revenues of those provinces would still have been included in the single financial system of the Roman state, which can be labelled with the name aerarium.

On the basis of this reconstruction of the Augustan system of finance, Last can therefore state his agreement with the opinion of Hirschfeld and Frank that the fiscus had not-yet come into existence. But at the same time Last himself maintains that the germ of the fiscus was the financial secretariat which the Princeps was bound to maintain 'to co-ordinate not only the finances of the various provinces with one another but the finances of the imperial provinces as a whole with those from the public
provinces and other sources'. Therefore, he holds that there is some truth in Mommsen's assertion against Hirschfeld that the fiscus had its origin in Augustan times, although in agreement with Hirschfeld he concludes that it was not until Claudius' reign that the 'imperial financial system seems first to have been separated off from the Aerarium'.

Last's theory of the origin of the fiscus places all the emphasis on developments in the imperial administration of public finance. In an article published in 1945, Sutherland takes a rather different approach to the question. In his view, the fiscus evolved from the imperial patrimonium. He states that 'some confusion still exists concerning the relationship between Princeps and state in the control of public finance in the early period of the Roman Empire', and that in his article he attempts to define the essential meaning of 'state finance' and 'imperial finance'. Similarly to Frank, he emphasizes that there is no evidence for supposing that Augustus absorbed any moneys drawn from the public revenues; on the other hand, he does stress that Augustus' private wealth facilitated interference in, and so control of, state finance. Again, in Sutherland's opinion, as early as Tiberius the line of demarcation between the aerarium and the emperor's private wealth ceased to be strictly maintained; for the emperor now began to seize properties which should automatically have gone to the aerarium as bona damnatorum.

Sutherland believes that the term fiscus is used anachronistically by Tacitus for the time of Tiberius, since 'in an absolute and unqualified sense, and in the singular number' fiscus is not found in any writer before
At the same time, however, defining *fiscus* (without qualification) as the personal wealth or 'privy purse' of the *princeps*, Sutherland argues that during Tiberius' reign 'the imperial privy purse, which had hitherto played a purely personal and non-reciprocal part - albeit a handsome one - in state finance, first began to take official place vis-à-vis the *aerarium*'.

He believes that under Claudius the outlines of the picture become clearer, as additional public financial responsibilities now assumed by the emperor contributed further to the process begun under Tiberius. In particular, Sutherland points to increased imperial influence over the *aerarium*, due to Claudius' action in transferring the management of it from praetors to young quaestors who, 'lacking wide experience, would naturally look elsewhere - to Claudius - for guidance'; again, Sutherland emphasizes that the emergence of Pallas, Claudius' financial secretary, also marks the waning independence of the *aerarium*. Moreover, 'the abolition of the post of *quaestor Ostiensis* removed the *frumentatio* - politically a most effective duty - from among the liabilities of the *aerarium* and placed it as a charge upon the privy purse'.

Then in A.D. 53, according to Sutherland, came the final step, 'when Claudius announced that his procurators should possess full competence and authority in all cases involving finance'. Sutherland concludes, therefore, that Augustus' Julio - Claudian successors steadily increased the measure of imperial control over the *aerarium*, so that in practice by A.D. 68 the *aerarium* and the *fiscus* were hardly distinguishable.

But while Sutherland considers that this state of affairs continued to prevail under the Flavian emperors, he
argues that an attempt was made by Nerva and Trajan to restore the line of demarcation between imperial and state finance. Sutherland observes that formal distinction between aerarium and fiscus certainly emerged in Trajan's reign, and whereas, on the one hand, imperial control of the aerarium was no less absolute under Trajan than in previous reigns, on the other hand Trajan (aided, in Sutherland's opinion, by his vast manubiae from Dacia) 'could revive and restore the false and subtle Augustan pattern of financial administration - the public aerarium ("free and independent") backed, guaranteed, and always guided by a princeps whose personal wealth might bear comparison with the wealth of the state itself'. This I, believe, is an important observation regarding the policies of Nerva and Trajan, and the public image of their rule they desired to project. Again, the implications of the contrast made in contemporary sources between fiscus and aerarium have, I feel, sometimes being overlooked or misinterpreted (see discussion of G. Boulvert's contribution to the debate on fiscus, below). Nevertheless, while purporting to clear up the remaining confusion concerning the definition of 'imperial' and 'state' finance in the early imperial period, in the conclusion to his article Sutherland seems to have lapsed into some confusion himself. On the one hand he maintains that, throughout the period from Augustus to Trajan, the aerarium was the sole public treasury (apart from the aerarium militare, with its special purpose), but on the other hand concludes that the fiscus, which continued to be regarded as the 'privy-purse', by Trajan's time 'now handled the great proportion of public revenue and
Thus Sutherland fails to clarify what he describes as the 'official status' assumed by the _fiscus_ from Tiberius on, and also to explain fully enough how Trajan could present his _fiscus_ as his personal treasury, if (at the same time) it was officially recognized as the treasury which, in place of the _aerarium_, now received the greater part of public revenue.

Nevertheless, certain aspects of Sutherland's thesis were subsequently taken up by scholars such as De Laet, who accepts his view that there are sufficient grounds for dating the emergence of the _fiscus_ to Tiberius' reign. On this assumption, De Laet proceeds to attribute to Tiberius the establishment of the large customs districts of the _quadragesima Galliarum_ and the _publicum portorii Illyrici_, as well as the organization of the _quattuor publica Africae_, whose institution he believes must date from the Julio-Claudian period. In De Laet's opinion, the revenues collected within the boundaries of these tax districts, which included senatorial and imperial provinces alike, must have accrued to the same treasury, and he concludes that Tiberius transferred this income to the _fiscus_.

The opinions so far discussed tend to assume that the crucial steps in the emergence of the _fiscus_ as the official imperial treasury alongside the old senatorial treasury, the _aerarium_, had already taken place before the end of the Julio-Claudian period. To some extent this is true of the analysis of A.H.M. Jones, but, as observed by Garzetti, he also introduces some new considerations into the scholarly debate on the _fiscus_. On the one hand, Jones agrees in principle with the conclusion of Tenney Frank and others that there
was still only the one central treasury in existence under Augustus.\(^54\) Indeed, he would appear to give added weight to this conclusion by pointing to the strong interest that the Julio-Claudian emperors showed in the efficient management of the aerarium, and the measures they took to bring its management under their own control.\(^55\) On the other hand, Jones also proposes that while the revenues collected throughout the Empire were in theory paid into the aerarium under the Republic, in practice a large proportion of the money collected in each province, whether by the governor or by the publicani, was spent locally. Only surpluses of local expenditure would be transmitted to Rome, and only when the expenses of a province exceeded its income would money be sent from the aerarium to a province.\(^56\) Therefore, in Jones' theory, the bulk of the Empire's revenues remained in the provincial fisci to meet on-the-spot needs. But as G.H. Stevenson observes 'It is impossible to believe what is often implied, that the cost of the defence of the Empire was borne entirely by the provinces in which troops were stationed, many of which were far from wealthy'.\(^57\) This factor is also taken into account by Jones, who remarks that as is generally admitted, a division of the Empire's revenues between Augustus and the senate on the basis of the provinces each governed could not have worked in practice since Augustus' expenses must greatly have exceeded the resources of his provinces.\(^58\) Jones' own theory of Augustus' relation to the aerarium is that, like the great Republican proconsuls, he was periodically credited by votes of the senate with such sums as would enable him to discharge his functions as proconsul. In addition, supplementary grants
must have been voted to him to finance such curae as he personally undertook (i.e., those managed by his own praefecti and not by curatores) but, once again, in practice he would have drawn this money from any convenient source: in the first place, from the fisci of his own provinces, but also from the fisci or publicani of adjacent senatorial provinces. Again, some money must have been drawn from the aerarium for expenditure in Rome and Italy, and to supplement the fisci of poor but expensive provinces, like Pannonia. Of all the imperial provinces, probably only Egypt produced a surplus over local expenditure, and as a contemporary source informs us, this surplus was paid into the aerarium. 59

Jones argues further that in theory Augustus would have been accountable for all the moneys allocated to him, but since he held his command until his death he need never have rendered any account. 60 Then, on Tiberius' accession, the vote of funds would presumably have been made without time limit, since no time limit was placed on his tenure of powers, and this continued to be the regular practice; therefore the vote of funds by the senate would have become a mere formality. Again, Jones (like the scholars whose views have been discussed above) points to the existence of an imperial financial secretariat under Augustus which presumably drew up his accounts and also the balance-sheet of the Empire. In addition, Jones considers that there must have been in some sense a ratio patrimonii from the beginning, whose officials were responsible for the accounts of the emperor's private fortune, since, in his view, these accounts must
always have been kept separately from those of the public moneys which the emperors handled.

From these considerations Jones proceeds to the question of whether the early emperors, in addition to their personal accounting staff, possessed a personal treasury, at which point he writes, 'we are faced with a confusing ambiguity in the use of the word *fiscus*. However, Jones believed that the following usages of the term can be distinguished - 1) an individual's private fortune and 2) a special fund. Thus in the Republican period, Jones points out, *fiscus* became a technical term for the public funds in the hands of a provincial governor, and in the early Principate it appears to be used in reference to the emperor in both senses: it may denote his private fortune, or it may denote special funds under his control either of public money or of his private money. Thirdly, Jones argues, the word *fiscus* early acquired a more extended meaning, analogous to our use of the word 'treasury', to denote the whole financial administration controlled by the emperor.

The reason for the emergence of this 'new meaning' Jones traces in the growth of the imperial administration in the period following Augustus. He writes:

The emergence of this last meaning is at first startling. But a new phenomenon had appeared - the huge organization staffed by imperial slaves, freedmen and procurators, which exacted money due to the emperor, made payments in his name, and controlled the funds at his disposal. A word was needed to describe this new phenomenon, and *fiscus* suggested itself for a variety of reasons. The public funds handled by the imperial department of finance might be regarded as being, notionally, in the emperor's *fiscus*, in the same way that public funds in a province were said to be notionally in the proconsul's *fiscus*. Most of the money concerned was physically stored in sundry provincial *fisci*. And finally the emperor made many payments for
public purposes out of his own pocket, 'e fisco suo'.

The next developments in the evolution of the fiscus Jones attributes to the emperor Vespasian. For while he considers that 'neither the literary nor the epigraphic evidence justify the assumption that the Julio-Claudian emperors possessed a fiscus in the sense of a treasury at Rome in which they kept public money', Jones believes that in the Flavian period this situation was changed. He concludes that in the Flavian period fisci, which were in fact public chests, were certainly established at Rome: under this heading Jones includes the fisci Asiaticus and Alexandrinus, as well as the fiscus Iudaicus and fiscus frumentarius. In Jones' view, the purpose behind the establishment of the chests called Asiaticus and Alexandrinus, which he describes as 'branch offices' of the provincial fisci of Asia and Egypt, was to enable Vespasian to draw on the surplus revenues of these provinces, and handle his finances through his own procurator without the necessity of making withdrawals through the officials of the aerarium. Therefore, Jones concludes, Vespasian would also have been able to avoid the last vestiges of publicity for his finances, 'since the rationes imperii had long ceased to be published, and now no imperial funds passed through the aerarium'. In returning to the question of the usage of the term fiscus in this period, Jones is careful to point out, however, that although in 'popular, and indeed in semi-official, language the term fiscus, in the singular, denoted the imperial financial administration, ... in strict official parlance, fisci in the plural was
still the correct expression'. 69 In support of this conclusion he cites an inscription, set up in A.D. 118, in which the senate and Roman people officially thank Hadrian for his remission of 900,000,000 HS due to the fisci, 70 although it is not made clear in the inscription whether 'public' or 'private' fisci, or both, are meant. 71

Nevertheless, Jones considers that because from Vespasian forward 72 'imperial' and 'public' finance were (in his view) completely severed, 'it was natural to think and speak of fiscus and aerarium as two separate and complementary organizations, one managed by the emperor and the other by the senate, between them covering all state finance'. 73 He concludes that it is in this sense that writers of the reign of Trajan often use the two terms, 74 and although Tacitus and Suetonius sometimes use such phrases as 'aerario et fisco' or 'aerario vel fisco' or 'aerarii fiscique': 75 in writing of earlier periods, Jones disregards these examples as anachronistic and therefore inapplicable to Julio-Claudian financial arrangements. 76

Jones' argument has been reproduced in considerable detail here because the significance of the administrative developments he discusses (including the appearance of fisci at Rome) will be referred to again in this thesis, along with the question of the 'accountability' of the emperor to the aerarium for public funds he administered through his procurators. 77 Also, Jones' definition of the term fiscus according to his analysis of various stages in its meaning has been the starting point for recent discussion on the subject.
Garzetti, who ends his survey of scholarly opinion on the emergence of the fiscus with Jones' article, sums up what he himself considers were the significant historical factors behind the establishment of the imperial treasury. For him the important question is how and when did the financial secretariat of Augustus (which he agrees was no more than a 'paper-work' organization at first) become a central treasury to which the name fiscus can be given. 78

In attempting to answer this question he points to the epigraphic evidence attesting fisci at Rome, and argues that the appearance of these fisci indicates a shifting towards the financial system characteristic of the provinces, and a system more subject to imperial control. 79 Garzetti also emphasizes the tendency of the complex palace bureaucracy to assume not only the role of accounting but also the actual management of the public funds, which would gradually have undermined the prerogatives of the aerarium. Garzetti acknowledges, however, that the actual passage from fisci to the fiscus remains a mystery. 80

Tacitus' account of how Pallas, the a rationibus of Claudius, asked and was granted a guarantee that his accounts with the res publica should be regarded as balanced, does imply that the emperor's financial minister was responsible for the management of public funds. 81 But apart from the reception of bona caduca and bona damnatorum, 82 there is no direct evidence that the fiscus, in the early period of the Principate, had equal status with the aerarium as a depository for public revenues. Again, there is no evidence that (as assumed by Rostovtzeff, Jones and Garzetti, e.g.) the individual fisci attested in
inscriptions were regarded as a single complex which
could be designated the fiscus. Nevertheless, it is often
assumed that the appearance of imperial officials in any
branch of administration (as in connection with the
administration of the indirect taxes, or the grain supply)
indicates that control over its finances had passed from
the aerarium to the fiscus. That assumption will be
frequently questioned in the chapters which follow.

In contrast to the conclusions of the scholars so far
discussed, Millar, in an article published in 1963, argues
that in the first two centuries of the Principate the
fiscus always refers to the emperor's private wealth, and
is simply a synonym for the terms res familiaris, patrimonium
and similar expressions. He maintains that the proper
historical standpoint for the understanding of the development
of the fiscus in the first two centuries of the Empire has
never, to his knowledge, been properly understood. In his
view,

The significant factor is the importance of the
the Emperor's private wealth in the running of
the State. In the way in which that wealth was
used for public ends the Empire, as in all things,
shows the practice of Republican magnates writ
large. Thus Augustus' huge expenditure on public
needs, detailed in the Res Gestae, was at once
the culmination of one aspect of Republican
politics and the foundation of a permanent element
in the structure of Imperial finance. It is to
these imperial funds that the word 'fiscus' refers -
and it is normally best translated as 'the imperial
estate'. There was no moment at which an
institution called 'the fiscus' was created. The
strictly correct way of describing what took place
is to say that 'fiscus' gradually became the
predominant technical term used in speaking of the
Imperial wealth.

Taking as his starting-point Seneca's statement
'Caesar omnia habet, fiscus eius privata tantum ac sua: et
Millar then proceeds to argue that the various usages of the term *fiscus* similarly illustrate 'the private-law position of the Princeps as an owner of slaves and properties, a *patronus* of freedmen and a party to ordinary commercial and legal transactions'. In particular, he emphasizes that *fiscus* frequently appears in connection with the ownership and tenancy of properties - as, for example, where Pliny the Elder says that Augustus paid the city of Naples 20,000 sesterces per year 'e fisco suo' for the Collis Leucogaeus, and states that in his own time the *fiscus* ran the balsam plantations near Jericho and sold the crops.

Millar's thesis, however, appears to break down when he attempts to include all uses of the term *fiscus*, especially where the word occurs in the context of provincial finance, under the general heading of the private wealth of the emperor. In an article which is largely a reply to Millar, P. Brunt concedes that with some of the texts cited by Millar this difficulty might be overcome if it is agreed that *fiscus* in these cases refers not to the imperial treasury but to a provincial chest. But Brunt considers, nevertheless, that Millar has 'failed to disprove Professor A. H. M. Jones' theory that "fiscus" has diverse senses'. In Brunt's own theory, *fiscus*, when used by Romans in the Principate without qualification and without any local context to which it can be confined, 'clearly refers to the imperial finances as a whole'. Citing Seneca, he agrees that originally the term referred to the private wealth of the emperor, and (contrary to Jones) he believes that Tacitus and Pliny more than once contrast *fiscus* and *aerarium*. 
Brunt acknowledges that enough of the *fiscus* income remained private in origin to make the contrast between it and the *aerarium* not wholly meaningless; but in his view the *fiscus* from an early stage administered, though it was not the proprietor of, public income. He considers that the reception of *bona caduca* and *bona damnatorum* by the *fiscus* from Tiberius' reign 'can hardly be explained except on the hypothesis that the "fiscus" was not, as Millar holds, a merely private fund of the emperor, but that it was itself a kind of department of the *aerarium*, of which the emperor was the administrator'.

Brunt may be correct in pointing to a gradual evolution in the history of the *fiscus* in the course of which public income administered by the emperor became assimilated with the imperial *patrimonium*. But it is unlikely that this process of assimilation began as early as he maintains. Although it is true that in the early imperial period procurators were administering public revenues as well as the private property of the emperors, Brunt himself can find little indication that in the first two centuries of the Principate direct and indirect taxes went to the *fiscus*. He argues that it cannot be assumed that taxes did not go to the *fiscus*, since to his knowledge no evidence from the period in question tells us where the direct taxes did go. That may be so; yet in view of the absence of direct testimony, it would appear more likely that taxes from both imperial and senatorial provinces were still regarded as belonging to a single financial system, for which the *aerarium* remained the sole central treasury. Again, Brunt, and earlier Sutherland, attach considerable
significance to the fact that the *fiscus* began to acquire *bona damnatorum* as early as Tiberius' reign. But although it is probably correct to argue that this represented a gradual intrusion of the *fiscus* on the rights of the *aerarium*, it evidently did not mean that the *fiscus* was already regarded as a public treasury possessing parallel status to the *aerarium*. If in the course of the first century the term *fiscus* was commonly used to denote 'the whole financial administration controlled by the emperor', including public revenues under the emperor's administration and control, it is difficult to see how Pliny the Younger in addressing Trajan can so explicitly contrast 'de publico', meaning the *aerarium*, and 'de tuo', meaning the *fiscus*.

This last consideration is also ignored by Boulvert, who in a recent article analyses what he considers were the various stages in the evolution of the term *fiscus*. Boulvert writes:

Tout gouverneur tient pour le compte de l' *aerarium* populi Romani une caisse, le terme *fiscus* désigne celle-ci. Le prince auquel sont confiées les provinces impériales détiendra de ce fait des *fisci*. Enfin, ces *fisci* du prince formant un tout sur le plan comptable, l'ensemble des finances publiques tenues par le prince et semble-t-il aussi ses biens patrimoniaux ont fini par constituer le *fiscus*, ensemble financier impérial s'opposant à toute autre caisse publique ou privée.

He argues that writers of the Julio-Claudian period still use *fiscus* in the concrete sense of a chest, whereas in the Flavian period a new meaning of the term appears. As the earliest example of this new usage Boulvert cites Pliny the Elder's statement that under Claudius, Annius Plocamus 'Maris Rubri vectigal a fisco redemerat'.

In Boulvert's view, the essential distinction between this and earlier usage of *fiscus* is that in Pliny: 'Le
fiscus intervenant comme une sorte de personne affermant le vectigal ne peut être confondu avec une caisse entendue au sens strictement matériel, et d'autre part une caisse provinciale ne peut être considérée comme une entité'.

Boulvert argues that because the fiscus was now regarded as an institution, writers contemporary with the Flavians or early Antonines often couple or contrast it with the aerarium. In Suetonius, he argues, fiscus appears in the Life of Vespasian in this new 'institutional' sense, whereas in the preceding Lives it denotes only a material chest. Thus in Boulvert's theory, Suetonius uses fiscus in the sense it actually had under each emperor. Boulvert also attempts to classify Tacitus' use of the term according to the same criteria. He concludes that in the Annals 'Tacite utilise le couple aerarium-fiscus comme on le fait de son temps et lorsque les auteurs qui ont pu l'influencer emploient fiscus à côté d'aerarium, ce n'est pas au sens de patrimonium'.

Boulvert's criteria for distinguishing between Julio-Claudian and post Julio-Claudian usages of the term fiscus are not convincing, however, when they are applied to certain passages in the Annals. This is especially apparent where (apropos of Ann. 6, 17) he is obliged to argue:

Même si sous Tibère c'est le patrimonium qui a profité de la mainmise, Tacite n'emploie pas fiscus en ce sens. À son époque, le fiscus, caisse impériale générale, reçoit des biens confisqués, Pline le Jeune l'affirme quelques années auparavant sans avoir fait valoir qu'il s'agissait de quelque chose d'irrégulier.

Again, even if Boulvert's analysis of Tacitus' terminology is accepted, it seems surprising that in the Annals Tacitus uses fiscus in a sense appropriate to his own
time in describing events of the early Julio-Claudian period, whereas in the Histories, according to Boulvert, he uses the term 'correctly' in the sense of a provincial chest, or the imperial patrimonium. Boulvert argues that the discrepancies between the vocabulary of the two works indicate a chronological evolution, 'non pas relative aux événements relatés et dans lesquels il est fait allusion à fiscus, mais aux deux ouvrages historiques de Tacite'. He concludes, then, that in the period between the composition of the Histories and that of the Annals, Tacitus' vocabulary underwent a significant modification.

But according to Boulvert's own theory, the 'new' meaning of the fiscus as a second public treasury had appeared earlier in the writings of Frontinus and Pliny the Younger. It is difficult to understand why Tacitus should have adopted the terminology of his time only for his second major work. It seems simpler to conclude that in the Annals as well as in the Histories, Tacitus uses fiscus to denote the private wealth of the emperor.

Boulvert, and A.H.M. Jones before him, would therefore appear to have erred in supposing that when Suetonius, Tacitus and Pliny the Younger couple the terms aerarium and fiscus, they are necessarily denoting two comparable institutions rather than two contrasting ones. Especially in view of Pliny's description of the aerarium as 'public', and the fiscus as Trajan's, the conclusion that in the course of the first century the fiscus had emerged as a second treasury of state remains open to question.
CHAPTER 2
THE IMPERIAL FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION
IN THE PROVINCES

As pointed out in the preceding chapter, it is generally assumed that during the first century A.D. control over a large proportion of the public revenues of the Roman Empire passed into the hands of the imperial financial organization. In this chapter, discussion will be focused chiefly on the question of how far the provincial financial administration came under imperial control in the period from Augustus to Trajan. In the course of this discussion, it will also be considered whether the establishment of imperial control over the financial administration of the provinces entailed the severance of their revenues from the aerarium Saturni, and their transfer to an imperial treasury, the fiscus.

Dio's account of the settlement of 27 B.C. provides some information about the new system of provincial government introduced by Augustus. Dio writes that following the ratification of his πρεσβεία by the senate and people in that year, Augustus nevertheless wished to be thought democratic: therefore, while he accepted all the care and oversight of the public business (τῶν τε προστασίων τῶν κοινών πᾶσιν) on the ground that it still required some attention on his part, he declared that he would not personally govern all the provinces, and that in the case of such provinces as he would govern, he would not do so indefinitely; and he did in fact restore to the senate the weaker provinces,
on the ground that they were peaceful and free from war, while he retained the most powerful, alleging that they were insecure and precarious and either had enemies on their borders or were able to begin a serious revolt on their own account. After listing the provinces which Augustus retained and those which were now handed over to the senate, Dio goes on to describe the regulations Augustus laid down for the government of both classes of provinces: with the exception of Egypt (which he placed under an equestrian praefectus), he at first appointed senators to govern them. Next he arranged that the governors of senatorial provinces should be annual magistrates, chosen by lot, except when a senator enjoyed a special privilege because of the large number of his children or because of his marriage. These governors were to be sent out by vote of the senate in public meeting; they were to carry no sword at their belt nor wear military uniform; the name of proconsul was to be given not only to the two ex-consuls but also to the others who had merely served as praetors or who held at least the rank of ex-praetors. The other governors, on the other hand, were to be chosen by the emperor himself and were to be called his envoys and pro-praetors (that is, the legati Augusti pro praetore), even if the men selected were ex-consuls.

As Dio's account indicates, Augustus delegated his imperium to senators of praetorian and consular rank, who were to be his legati and replace him at the head of his provinces. He also delegated imperium to men of equestrian rank, whose title of praefectus underlines the military basis of their imperium. From Claudius' reign the title of these equestrian governors was generally replaced by
that of *procurator*, but the combined title *procurator et praefectus* also occurs. 6

In appointing *praefecti* Augustus was possibly following and developing Republican usage. 7 On the other hand, the position of the *praefectus Aegypti* was definitely exceptional, the powers and functions attributed to this official being 'quite abnormal for a prefect, since he not only ruled an exceptionally important province, but commanded an army of three legions beside auxiliary troops'. 8

Yet, in theory, the province of Egypt remained the property of the Roman state. The revenues of the province fell to the public treasury, 9 and Augustus declared in the *Res Gestae*: 'Aegyptum imperio Populi Romani adieci'. 10 Moreover, the senate, as well as the emperor and his prefect, issued regulations in the province. *Senatus consulta* are cited as one source for the regulations contained in the *Gnomon* of the *Idios Logos*. 11

Thus the senate was not, in a formal sense, excluded from exerting its authority in the provinces governed by the emperor. Conversely, the sources indicate that, in practice, representatives from communities in senatorial provinces might approach the emperor, as well as the senate. 12

On the financial level, a division of the provinces between senate and emperor would never have worked in practice, since 'Augustus' expenses must greatly have exceeded the resources of his provinces: a supplementary grant in some form would have been necessary'. 13 It is likely, for example, that the revenues from Asia and those raised in all the Gallic provinces (including Narbonensis) were
necessary for the payment of the armies and the costs of defending the frontiers of the Empire. At any rate, a passage in the *Histories* of Tacitus does show that the tribute from the three imperial provinces of Gaul was used to cover the cost of the defence of Britain and Germany.\textsuperscript{14} For Nero's time, the grain tribute of the senatorial province of Africa is reported to have fed Rome for eight months of the year, and that of Egypt for four months.\textsuperscript{15} Again, Tacitus depicts Vespasian as predicting the defeat of the Vitellians, because 'quando Aegyptus, clastra annonae, vectigalia opulentissimarum provinciarum obtinerentur, posse Vitelli exercitum egestate stipendii frumentique ad deditionem subigi'.\textsuperscript{16}

There was, however, a clear administrative distinction between senatorial and imperial provinces in the Julio-Claudian period. In the imperial provinces, the chief officer of finance was the procurator.\textsuperscript{17} In Dio's time, the procurators (ἐξηγητούς) were the officials who collected the public revenues and made disbursements according to the instructions given them.\textsuperscript{18} It is doubtful whether they actually collected the taxes under Augustus, for in the earliest period of the Principate it appears that the collection of both tribute in kind and money taxes was still fairly generally farmed out, as a passage of Tacitus indicates: 'frumenta et pecunia vectigales, cetera publicorum fructuum societatibus equitum Romanorum agitabantur'.\textsuperscript{19} But even under Augustus the procurators in imperial provinces must have had some responsibility for seeing that the tribute was collected and reached the administrative centre of their province. It is also probable that they were responsible for
keeping an account of the money on hand (as presumably were the quaestors in the senatorial provinces).\textsuperscript{20} For Augustus' reign we know of the activities of the notorious Licinus, \textit{"\epsilon\acute{p}ιτροπος της Γαλατίας"}, who was a former slave of Caesar freed by Augustus. Licinus was reported to have increased the tribute collected from the Gauls by dividing the year into fourteen months: for he declared that December was really the tenth month, and for that reason they must reckon on two months more (which he called the eleventh and twelfth respectively) as the last, and contribute the money that was due for these last months.\textsuperscript{21}

Whether the revenues collected in each imperial province were for the most part used on the spot for local expenditure, or whether there was a surplus to be despatched to Rome or directly to neighbouring regions, the procurators and their staff were presumably employed either in supervising local disbursements or in allocating the funds to be despatched. It is generally accepted that the following inscription attests the existence of a provincial chest at Lugdunum under Tiberius: \textit{"Musico Ti. Caesaris August. / Scurrano disp. ad fiscum Gallicum / provinciae Lugdunensis / ex vicari(i)s eius qui cum eo Romae cum decessit fuerunt...."}\textsuperscript{22} It would not be surprising to find a fairly complex imperial administration at Lugdunum early in the Principate, since it is quite likely - especially if the Gallic revenues were already important in financing the costs of defence on the German frontier - that it served as the chief financial centre for the whole region (see Rostovtzeff, \textit{DE} art. \textit{fiscus} P.110). The principal imperial mint was also located at
Lungdunum under Augustus and Tiberius (see Mattingly, *Roman Coins*, pp. 105-6), and imperial slaves associated with the minting of the coinage are known to have been employed in it.  

Again, the procurators who held their posts in an imperial province evidently fulfilled a dual function in that they were also responsible for the management of the emperor's private property in that territory. Certain incidents related in the literary sources point to the responsibilities of the provincial procurators over the private affairs of the emperor: Josephus, for example, relates how, c. A.D. 36, the future Jewish king, Agrippa I, was pursued by Herennius Capito, the procurator of the region of Jamnia, who sent soldiers to exact from him ἡ ἡγεμόνες ήσσαυρά της Καίσαρος ἀπελαμβάνας ἐπὶ 'Ῥώμης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ'.  

Josephus, for example, relates how, c. A.D. 36, the future Jewish king, Agrippa I, was pursued by Herennius Capito, the procurator of the region of Jamnia, who sent soldiers to exact from him ἡ ἡγεμόνες ήσσαυρά της Καίσαρος ἀπελαμβάνας ἐπὶ 'Ῥώμης ὑπ' αὐτοῦ'.  

Jamnia had become an imperial property when Herod's sister Salome bequeathed this territory to Livia.  

Capito must have been procurator from before A.D. 29 until at least 41. Earlier, in A.D. 6, when the rule of Archelaus (who had been allotted a share of Herod's kingdom after the latter's death in 4 B.C.) was dissolved, Josephus states that ἡ οὐσία ἀπό τοῦ Καίσαρος ἡγεμόνος ἐγκαταστάθησεν.  

In this instance, however, it was the governor of Syria, Quirinius, who was entrusted with the liquidation of the estate, although the region as a whole was then converted into a procuratorial province. After Quirinius had carried out a census and sold Archelaus' estate, the equestrian Coponius took over responsibility for the administration of Judaea: ἡ ἡγεμόνες Ἰουδαίων τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐξουσίᾳ.  

Later, under Nero, imperial slaves were
apparently used in the province of Britain to appropriate the hereditary properties of the king of the Iceni.30

In the senatorial provinces, on the other hand, the functions and authority of the emperor's procurators were carefully defined as extending only to the management of his private property in those areas. Under Tiberius, the procurator of Asia, Lucilius Capito, was obliged to plead his case before the senate when he was indicted by the province. According to Tacitus, Tiberius forcefully asserted that he had given Capito power only 'in servitia et pecunias familiares': if he had usurped the governor's authority and used troops, this was against his own orders and therefore the provincials' case should be heard.31

Under Nero, too, the procurators of Asia (Publius Celer, an equestrian, and Helius, a freedman) were 'rei familiari principis in Asia impositi'.32 But in a province where the emperor's estates were extensive, his private affairs might be considerable.33

In the imperial provinces the procurator's role in the conduct of financial affairs was probably subordinated to that of the governor at first. The power of Licinus was possibly exceptional, just as the appointment of a freedman as financial procurator of a province was possibly exceptional also.35 Significantly, it was the governor, not the procurator, who carried out the important financial operation of the census, although equestrians might be specially appointed to assist in its taking.36

The literary sources show that governor and procurator sometimes came into conflict, and such a case is recorded
by Josephus for Augustus' reign. According to Josephus, the procurator of Syria, Sabinus, entered Judaea following the death of Herod (4 B.C.), τινὶ φυλαχῇ τῶν Ἡρῴδου χρημάτων. Sabinus used troops in his attempt to lay claim to Herod's estate, but his actions were contested by the Governor of Syria. But by the end of the Julio-Claudian period the imperial legati were sometimes unable to control the activities of the procurators in their provinces. Also, from Claudius' reign the procurator was becoming an official of the emperor as such, in his capacity as supreme magistrate of the Roman state. Previously, procurators are more likely to have considered themselves personal agents of an individual emperor. This development is reflected in changes in the titulary formula: under Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius procurators are described as the agents of a particular emperor, whose name is given in the titulary formula; but beginning with Claudius, the abbreviated formula 'procurator Augusti' or 'Augustorum' becomes general. Again, towards the end of the Julio-Claudian period, the introduction of a system of dual procuratorships, namely equestrian procurator with imperial freedman subordinate, is indicated.

These tendencies no doubt contributed to the procurators of provinces possessing greater independence in the financial sphere. In a sense they were already members of a civil service which possessed a separate existence from the senatorial administration. But it is far from certain that, from Claudius' time, a complex, hierarchical structure of officials existed in the provinces.

On the basis of epigraphic evidence it appears that each province eventually possessed not only its fiscus, but also a bureau staffed by a hierarchy of officials who were drawn from
the slaves and freedmen of the emperor: apart from the dispensatores ('pay-masters') and their assistants (the arcarii), who were imperial slaves employed for the management of the funds in the provincial fiscus,45 tabularii ('accountants') and a commentariis (officials in charge of records)46 are recorded at provincial centres. The tabularii and a commentariis were normally drawn from the imperial freedmen, and were provided with both freedman and slave assistants.47 Imperial slaves were also employed at provincial centres in non-clerical capacities, in particular as tabellarii ('messengers').48

It seems certain that Lugdunum was an important financial centre early in the imperial period, and probably already possessed the nucleus of a bureaucratic organisation under Augustus and Tiberius.49 But there is little epigraphic evidence to show that in the Julio-Claudian period the administrative centres of all imperial provinces had a numerous staff of various grades of imperial clerks.50 A large number of such officials who are attested in inscriptions must be dated to the second century,51 while a number of inscriptions which have been dated in the Julio-Claudian period have been dated on dubious criteria. For example, Boulvert's attempts to date a tabularius at Tarraco52 and an arcarius in Belgica53 to Julio-Claudian times have no solid foundation. In each case the children have a Julian name, but the children of the tabularius could have taken the name from their mother rather than their father, while the son of the arcarius cannot have taken the name from his father who, being a slave, had no nomen of his own. Since in each case the mother may not have been an imperial freedwoman but an ingenua, the occurrence of the Julian name is an insufficient guide to the date of the inscriptions.54 An inscription from Hispania Citerior records a 'Tib. Claudius', presumably a freedman of either Claudius or Nero, who was a tabularius.
but the possibility cannot be excluded that he was appointed to this post under Vespasian, rather than Claudius or Nero.\textsuperscript{55}

Literary evidence points to the existence of a provincial chest in Hispania Citerior under the Julio-Claudian emperors: Pliny the Elder refers to a certain 'servus Drusilianus nomine Rotundus dispensator Hispaniae citerioris', who had been a slave of Drusilla, then of Claudius.\textsuperscript{56} The senatorial province of Achaea may have possessed an imperially administered chest as early as Augustus' reign, but the evidence is not clear: the Φίσσος mentioned in a Greek inscription dated to his reign was not necessarily an imperial chest.\textsuperscript{57} The existence of a regional fiscus for the imperially administered Balkan territories can perhaps be deduced for the Augustan period, though there is no direct evidence on this point. Parthenianus, probably a former slave of the emperor Domitian's chamberlain Parthenius, is called a dispensator Illyrici in the inscription which records him.\textsuperscript{58} It is most probable that he held this post under Trajan, but the use of the term 'Illyricum' in his title possibly indicates that the chest to which he was attached was established before Illyricum was divided into the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia, towards the end of Augustus' reign.\textsuperscript{59} In general, the inscriptions of provincial dispensatores and arcarii (with the clear exception of CIL VI, 5167, only) cannot be dated earlier than Trajan.\textsuperscript{60} Nevertheless, as Pliny's reference to the dispensator Rotundus suggests, plus the evidence of CIL VI, 5167, in the Julio-Claudian period imperial slaves were used in the administration of the public finances of some provinces, at least.
Strabo's statement that imperial slave ὀλχονόμοι assisted the Idiologus, shows that in Egypt the familia Caesaris was employed in the financial administration of the province as early as Augustus. The ὀλχονόμοι are also mentioned in the Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander (A.D. 68): '...Κελεύω συν, οὕτως ἐν ἐνιστᾶτε ἐπίτροπος τοῦ Κυρίου ὁ ὀλχονόμος.' From the preceding line of the Edict it emerges that the provincial revenues were managed through the φίλος, which is identified here with the 'public account' (στρατιαρχικὸς λόγος). Earlier in his Edict, the prefect states that it was to the advantage of the 'imperial accounts' (μαρτυρία νῦν) that those who farmed the taxes should do so voluntarily. It appears, then, that in Egypt the public finances could already be described generally as 'imperial'. But this does not mean, necessarily, that by the end of the Julio-Claudian period, when the edict was published, the aerarium no longer had any claim over the revenue derived from this province. Without attempting an analysis of the full range of financial terms used in the Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander, it can still be argued that the use of the term ἴσημος to describe the financial administration of the province indicates that Egypt (down to the end of the Julio-Claudian period, at any rate) continued to be regarded as a public province subject to the populus Romanus under whose imperium Augustus claimed to have placed Egypt. At the same time, in Egypt itself the ruling power was seen to be the emperor rather than the senate, and the use of the term κυριακὸς to describe the financial administration of the province is not really surprising in the context of an edict addressed to its subjects.

As pointed out above, from the range of inscriptions attesting imperial freedman or slave officials in the provinces, very few of these officials can be dated firmly in the Julio-Claudian period.
Inscriptions attesting imperial *tabularii* and *commentariis* attached to the provincial administration are, in fact, singularly lacking for this period. On the other hand, the little evidence we do possess, supported by literary references, indicates that the *familia Caesaris* was already used in the financial administration of several imperial provinces, namely in Gaul, Spain and Egypt. Also, imperial freedman and slave officials are known from certain senatorial provinces, who were presumably concerned with the administration of the emperor's private property. But it should be emphasized that the employment of imperial slaves and freedman in the public financial administration of the imperial provinces was (as Strabo indicates for Egypt) an innovation dating from Augustus' reign.

It is perhaps not surprising that a uniform bureaucracy for the administration of provincial finances evidently did not emerge in the Julio-Claudian period. In the following chapters it will be shown that the process of 'bureaucratization' was more gradual than has been supposed in other branches of administration, too.

On the assumption that Tiberius did away with the companies of *publicani* farming the direct taxes, it has been suggested that the vacuum left by the removal of the *societates* was filled by the imperial bureaucracy. But although the Julio-Claudian emperors may have extended the system whereby the municipalities were made responsible for the collection of the direct taxes, evidence indicating the complete removal of the *publicani* from the area of tribute collection appears to be lacking for this period. It is possible, therefore, that in general the procurators of provinces as yet required the services only
of their personal assistants, and perhaps a few imperial slaves and freedmen, to help them discharge their responsibilities.

In the Flavian period, however, there are definite signs that the imperial bureaucracy, in both its private and public aspects, was becoming more complex and systematized. Much of the evidence from the provinces relates to the organization of the imperial estates (which passed from the Julio-Claudian to the Flavian emperors), and imperially administered mines. In the province of Africa, especially, there is evidence to suggest that by Flavian times there was a large number of imperial estates (saltus), which were later administered according to tractus and regiones. It is almost certain that estates covering a large area had been acquired by Nero, even if Pliny the Elder exaggerates when he states that 'six owners were holding half of Africa when Nero killed them'. Some, though not all, of these estates were evidently located in the Bagradas Valley, for which there is epigraphic evidence dating from the time of Trajan.

The ducenarian post of procurator provinciae Africæ is clearly attested from the period of Vespasian to Trajan, and may have existed earlier. This official was probably originally responsible for paying the soldiers stationed in the senatorial province of Africa, but may also have exercised a general supervision over the emperor's other financial interests in Africa. When these interests expanded, from Nero's time on, more officials would have been needed. Baebius Massa (A.D. 69) is referred to by Tacitus as
one of the procurators of Africa' ('e procuratoribus Africae': Hist. 4.50). Then by Trajan's time, it appears that the large complex in the Bagradas Valley had a fully evolved organization as a tractus with its office at Carthage under an equestrian procurator, as well as subdivisions under a freedman procurator and assistants. Also, the large body of inscriptions from Carthage, all of imperial officials, indicates the establishment there of an important administrative bureau for the affairs of the emperor. From an incident Tacitus relates, it appears that during the Civil Wars an imperial freedman of Nero stationed at Carthage was powerful enough to exert a considerable influence over the policy of the province. Moreover, several T. Flavii are recorded among the freedman officials at Carthage, which suggests that before the end of the first century there was already a fairly complex bureaucracy at this centre.

Asia, in contrast to the province of Africa, furnishes only limited evidence of the emergence of administrative subdivisions. Pliny the Elder mentions the regiones Apamena et Eumenetica, and the tractus Cyllanicus, in Phrygia, but these terms may not be associated with the imperial estate administration in this area. Inscriptions dating from the second century record procurators of Phrygia, but do not indicate the emergence of an administrative organization along the same lines as in Africa. On the other hand, epigraphic evidence dating from Nero's reign indicates that an administrative centre grew up at Synnada, in Phrygia, evidently in connection with the exploitation of
the rich marble quarries located nearby at Docinium.\textsuperscript{91} Also, arcarii of Domitian and Trajan are recorded at Gordus, in Lydia.\textsuperscript{92}

The existence of imperially exploited mines in the senatorial province of Baetica goes back to the reign of Tiberius, who took possession of the gold and copper mines confiscated from Sextus Marius, 'the richest man in Spain'.\textsuperscript{93} The emergence of a special administrative organization for the exploitation of these mines is indicated by the presence of a freedman of the Flavians who was a proc(urator) montis Mariani.\textsuperscript{94} But the existence under the Flavians of an imperially administered chest in Baetica, which Pflaum\textsuperscript{95} accepts on the basis of a single inscription reconstructed as attesting an equestrian praef(ectus) fisci et curator divi Ti\textsuperscript{et}i in Baetica, praef(ectus) Galleciae,\textsuperscript{96} is doubtful: the inscription itself is known only from a sixteenth century copy, and its authenticity must therefore be doubted.

The provisions of a lex metalli relating to the management of the mines at Vipasca in Lusitania, under Hadrian, show, however, that in this province the working of the mines was leased out to contractors on behalf of the fiscus.\textsuperscript{97} Since Lusitania was an imperial province, fiscus, in the context of this lex, may indicate the provincial chest. But possibly it was the private chest of the emperor which
controlled the revenues from mines managed through imperial procurators. Whether or not the imperial mining monopoly at Vipasca dates from the reign of Vespasian, we do have testimony concerning the existence of one monopoly under Vespasian: Pliny the Elder states that the balsam plantations of Judaea, which were formerly managed as a royal monopoly, were in his time cultivated by the fiscus. But from Pliny's remark that the plantations now paid tribute along with the Jewish people, it appears that the monopoly, in this case, was exploited for the profit of the public chest of the province, rather than the emperor's private chest.

By the end of the Flavian period the expansion of the imperial bureaucracy in the provinces may have begun to have some repercussions on the exaction of public revenues, even in the 'senatorial' provinces. The formation of administrative units for the management of imperial estates and mines (as for the estates near Carthage in Africa, for the quarries of Synnada and Tralles in Asia, and the mines of Baetica), must have resulted in the severance of these units from the municipal system. If the cities neighbouring on these mines and estates were no longer responsible for the collection of the tribute from them, it is probable that the conductores who collected the land rents also collected the tribute owed by the tenants. In this way, both categories of revenues may have been turned into regional chests administered by imperial officials.
It is perhaps unlikely that radical changes in the administration of the provincial revenues had been introduced before the second century. In Africa, the full development of the imperial estate administration is not clearly attested prior to the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. But an imperial bureau certainly existed at Carthage under the Flavians, and an imperially administered chest probably existed at Ephesus, in Asia, under Trajan. Where and when a complex imperial bureaucracy did grow up, as at Carthage and Ephesus, it is possible that the functions of the officials employed in these centres were gradually extended to include the administration of all aspects of finance in the territory for which they were responsible. In effect, they may have begun to carry out the sort of functions which, in some provinces, had formerly been attributed to the companies of publicani. Beginning with Trajan the publicani ceased to collect the indirect taxes and were replaced by officials, or by individual contractors (the conductores).

Presumably, by then the publicani had been eliminated from the sphere of tribute collection, also.

From Trajan's reign the bureaucracy in the imperial provinces probably began to expand. Freedmen of this emperor are recorded as tabularii in Spain and in Gaul. But there is not sufficient epigraphic evidence to show that every imperial province possessed an extensive staff of imperial freedman clerks in his reign. For example, no freedmen of Trajan are recorded as tabularii in the newly acquired province of Arabia-Petraea, or in the provinces of Dalmatia-Pannonia, which Trajan reorganized. On the other hand,
imperial dispensatores are attested in Dalmatia both before and during his reign. But, as observed above, the practice of employing imperial slaves as dispensatores in the imperial provinces dates from the Julio-Claudian period: this practice had no doubt been extended to most areas of the Empire by the end of the first century.

It appears, then, that the growth of the imperial bureaucracy in the provinces was generally much slower than scholars such as Boulvert would argue. On the basis of the available epigraphic evidence it seems likely that the expansion of the provincial bureaucracy dates from the second century, rather than the first. Moreover, the growth of this provincial bureaucracy can be traced at the administrative centres of senatorial and imperial provinces alike, in the second century. As suggested above, it might be conjectured that the role of the imperial bureaucracy was gradually extended, so that the imperial slave and freedman officials at these centres began to carry out some of the work of administering the public finances in senatorial, as well as in imperial, provinces. At any rate, under Hadrian the procurators of Asia seem to have regarded it as their duty to inform the emperor concerning a too high level of public expenditure on the construction of an aqueduct in that province.

Initially, as we have seen, an administrative distinction was made between the imperial and senatorial provinces in that the emperor gave his procurators public duties in the former territories, but restricted them to the management of his patrimonium in the latter areas. But if there was never a strict principle by which the senate kept to 'its' half of the Empire, and the emperor to 'his', it would perhaps
not be surprising if, as it became customary for the imperial bureaucracy to be employed on a large scale in public administration, the familia Caesaris began to assume public functions in senatorial, as well as in imperial, provinces. The same, I believe, can be said concerning the use of the familia Caesaris in the administration of the indirect taxes and customs duties in both the senatorial and imperial provinces.

On the basis of an inscription from Rome recording an imperial freedman proc(urator) fiscorum transmarinor(um), which is possibly Julio-Claudian in date, A.H.M. Jones suggests that by the end of the Julio-Claudian period, the imperial bureaucracy at Rome was already involved in receiving and allocating provincial revenues despatched to Italy. In Jones' view these fisci were the precursors of the fiscus Alexandrinus and the fiscus Asiaticus, which he identifies as urban 'branch offices' of the provincial fisci of Egypt and Asia. Jones therefore concludes that from the time of Vespasian, to whom he attributes the establishment of both fisci, the disposal of a significant percentage of the Empire's revenue was in the hands of the imperial officials who administered these chests.

The fiscus Alexandrinus seems certainly to have been in existence before the end of the first century, and the fiscus Asiaticus was most probably in existence under Domitian. But there is no direct evidence as to their function, and several interpretations have been proposed, all of which are inconclusive. Jones' interpretation is perhaps supported by the fact that the eastern provinces, particularly Egypt and Asia, were regularly sending revenues to Italy in the first century; on the other hand, it is possible that both the fiscus Alexandrinus and the fiscus Asiaticus were established to receive the income from the private property of the emperor, held in
Egypt and Asia. There is no clear evidence that the establishment of the the fisci transmarinī preceded the establishment of the fiscus Alexandrinus and fiscus Asiaticus, and were the precursors of the latter chests. But the quite plausible reconstruction by Sanders of two lines of the fragmentary inscription recording the career of the freedman Martialis, as proc. fiscorum/ transmarinor./ t fisci castrensis ..., perhaps indicates that the fisci transmarinī were private chests of the emperor. The fiscus castrensis was a private chest, and the text of the inscription as reconstructed by Sanders suggests that the procuratorships of that chest and the fisci transmarinī were held conjointly, and thus may have been similar in character.

On the basis of the available epigraphic evidence, therefore, we can conclude that, as late as Trajan's reign, the number of imperial officials directly employed in administering the public provincial finances was still small, and only beginning to become significant. It must be emphasized again that the growth of an imperial provincial bureaucracy, organized along hierarchical lines, is a development which appears not to have begun before the Flavian period, and which gained real momentum only during the second century, from the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian on. Finally, there is no evidence that in the period between Augustus and Trajan, public provincial finances which were administered - at any rate in the imperial provinces - by imperial officials, came to be regarded as separate from the funds held in, or held accountable to, the aerarium Saturni. Moreover, the principle, at least, of accountability to the senate by the emperor for funds under his administrative control evidently continued beyond the reign of Trajan. If funds under imperial administrative control had been regarded officially as accountable to a separate imperial treasury, Marcus Aurelius could hardly have declared before the senate that all the public funds, whether in the public treasury or elsewhere, belonged to the senate and the Roman people.
CHAPTER 3
THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE INDIRECT TAXES

Apart from the income received from the direct taxation imposed on the provinces, and the revenues which were furnished by the income from the *ager publicus* and the mines and quarries of the Empire, a significant income was yielded by the indirect taxes which were levied in Italy as well as in the provinces. When the emperor Nero proposed to abolish all indirect taxation his impulse, according to Tacitus, was checked by some of the senators who argued that the empire could not survive without the revenues drawn from this source.¹

This form of taxation had already existed in the Republican period: the *vicesima libertatis* had been instituted in 357 B.C., and the returns from it were set aside in a sacred treasury as an emergency fund;² and by the second century B.C. the *societates* who farmed the *portorium*, or customs-dues, had already attained considerable financial and political influence.³ New imposts were created under Augustus: the *vicesima hereditatium* was established in A.D. 6 to finance the new *aerarium militare*, from which army bonuses were to be paid;⁴ and the *centesima rerum venalium*, which was instituted 'after the Civil Wars', also helped to finance the *aerarium militare*.⁵ Finally, the *quinta et vicesima mancipiorum* was established by Augustus in A.D. 7 because additional funds were required for the wars and for the support of the *vigiles*.⁶ Presumably the tax went to the *aerarium Saturni*, which paid the salaries of the *vigiles*.⁷
The introduction of new indirect taxes as a means of balancing public expenditure was evidently an aspect of Augustus' own financial policy. Following the establishment of the aerarium militare in A.D. 6, Augustus decided on the vicesima hereditatium as a suitable means of furnishing a regular source of income for the new chest. According to Dio, he anticipated senatorial opposition to this plan: therefore he asked each member of the senate to each present a plan for raising more funds for military expenses, but approved of none of them so that his own scheme was adopted. Later, Dio relates, despite their mounting opposition to it the senators were persuaded to retain the tax when Augustus threatened to introduce direct taxation in Italy in place of it. The centesima rerum venalium was equally unpopular; but even in the face of public outcry against it in A.D. 15, Tiberius refused to abolish it on the grounds that it was necessary for the support of the military treasury. Two years later he reduced it by one half, but only after the annexation of Cappadocia brought in new income. It is clear, then, that Augustus and Tiberius closely supervised financial policies, even to the extent of introducing and maintaining new and unpopular forms of indirect taxation to support expenditure on the armies. But the main question to be discussed in the first part of this chapter, is whether in addition to their concern to keep public income and expenditure balanced, the Julio-Claudian emperors also supervised the collection of the indirect taxes through imperial officials, and whether they transferred some of the revenues produced by these taxes to the fiscus.
In the early Principate the actual collection of the vectigalia remained in the hands of companies of publicani. These organizations evidently retained considerable power and autonomy in their affairs, since early in Nero's reign they were practising unchecked certain irregular sorts of exaction. It was in response to public complaints against the societates vectigalium that Nero at first contemplated completely abolishing the vectigalia, as a 'noble gift' to the human race. Although some of his senatorial advisors dissuaded Nero from taking this step, they nevertheless agreed that the acquisitiveness of the societates ought to be restrained: 'Ergo edixit princeps ut leges cuiusque publici, occultae ad id tempus, proscriberentur; omissas petitiones non ultra annum resumerent; Romae praetor, per provincias qui pro praetore aut consule essent iura adversus publicanos extra ordinem redderent; militibus immunitas servaretur, nisi in iis quae veno exercerent'. Tacitus continues that other just provisions were framed, also, although they were soon evaded. Nevertheless, some of the regulations framed against the illegal exactions invented by the publicani were still valid in his time. Nero's reforms appear to be the first attempt by any emperor to exert some degree of control over the affairs of the publicani farming the vectigalia. Also, according to one of Nero's regulations, jurisdiction in cases involving the societates vectigalium was to be entrusted to the praetor at Rome, and in the provinces to the senatorial governors. Yet, it has been argued that before Nero's reign imperial procurators had already been appointed to supervise the societates vectigalium, and that the
revenues of the portorium, in particular, had been transferred from the aerarium Saturni to the fiscus. 18

At some point before the end of the first century A.D., certain provinces were grouped together for the purpose of farming out the portorium imposed in those regions. The supra-provincial customs districts which were formed in this way are the quadragesima Galliarum, which included all the Gallic provinces, 19 and the publicum portorii Illyrici, which extended over Northern Italy and the Balkan provinces. 20 Also, during the early Principate the portorium in Roman Africa began to be farmed jointly with three other imposts to form the tariff group known as the quattuor publica Africæ. 21 Unfortunately, the date when the three tariff regions were formed cannot be determined precisely from the evidence available. The inscriptions recording the companies of publicani who farmed these regions can be dated only tentatively to the first century, 22 or else have been given an early date on unreliable grounds. 23

On the other hand, the term publicum portorii Illyrici suggests that the organization of this customs district goes back to the period when Illyricum was the official title for the whole region. Originally, under the Republic, Illyricum designated one province comprising the Dalmatian coast. Its territory was later extended towards the Danube, firstly by the campaigns of Octavian (35-34 B.C.), then by those of Tiberius (12-9 B.C.) Next, following a serious rebellion between 6 and 9 A.D., the province was reorganized and divided into Upper and Lower Illyricum. 24 Afterwards, these provinces were named Dalmatia and Pannonia, respectively. These names definitely replaced the name Illyricum in
official terminology only from the Flavian period; but even in the Julio-Claudian period the names Dalmatia and Pannonia may have been used concurrently with Upper and Lower Illyricum. 25

Thus the survival of the term 'p(ublicum) p(ortorii) Illyrici utriusque' in two inscriptions of the reign of Antoninus Pius, 26 although other provinces were attached to this customs district, 27 implies that its establishment goes back to the period shortly after the division of the original province of Illyricum under Augustus. 28 Again, the existence of the quadragesima Galliarum in the Julio-Claudian period is indicated by coins of Galba, which seem to proclaim his abolition of this duty. 29

Finally, there is a group of inscriptions from Rome recording several imperial freedman officials who were concerned in the administration of at least two of the tariff regions. But it is not certain that, as De Laet and Boulvert assume, 30 these officials date from the Julio-Claudian period. The only inscription of this group which can be dated securely in the Julio-Claudian period is fragmentary. It is dedicated to Neritus, a freedman of Claudius, who had held some post in connection with the region of Illyricum; 31 but the restoration of part of the missing text as tabul(arius) vect(igalis) Illyrici is uncertain. 32 Of the other inscriptions of this group, one is also fragmentary and furnishes no indication of date. 33 Another, which records an imperial freedman who was an actor XXXX Gal(liarum), has been dated to the first century from the fact that his wife's name was Claudia Fortunata. 34 But since there is no indication that Claudia Fortunata was an imperial freedwoman
her name is no guide to the date of the inscription. On the other hand, the status nomenclature 'Aug.1.', which occurs in the inscription of an imperial freedman who was jointly procurator IIII p(ublicorum) Afr(icae) et XXXX Galliar(um), is found more commonly than 'Aug.lib.' in inscriptions of the Julio-Claudian period, and its usage declines sharply in the second century. A first century date, at any rate, is likely for this procurator. Also, the imperial slave-indication 'Caesaris', which occurs in the inscription of a slave who was attached to the statio XXXX Galliarum, is the characteristic form in the Julio-Claudian period. In this case a Julio-Claudian date for the inscription is likely; but the possibility of a date later in the first century cannot be excluded.

De Laet and Boulvert consider that the creation of the supra-provincial customs districts of the quadragesima Galliarum and the publicum portorii Illyrici, as well as of the tariff group of the quattuor publica Africae, was associated with the seizure for the fiscus of the revenues of the portorium from certain senatorial, as well as imperial provinces. De Laet attributes such an innovation to Tiberius, while Boulvert attributes a similar step to Claudius. As indicated above, however, it is not possible to date the organization of the new tariff regions from the reign of a particular emperor. It is not possible, either, to date definitely in the Julio-Claudian period the emergence at Rome of imperial bureaux for the administration of these tariff regions. On the other hand, it appears that the quadragesima Galliarum and the publicum portorii Illyrici
(and perhaps the quattuor publica Africae⁴¹) had been formed by the end of the Julio-Claudian period. But in the absence of evidence pointing definitely to imperial administrative intervention in the farming of the large tariff regions under the Julio-Claudian emperors, there is no reason to link the organization of any of them with the seizure of the portorium for the fiscus. Therefore, the formation of the quadragesima Galliarum and the publicum portorii Illyrici should probably be associated with the emergence of what was evidently the more convenient practice of farming out en bloc the customs duties of certain areas of the Empire, or, in the case of the formation of the quattuor publica Africae, the practice of farming together the principal indirect taxes collected in Roman Africa.⁴²

Within the Julio-Claudian period, only in connection with the farming of the vectigal of the Red Sea is there any suggestion that the imperial fiscus claimed any part of the revenues derived from the customs dues.⁴³ But it is possible that Annius Plocamus had first farmed the Red Sea concession under Augustus,⁴⁴ and in that period the public revenues of Egypt are known to have been accountable to the aerarium Saturni (as shown by Velleius Paterculus, 2, 39, 2). Therefore it is more likely that Plocamus collected the Red Sea vectigal on behalf of the provincial chest, rather than for the profit of the imperial fiscus. Also, the measures taken by Nero to check illegal activities on the part of the societates vectigalium placed jurisdiction in cases involving them in the hands of senatorial magistrates.⁴⁵ This seems to point away from the conclusion that, prior to Nero's reign,
imperial freedman procurators in Rome were already involved in supervising relations between the Roman state and the societates.46

For the indirect taxes other than the portorium, a single inscription from Rome attests the post of tabular(ius) Caesar(is) XX lib., held by an imperial freedman who was probably manumitted by either Claudius or Nero.47 There is no other evidence, however, which points to the emergence of imperial control over the manumission tax in the first century.48 Possibly the job of the freedman tabularius at Rome was to keep records of the amount of the tax payable to the public treasury from the manumission of the emperor's slaves.49

There is no record of an imperial bureau for the quinta et vicesima mancipiorum, which in the early imperial period was farmed jointly with the vicesima libertatis.50 Definite evidence of the establishment of an imperial bureau for the supervision of the centesima rerum venalium is also lacking.51 If the abolition of this tax by the emperor Gaius was in fact lasting and universal,52 this would, of course, explain why there is apparently no record of an administrative organization connected with its exaction. But it is possible that Gaius abolished the tax only for Italy,53 in which case it would appear that the creation of a special branch of the imperial administration for the centesima was not found necessary.

On the other hand, an inscription dedicated to Saturninus, Ti. Claudius Aug. libertus, a freedman of either Claudius or Nero who held the post of procurator XX here(ditatum) provinciae Achaiae,54 suggests that imperial supervision of
this tax at the provincial level dates from the first century A.D.55 It would thus appear that in some areas of the Roman Empire the revenues derived from the *vicesima hereditatium* (which was levied on Roman citizens) were large enough to require the appointment of a special procurator to supervise its collection.56 If, however, the freedman procurator Saturninus is dated in the Julio-Claudian period (as he is by most scholars), his inscription would furnish the sole evidence of the existence of a special administrative organization for the *vicesima hereditatium* at that stage.57 But it is quite possible that Saturninus held his procuratorship of the *vicesima hereditatium* under the Flavian, rather than the Julio-Claudian emperors.58

It has been emphasized above that, contrary to the views of such scholars as De Laet and Boulvert, the inscriptive evidence does not indicate that imperial supervision over indirect taxation dates from the Julio-Claudian period. In the following section of this chapter, it will be shown that the appointment of imperial officials associated with the administration of certain of the indirect taxes does date from the Flavian period. It will be shown, also, that there is inscriptive evidence which indicates that the emperor Trajan introduced the system of direct collection of indirect taxes by imperial officials — at any rate on a limited scale in Africa. But it will be concluded that, while Trajan initiated this and probably other changes in the collection of the indirect taxes, the emergence of systematic, large-scale imperial supervision over the administration and collection of the indirect taxes dates mainly from the period beyond Trajan.

According to De Laet, no changes in the administration of the *portorium* took place between the Julio-Claudian period and Trajan's reign, when he believes the imperial bureaux for the *portorium* at Rome disappeared, and the administration of the *quadragesima Galliarum*, the *publicum portorii Illyrici*, and the *quattuor publica Africae* shifted to these tariff regions.59 It was evidently Trajan who introduced the system of collecting the *portoria* through individual contractors (*conductores* and *promagistri*), who acted under the supervision of imperial officials in their districts.60 But contrary to what De Laet assumes, there is no direct evidence to link the appointment for the first time of regional officials of the *supra-provincial customs districts* and the *quattuor publica Africae* with
removal of the *societates vectigalium*. Moreover, as indicated above, not all the freedman officials attached to the administration of the *portoria* at Rome can be shown to date from the first century.\textsuperscript{61} It is not certain, therefore, that these urban posts were replaced by regional ones under Trajan.\textsuperscript{62} It is just as likely that the imperial bureaux attested at Rome were established about the same time as imperial officials were first appointed at centres within the tariff regions themselves. At any rate an inscription from the *Fines Cotti* fairly certainly records a freedman of the Flavians in the service of the *quadragesima Galliarum*; his wife appears to have been a freedwoman of either Claudius or Nero, so the inscription should probably be dated to the first century rather than the second.\textsuperscript{63}

It appears, then, that it was towards the end of the first century that the imperial bureaucracy first began to play a direct role in the administration of the *portoria*. At Rome, special imperial procurators were perhaps made responsible for compiling a balance-sheet of the revenues drawn from the *quadragesima Galliarum* and the *quattuor publica Africae*; and at the regional level other officials may have examined and forwarded the accounts of the *publicani* to Rome. The emergence of imperial administrative supervision over the revenues of the principal tariff regions of the Empire was possibly contemporary with the appointment of freedman officials of the *vicesima hereditatium*, such as *Saturninus, proc. XX hereditatium provinciae Achaiae*.\textsuperscript{64} The dating of these developments to the Flavian period would seem to receive some support from the fact that a bureau for the *vicesima hereditatium* was very probably
established at Rome under the Flavians. A T. Flavius Aug. lib. is attested at Rome as an *adiutor tabular(ii) XX hereditatium*, whose death at the age of 26 years makes it more probable than not that he held that post before the end of the Flavian period. Also, the appointment of a high-ranking equestrian *procurator Augusti XX hered.* under Domitian definitely indicates the existence of an administrative organization for this tax in the Flavian period.

Important changes in the system of exacting the *vectigalia* were introduced in the second century, for the system of farming out the indirect taxes was gradually superseded by direct collection through officials. At the beginning of Trajan's reign *publicani* still collected the *vicesima hereditatium*, but an inscription from Lepcis Magna in Africa shows that a *vilicus* of Trajan was engaged in collecting the *vicesima hereditatium*, and probably a customs duty, also, at this centre. The use of imperial officials to collect the *vectigalia* in Africa can only have been temporary at this stage, however, since *conductores* of the *quattuor publica Africae* are attested after Trajan's reign. Under Hadrian equestrian procurators of the *quadragesima Galliarum* and the *quattuor publica Africae* were appointed, whose function in this period must have been to supervise the *conductores*, who continued down to Marcus Aurelius or Commodus to collect the *quadragesima* and the four *publica.*

Equestrian procurators of the *publicum portorii Illyrici* are not recorded in the first half of the second century, but under the Antonines an equestrian procurator *vectigalis Illyrici* replaced the *conductores* in this customs district, too. In other parts of the Empire, where the *portorium* was collected
within provincial boundaries (as in the province of Asia), the collection of the duty was evidently supervised by the officials of the provincial administration, since no special functionaries for the portorium are recorded. 73

Either in the first years of Hadrian's reign, or perhaps towards the end of Trajan's reign, the societates collecting the vicesima hereditatium at Rome were replaced by pro

magistri XX hereditatium, 74 who appear to have assisted the procurator XX hereditatium to collect the tax. 75 This change seems to have resulted in the employment of a more numerous personnel in the urban bureau of the vicesima hereditatium. At any rate, the number of tabularii employed there was sufficient to justify the appointment of a princeps tabularius, who was a freedman of Trajan, 76 and the existence of a staff of imperial clerks is indicated well into the second century. 77 A dispensator and an arcarius of the vicesima hereditatium, who are also recorded at Rome, 78 should probably both be dated in the second century too, in the period when the statio

XX hereditatium 79 at Rome evidently served as a collection bureau as well as an administrative centre for the tax. The presence of a dispensator and arcarius suggests that the revenues of the tax collected in Rome were allocated through the personnel of this bureau. At the same time, however, the continued existence of the aerarium militare into the third century 80 indicates that it still received the revenues from this tax. 81 Therefore, the imperial bureau of the vicesima hereditatium in the capital, and also collection bureaux for the tax in the provinces and in Italy, presumably served only as 'clearing houses' for its revenues.

Towards the middle of the second century Italy was divided into regiones under equestrian procurators for the
collection of the vicesima hereditatium. Outside Italy, from Hadrian's time equestrian procurators were placed in charge of the collection of the tax, sometimes for one province, sometimes over larger territories. These officials were assisted by freedman procurators and a staff of imperial clerks and cashiers. On the other hand, a special branch of the imperial administration for the quinta et vicesima venalium mancipiorum, and the centesima rerum venalium, is not certainly attested at any stage in the history of the Principate. The latter tax, however, which had also been instituted under Augustus to furnish funds for the aerarium militare, if it still existed in the second century, may have been managed jointly with the vicesima hereditatium. Again, the emergence of an imperial administrative organization for the vicesima libertatis seems to be no earlier than the second half of the second century.

It appears that during the second century imperial supervision over the collection of the portoria and the vicesima hereditatium became the rule throughout the Empire. The emergence of an imperial administrative organization for the portoria and the vicesima hereditatium, both at Rome and at the regional or provincial level, almost certainly goes back to the Flavian period. But the chief impetus towards the establishment of bureaucratic control over the collection of the vicesima hereditatium evidently came with the introduction under Trajan and Hadrian of a system of direct collection through imperial agents. Yet, with the definite exception only of a short period under Trajan, the collection of the portoria and the four publica of Africa, including the portorium, was leased out to individual
contractors during the first half of the second century.\textsuperscript{91} In this period the role of the officials attached to the administration of the customs districts and the \textit{quattuor publica Africae} probably consisted chiefly of scrutinizing the accounts of the \textit{conductores} and \textit{promagistri}.\textsuperscript{92} In the early second century, imperial control over the collection of indirect taxes was still emerging therefore. As emphasized in the preceding chapters, the imperial provincial bureaucracy, also, expanded only slowly, and mainly from the second century. The gradual emergence of full imperial control over the indirect taxes, and also the fact that the \textit{aerarium militare} still existed in the third century, make it appear unlikely that the revenues of either the \textit{vicesima hereditatium} or the \textit{portoria} (or those of the other indirect taxes) had already been transferred to the \textit{fiscus}\textsuperscript{93} by the time of Trajan or Hadrian.
CHAPTER 4

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ROMAN GRAIN SUPPLY

Under the Republic, the cura annonae, including the distribution of grain to the Roman people, was normally one of the functions of the aediles. But special commissions were necessary from time to time to deal with emergencies caused by grain shortages. Thus in 57 B.C. the senate conferred extraordinary powers on Pompey, giving him control over all the ports, markets, and granaries of the Empire, so that he might secure sufficient supplies to feed the city.¹

Towards the end of the Republic Julius Caesar created two special aediles ceriales whose only function was to supply the grain necessary to feed the population of Rome.² But in 44 B.C. there was again a shortage at Rome, serious enough to make plausible special commissions for Brutus and Cassius to gather supplies of grain in Asia and Sicily.³

Shortages continued to occur under Augustus, and about 24 B.C. the young Tiberius won himself a good reputation for dealing with a severe food shortage in Rome and Ostia. Tiberius was holding the quaestorship at the time, but according to Velleius Paterculus he was acting on Augustus' instructions.⁴ Then in 22 B.C. Augustus decided it was wise to accept personal responsibility for the capital's regular food supply: during a serious famine he agreed to become commissioner of the grain supply, 'as Pompey had once done'.⁵ In the Res Gestae he claimed that through his administration, and with his own money, he restored confidence within a few days.⁶
In the same year, Augustus made new arrangements for the frumentationes, or free distributions of grain, by the creation of a special organization for this function. According to Dio, Augustus ordered that two men should be chosen annually from among those who had served as praetors not less than five years previously to attend to the distribution of the grain. It is implicit in Dio's account that Augustus made these arrangements in virtue of his overall cura, and that the new officials were to be selected by the senate. Suetonius describes the office as the cura frumenti populo dividundii. The magistrates who held it had the title of praefecti frumenti dandi, but under Augustus they were also called the curatores frumenti. Like other magistrates they were allowed apparitores, scribae, accensi and praecones at the expense of the aerarium. At the beginning of the Principate, therefore, responsibility for the free distributions of grain to the citizens of Rome remained formally under the patronage of the senate.

It appears that Augustus only temporarily assumed control of the grain supply in 22 B.C. For some time no new arrangements were made for the annona as a whole and once the threat of famine was removed the function of the aediles ceriales was presumably restored. The arrangements for the frumentationes were, however, modified in 18 B.C. Through Augustus' intervention, the method of selecting the officials placed in charge of the distributions (i.e., the praefecti) was changed, and the number raised from two to four. Later in 2 B.C. Augustus intervened to limit the number of people eligible to be supplied with grain ('a number not previously fixed') to 200,000.
also attempted to alter the administrative schedule for the
frumentationes, but abandoned this plan.\textsuperscript{15} Thus Augustus
clearly did not resign all responsibility for the
frumentationes to the board of senatorial praefecti frumenti
dandi.\textsuperscript{16} Also, from 18 B.C. on, it appears that Augustus
made further subsidies of grain at his own expense to
supplement the public supplies in bad years.\textsuperscript{17} Yet the
private nature of these subventions only emphasizes that
normally it was the responsibility of the state to provide
for the dole out of the resources at its disposal.

The first steps towards reorganizing the administration
of the annona in general came in A.D. 6, when, due to a new
crisis in supplies, ex-consuls were appointed (probably on
Augustus' recommendation) to control sales of wheat and
bread.\textsuperscript{18} It appears that some percentage of the state grain
was sold to the Roman people at low, fixed prices. The
grain put up for sale by the state seems customarily to have
been described by the Latin term frumentum plebis,\textsuperscript{19} whereas
the term frumentum publicum, on the other hand, was used to
denote the grain stored for the free distributions (the
frumentationes).\textsuperscript{20} Despite the appointment of special
commissioners to control the public grain market, the
expulsion of some of the population from the city, as well
as an additional free distribution by Augustus,\textsuperscript{21} the
shortage continued. In the following year (A.D. 7) Dio
says that Augustus, in view of the famine, appointed two
ex-consuls commissioners of the grain supply, granting them
lictors.\textsuperscript{22} Presumably this appointment was made because,
owing to the continuing crisis in supplies, Augustus
decided to renew the extraordinary commission set up in
A.D. 6.\textsuperscript{23}
Suetonius says that when grain at last became more plentiful, Augustus: 'impetum se cepisse scribit frumentationes publicas in perpetuum abolendi, quod earum fiducia cultura agrorum cessaret; neque tamen perseverasse, quia certum haberet posse per ambitionem quandoque restitui.' Moreover, at some stage before A.D. 14 Augustus assumed the cura annonae permanently, appointing an equestrian praefectus annonae as his representative. The office certainly existed in A.D. 14, as Tacitus records that Gaius Turranius, the praefectus annonae, and Lucius Seius Strabo, the Praetorian Prefect, followed the consuls in giving the oath of allegiance to Tiberius.

The cura annonae had thus become the direct responsibility of the emperor, who discharged it through an equestrian praefectus. But this does not mean that the management of the frumentationes, which were formally under the charge of the senatorial praefecti frumenti dandi, was now an entirely separate branch of administration under senatorial as opposed to imperial management. Seneca's essay written in 49 A.D. to the newly appointed praefectus annonae, Pompeius Paulinus, indicates that the frumentum publicum was under the supervision of this official. Admittedly, an essay written under Claudius might not reflect conditions at the end of Augustus' reign. But it seems likely that from the time a praefectus annonae was first appointed, he had responsibility for seeing that sufficient supplies for the frumentum publicum were transported to Rome, and that these supplies did not rot in storage. Therefore, it is probable that there was always some overlap between the functions of the praefectus annonae and those of the senatorial praefecti
frumenti dandi, who were responsible for actually distributing the dole. In addition, like the senatorial commissioners appointed in A.D. 6, the praefectus annonae presumably exercised some supervision over the sale of grain from the public granaries. 31

Augustus' successors continued personally to exercise a general supervision over the urban grain supply, including the grain market. Tiberius 32 felt a special responsibility towards ensuring that the city's grain supplies did not fail. In addressing the senate on the feasibility of introducing new legislation against luxury (in A.D. 22), he stated: 'at hercule nemo refert quod Italia externae opis indiget, quod vita populi Romani per incerta maris et tempestatum cotidie volvitur. ac nisi provinciarum copiae et dominis et servitiis et agris subvenerint, nostra nos scilicet nemora nostraeque villae tuebuntur. hanc, patres conscripti, curam sustinet princeps; haec omissa funditus rem publicam traheat'. 33 Moreover, this passage indicates that the cura annonae was acknowledged to be the responsibility of the emperor.

On at least two occasions during Tiberius' reign, a grave situation developed when the price of grain rose sharply. On the first of these occasions (A.D. 19), as a result of popular agitation, Tiberius 'statuit frumento pretium quod emantor penderet, binosque nummos se additurum negotiatoribus in singulos modios. neque tamen ob ea parentis patriae delatum et antea vocabulum adsumpsit'. 34 The fact the senate considered it a fitting occasion to vote Tiberius the title of 'pater patriae' suggests that the subsidy to the dealers was to be paid out of the
emperor's private funds, thus removing the necessity for this burden to be placed on the public funds. On the second occasion (A.D. 32), Tiberius' attitude implies that he regarded the cura annonae as a magistracy for whose management he was in some sense publicly accountable. Tacitus records that he enumerated to the senate the number of provinces from which he was importing grain, more extensively than Augustus.\textsuperscript{35} In this instance, no special measures to relieve the situation are attributed to the emperor; instead, at his urging, the senate passed a resolution censuring the Roman people for their protests.

The references to the administration of the grain supply under Gaius hardly permit any solid conclusions regarding this emperor's policies. According to Suetonius, Gaius openly deplored the absence of public disasters which would make his reign famous, and every now and then he wished, among other things, for a famine to occur.\textsuperscript{36} Such a famine was imminent at the time of Gaius' death: 'modo modo intra paucos illos dies, quibus C. Caesar perit, si quis inferis sensus est, hoc gravissime ferebat populo Romano superstiti septem aut octo certe dierum cibaria superesse, dum ille pontes navibus iungit et viribus imperi ludit aderat ultimum malorum obsessis quoque, alimentorum egestas'.\textsuperscript{37} During the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius and Gaius, therefore, it appears that the problems of securing a regular supply of grain for the capital had not been overcome. It was not until Claudius' reign that an extensive programme was launched to facilitate the transportation of grain from the provinces to Italy.
It was the threat of famine at the beginning of his reign that prompted Claudius to improve conditions for the import of grain supplies. On the one hand, he introduced legislation aimed at inducing merchants to ship grain, and on the other hand, he began building a new, improved harbour at Ostia. In addition, he abolished the post of quaestor Ostiensis and appointed instead an imperial procurator portus Ostiensis. The introduction of the procuratorship, following the removal of the senatorial office of quaestor, suggests that Claudius decided to impose direct imperial control over the traffic passing through Ostia, and, in particular, over the cargoes of grain.

It is frequently asserted, however, that Claudius' efforts to improve the urban grain supply were more far-reaching than the measures noted above. It has been argued that from his reign forward the whole cost of the annona and the frumentationes was borne by the fiscus. The evidence for the alleged transfer of control of the frumentationes from senate to emperor is drawn from several sources: Seneca's account of the duties of the praefectus annonae, Pompeius Paulinus; the apparent disappearance of the senatorial praefecti frumenti dandi between the reigns of Claudius and Nerva; the presence of a supposed imperial curator at the Porticus Minucia (the centre at which the free distributions were made); a supposed connection between Nero's financial subsidies to the state and the cost of the dole; and Statius' account of the duties of the a rationibus. It will be shown that none of these sources gives firm evidence of a change of policy under Claudius with respect to the frumentationes.
Firstly, as emphasized above, it seems reasonable to conclude that from Augustus' reign the duties of the praefectus annonae already included supervision of the grain market, and the grain stored for the frumentationes. Again, even after the appointment of praefecti frumenti dandi, Augustus had continued to intervene in this branch of the urban grain supply. Thus the separation of the cura frumenti dividundi from the administration of the cura annonae as a whole has probably been exaggerated.

Secondly, it is not certain that the senatorial cura frumenti dividundi was suspended between Claudius and Nerva. It is in fact possible that one of the known praefecti, M. Iulius Romulus, was praefectus frumenti dandi in Nero's reign, although a date under Claudius cannot be excluded. The dating of another official, Sospes, presents more difficulties, although a date under Domitian has been widely accepted. Pflaum, who defends the view that the cura frumenti dividundi was suppressed by Claudius and restored by Nerva, argues that Sospes' praetorian posts (including the prefectship of the grain distributions) were held under Trajan, and his senior posts (that of military legate and governor of Galatia) as late as Hadrian. To account for the postponement of Sospes' higher offices, he proposes that Sospes (whom he identifies with the L. Caesenni, a gens favoured by the Flavian emperors) was a protégé of Domitian, and suffered a political eclipse under Nerva and Trajan.

In view of the problems associated with dating the career of the senator Sospes, together with the absence of any other evidence to confirm the existence of the cura
frumenti dividundi in the Flavian period, the possibility that the cura was suspended during the second half of the first century cannot be discounted. If it had been suspended, it is, however, more likely that this happened in the last years of Nero's reign rather than under Claudius, as Nero reportedly abolished the frumentationes altogether. 52
Moreover, the fact that the cura was afterwards restored 53 indicates that its suspension should not be viewed as a political measure designed to give the emperor sole control over the frumentationes at the expense of participation by the senate. 54

Another argument which has been used to show imperial control of the frumentationes in the later Julio-Claudian period is the supposed existence of an imperial curator responsible for grain distributions at the porticus Minucia. 55 The earliest evidence claimed for grain distributions taking place here concerns a freedman of Claudius or Nero, Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. Ianuarius. 56 But attempts to identify this freedman as an imperial curator at this centre have been mistaken, as demonstrated by Van Berchem's analysis of the inscription in question. 57

Nero, like most of the Julio-Claudian emperors, concerned himself closely with the capital's grain supply, but there is no specific evidence that he financed or took over the frumentationes. He claimed in A.D. 62 that, whereas previous emperors had spent ahead of their income, 'se annuum sexcenties sestertium rei publicae largiri'. 58 This annual subvention of sixty million sesterces appears to correspond exactly with the estimated cost of the dole in this period, and it has been assumed that Nero was referring
to his expenditure for that purpose. But the phrase 'se... largiri' used by Tacitus suggests that Nero made a gift of this money to the state, and that the sum therefore represented a private subsidy rather than expenditure drawn from public funds at the emperor's disposal. Also, there is no explicit indication in Tacitus' account that Nero's subvention was a grant made to cover the expenditure on the frumentationes. Nero did, however, intervene in other ways to regulate the grain supply in Rome. Like Tiberius he was concerned to keep the price of grain low, and like Claudius he had legislation passed to reward merchants who shipped grain. After the fire of 64 he took special measures to see that the Roman people were fed: supplies were brought in from Ostia and neighbouring towns, and the price of grain was cut 'ad ternos nummos'. Presumably the fixing of the price at this low rate was achieved (as under Tiberius in A.D. 19) by means of an imperial subsidy to dealers. Nero is also reported to have actually abolished the free distributions in A.D. 64. If this was indeed the case, his action may have been the result of an increased general demand on the capital's food stores in the emergency after the fire. Thus the information furnished by the sources regarding Nero's administration of the grain supply underlines his interest and supervision of supplies. But at the same time the sources do not attribute to him any line of action or policy which would not be equally appropriate to Augustus or Tiberius, or to Nero's immediate predecessor, Claudius. Nor is there any evidence that Nero had 'taken over' the frumentationes in any sense.
Proof that the cost of the frumentationes was transferred from the aerarium to the fiscus has also been seen in a line of Statius referring to the father of Claudius Etruscus, who was a rationibus under the Flavian emperors. Among the expenditures which it was his responsibility to estimate is included 'quantumque tribus'. This seems to be an allusion to the free grain supplies, which were distributed by tribes. Again, in listing the sources of wealth and revenue which the father of Claudius Etruscus was responsible for allocating ('iam creditur uni/sanctarum digestus opum partaeque per omnis/divitiae populos magnique impendia mundi'), Statius lists 'quod messibus Afris/verritur, aetiferi quicquid terit area Nili'. This is fairly certain a reference to the grain tribute of Africa and Egypt, which at the end of the Julio-Claudian period provided the bulk of the grain needed to supply the capital. It is doubtful, however, whether the responsibilities of this official in estimating public income and expenditure demonstrate that the resources and costs in question were now actually paid to and from the fiscus rather than the aerarium.

Some measure of imperial control over the grain tribute from senatorial and imperial provinces alike would have been necessary from the time Augustus had assumed direct responsibility for the cura annonae. As we have seen, this cura included responsibility for maintaining a sufficient level of supplies in the capital's granaries, and Tiberius had enumerated to the senate all the provinces from which he was importing grain. Augustus had used his household slaves and freedmen to draw up accounts of the level of
tribute and other public funds on hand. It is not surprising, then, that later the emperor's a rationibus was expected to estimate funds needed for the dole, and probably the requirements of the state grain market in general. But Statius' account of the responsibilities of the a rationibus cannot be used as evidence for the Julio-Claudian period: the father of Claudius Etruscus was probably appointed to the office only under Vespasian,78 and he held it until his dismissal by Domitian.79

As noted above, imperial granary officials are attested under Claudius and Nero;80 and an imperial freedman, formerly a slave of Pallas, is recorded as the adiutor of the praefectus annonae Claudius Athenodorus, probably under Nero.81 Also, an imperial slave who made a funerary dedication: 'dis manibus M. Antoni Pallantis l(iberti) Nobilis' is recorded as a disp(ensator) a frument(o).82 But most of the freedman officials whose titles suggest they assisted the praefectus annonae in some aspect of his cura (e.g., a tabellarius ex officio annonaes (sic)83) are later than the Julio-Claudian period, and cannot be dated securely even to the Flavian period. Only two officials who held posts at Ostia are likely to be Flavian. One of these, T. Flavius Aug. lib. Primigenius, is recorded as a tabularius adiutor.84 There is no indication in his inscription that he was employed in the administration of the annonae; but he may have been a subordinate of the procurator Ostiensis, and in that capacity he would perhaps have been responsible for checking the cargoes of grain coming through the port.85 The other, a freedman named Ingenuus, is recorded as a tabularius portus Aug(usti) in
one inscription, and is identified as a T. Flavius [Aug. lib.] in another inscription.

A number of inscriptions recording imperial officials with the title of 'a frumento' are known. Their specific function, except in one case (actor a frumento) is not stated, however. Their function may have been to procure grain for the urban annona, but, alternatively, it is possible they were attached to the imperial household, and were responsible for delivering, storing, and distributing the grain for the emperor's domestic staff. The actor a frumento is possibly Flavian, but other officials of this group definitely date from the second century.

From Domitian's reign the praefectus annonae had the services of an equestrian adiutor, who appears to have been selected personally by the prefect to act as his assistant. But a general increase in the number of officials used in the administration of the annona is indicated from Trajan's reign. In the first place, it is in his reign that the equestrian posts of procurator annonae Ostiae, and procurator Aug(usti) ad Miniciam (sic) are first attested. The introduction of the second post is especially significant, for it marks the earliest appearance of an imperial official who clearly had some function associated with the actual distributions of grain from the porticus Minuciae.

Secondly, it was probably only under Trajan that a special chest for the financing of the annona was established. The emergence of this chest, the fiscus frumentarius, and of an associated ratio, has been dated to the Flavian period. But the evidence for a Flavian date is tenuous. Two
inscriptions, which record officials with the title of a *libellis* (department of petitions) attached to the *fiscus frumentarius*, furnish only doubtful criteria of Flavian date. In one inscription there is no indication that the official, T. Flavius Apollonius, was a freedman. In the other inscription, the post is attributed to an imperial freedman, Athictus, whose wife is named Flavia Eutycha, but there is no indication that she was an imperial freedwoman. The existence of the *fiscus frumentarius* under Trajan is, however, indicated by two inscriptions erected by a slave of this emperor, who was a *dispensator* attached to the chest.

The *fiscus frumentarius* evidently served as the cashbox of the officium of the *praefectus annonae*. Its establishment does not prove that the finances of the *annona* were now exclusively imperial, and entirely severed from the *aerarium*. On the other hand, Trajan, like Augustus, made extraordinary grain distributions, presumably out of his private funds. Pliny is probably referring to the purchase of such additional supplies when he writes: "quippe non ut ex hostico raptae perituraeque in horreis messes nequiquam quiritantibus sociis auferuntur...emit fiscus quidquid uidetur emere. inde copiae, inde annona de qua inter licentem uendentemque conueniat, inde hic satietas nec fames usquam". Certainly, the presence of an imperial procurator at the *porticus Minucia* shows that under Trajan imperial control began to be exercised more directly over the *frumentationes*. But at the same time, the continued appointment of senatorial *praefecti frumenti* dandi suggests that at least in theory the senate still had a
share in the financing and management of the grain distributions.

CHAPTER 2

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE URBAN DISTRICT

In the early years of the Principate new boards were established for various sectors of administration for which responsibility fell on the urban magistrates. As in the case of the grain supply, the initiative to create the new forms of administration came from the Principate. But in contrast to the cura annonae, for which the emperor assumed direct responsibility, the boards discussed below, like the cura praebentevalendi, were substituted or boards made up of senatorial magistrates, and their establishment was ratified by a lex. The setting up of permanent supply was very largely the work of Augustus, but their organization was modified and extended under the Julia-Claudian and later emperors. Moreover, on the model of Augustus, Tiberius set up new boards of senatorial commissioners whose authority was based on a lex. The boards in question whose organization dates from Augustus and Tiberius are the cura acieorum, the cura pomorum at Alia Tiberis, the cura viarum, and the cura publicarum at other important public works. In addition, new arrangements were made for the security of the city, including the maintenance of the city streets at the expense of the highways outside Rome, which had been placed under the charge of the curatores viarum. The history of each of these branches of administration will be discussed in turn.

Under the Republic the care of Rome's water supply had been entrusted to the medicae and camaro, and sometimes to
CHAPTER 5
THE ORGANIZATION OF THE URBAN CURAE

In the early years of the Principate new curae were established for various sectors of administration for which responsibility fell on the urban magistrates. As in the case of the grain supply, the initiative to create the new forms of administration came from the Princeps. But in contrast to the cura annonae, for which the emperor assumed direct responsibility, the curae discussed below, like the cura frumenti dividundi, were constituted as boards made up of senatorial magistrates, and their establishment was ratified by a s.c. The setting up of permanent curae was very largely the work of Augustus, but their organization was modified and extended under the Julio-Claudian and later emperors. Moreover, on the model of Augustus, Tiberius set up two new boards of senatorial commissioners whose authority was based on a s.c. The curae in question whose organization dates from Augustus and Tiberius are the cura aquarum, the cura riparum et alvei Tiberis, the cura viarum, and the cura aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum. In addition, new arrangements were made for the security of the city, including the maintenance of the city streets as opposed to the highways outside Rome, which had been placed under the charge of the curatores viarum. The history of each of these branches of administration will be discussed in turn.

Under the Republic the care of Rome's water supply had been entrusted to the aediles and censors, and sometimes to
the quaestors. In the first part of Augustus' reign Agrippa had undertaken both the construction of new works and the repair of the existing aqueducts, for which works he had employed his own gang of slaves. Frontinus (whose lengthy account of the history of the Roman aqueducts furnishes the fullest account available of any branch of administration under the Principate) describes Agrippa as 'operum suorum et munerum velut perpetuus curator'. Then in 11 B.C. Augustus decided to put the administration of the Roman water supply on a more regular footing. Several senatorial decrees were passed for the purpose of regulating the consumption of public water, and at the same time Augustus nominated a board of three curatores aquarum, consisting of a senior senator assisted by two senatorial subordinates.

It was clearly the emperor who initiated the setting up of the cura, although the appointment of the new commissioners was made with the 'approval' of the senate: in the language of the s.c. relating to the establishment of the cura aquarum, the curatores are described as 'quos Caesar Augustus ex senatus auctoritate nominavit'. By the same decree they were granted the insignia of magistrates, apparitores and ministeria, at the expense of the aerarium. The authority to permit the drawing off of water from the public reservoirs (castella) appears, however, to have been retained fully by the emperor: Frontinus states that 'Augustus quoque edicto complexus est, quo iure uterentur qui ex commentariis Agrippae aquas haberent, tota re in sua beneficia translata'. Moreover, it was laid down in the relevant senatorial decree of 11 B.C.
that access to the public reservoirs by privati depended on the possession of the ius (aquarum), which meant possession of an imperial licence (benefici um Caesaris).

To carry out maintenance work on the aqueducts, the curator and his assistants were provided with a staff of technicians and labourers, who at first were all public slaves. This public slave gang was formed originally from the gang of private slaves owned by Agrippa, which Augustus later handed over to the state. Under Nerva, when Frontinus wrote his commentary, the public slaves were still supported by funds drawn from the aerarium, an expense which was lightened by the income derived from water rentals (ius aquarum). But one of the decrees which Frontinus quotes shows that following the establishment of the cura aquarum Augustus continued to subsidize maintenance costs in an ad hoc way.

Claudius made the cura aquarum more dependent both on imperial direction and on imperial subsidization. In the first place, it was this emperor who introduced an imperial freedman procurator into this branch of administration. Frontinus states that whenever the curator aquarum was called upon to see that privati were granted access to the public reservoirs, he notified the imperial freedman who was the procurator appointed for this purpose. The decree of 11 B.C. relating to grants of water rights to privati states that it was the function of the curator to direct at what points, within the city of Rome, privati might erect their own reservoirs for the purpose of drawing the water supply which they were entitled to draw off, at the direction of the curator, from one of the public reservoirs. Frontinus' description
of the procedure followed in his own times shows that the procurator had been given the practical function of supervising the construction of pipes by privati to draw the water off from the public reservoirs. 20

It is perhaps significant that Frontinus speaks constantly of the one curator aquarum when writing of the administration of the aqueducts in his own time. It is not certain if and when the two junior curatores were removed; but after Claudius' reign there appears to be no further mention of a board of curatores aquarum. 21 It is possible, therefore, that the cura was later administered by the consular head, assisted by the imperial procurator. 22

The importance of the latter's position in the cura's administration probably increased after the appointment of an equestrian procurator under Trajan. 23 The equestrian was evidently appointed over the freedmen procurators, who are still attested in Trajan's reign. 24

Claudius also introduced a new work force to help service the aqueducts. This was the familia Caesaris, and according to Frontinus it numbered 460 men, as opposed to the work force of public slaves (the familia publica) which numbered only about 240 men. 25 Both gangs were composed of the same categories of workers, 26 but whereas the familia publica received its wages from the aerarium, the new familia Caesaris was supported by the fiscus. 27 Moreover, in addition to the cost of maintaining the slave gang, Frontinus states that the expenditure on lead and all the materials needed for the conduits (ductus), reservoirs (castella), and basins (lacus), was also borne by the fiscus. 28 When Frontinus was curator aquarum, therefore, a
The large percentage of the cost of labour and materials for the repair of the Roman aqueducts regularly came out of imperial funds. This was not a new form of imperial subvention, since Augustus had promised the senate that he would contribute to some of the costs; but there is no doubt that from Claudius' reign imperial funds contributed more than the aerarium did to maintaining the public water supply.

Frontinus' description of how costs and labour were divided between the aerarium and the fiscus does not, however, demonstrate that the aqueducts were now managed by two parallel public administrations: that is, one supported by public funds at the disposal of the senatorial administration, and the other by public funds controlled by the emperor.

The evidence relating to the institution of the cura aquarum shows that it was never wholly an independent senatorial branch of government managed without imperial intervention. Augustus acted formally through the senate in setting up the board of curatores aquarum and s.c.c. were issued to control the distribution of water to privati, but the emperors also issued their own directives in this regard. Therefore, the cura aquarum appears to have been a dual administration by emperor and senate from the beginning.

It is true that the familia Caesaris was employed on public business, and Frontinus states that as curator aquarum he directed what work was to be carried out on the aqueducts by the two gangs of slaves, public and imperial. But Frontinus clearly contrasts the familia publica, which was the property of the state, with the familia that was
Caesar's and was therefore his property. The clue to understanding the nature of the Claudian innovation surely lies in the fact that this emperor introduced his slave gang at the time the construction of the *Aqua Claudia* was completed. This, like the other new aqueducts built during the early Principate, was constructed at the emperor's own expense; and so it is probable that Claudius and his successors were in a sense, like Agrippa, curators of their own works, which they continued to maintain with their own funds. Thus, in stating that the upkeep of the *familia Caesaris* and other regular outlays on the aqueducts were paid for by the fiscus, Frontinus is more likely to be referring to an aspect of the emperor's private liberality towards the state, than to an expenditure met by public funds at their disposal.

Under Augustus the function of delimiting the Tiber banks was carried out by the consuls, or by Augustus personally. But in A.D. 15 a special Tiber Commission consisting of a board of five selected by lot from the senate was established on Tiberius' initiative. The earliest reference to the board shows the *curatores* restoring, by the authority of a s.c., the boundaries of the Tiber formerly established in Augustus' reign. The inscriptions of two later boards who served under Tiberius show that the Commission was headed by an ex-consul.

In an inscription erected under Claudius an equestrian, Turranius Proculus Gellianus, records that he had been *praefectus* (sic) *curatorum alvei Tiberis*, *praefectus* pro *prætore* i(ure) d(icundo) in urbe *Lavinio*, and 'pater *patratus populi Laurentis foederis ex libris Sibillinis*
percutiendi cum p(opuli) R(omani). His title praefectus curatorum suggests that Turranius assisted the senatorial board in some capacity; and the fact that he was given a prominent role in the cult of the Laurentine Lavinates at Lavinium suggests that he was probably in office at Ostia. Later inscriptions show that officials associated with the cult were drawn from Ostia, for the very good reason that they could attend the ceremonies without difficulty. It is probable that Turranius was head of a statio of the cura located at Ostia, where the curators themselves could not have been permanently in residence. The date of his prefectship cannot be determined precisely, but on the basis of an inscription from Ostia it appears that he held the office under Tiberius, rather than Claudius as is usually assumed.

It has been suggested that before the end of Tiberius' reign an imperial procurator was introduced into the service of the cura riparum et alvei Tiberis. This, however, cannot be firmly established. It is not certain that the equestrian post of procurator ad ripas Tiberis attributed to Lucius Pupens Praesens was held under Claudius or actually in an earlier reign. Moreover, the function of the procurator ad ripas Tiberis may not have been directly associated with that of the senatorial curatores. A similar post is not attested again for the first century, and it is perhaps more likely that Lucius Pupens Praesens had been appointed to supervise works undertaken by the emperor in connection with the Tiber banks.

Under Claudius a significant change was made in the administration of the cura riparum et alvei Tiberis. Whereas,
under Tiberius, the board of curatores performed the function of marking the boundaries of the Tiber banks by the authority of a senatus consultum, the curatores of Claudius' reign state that they are carrying out this function by the authority of the emperor: 'ex auctori[tate] Ti. Claudi Caesaris Aug. Germanic[i] principis s[ui?] ripam cippis pos[itis] terminaverunt a Tr[ig]ar[io] ad pontem Agripp[ae]',.

It appears, therefore, that the curators now carried out their functions as the nominees of the emperor, which indicates that responsibility for the Tiber had been assumed by the emperor directly.

Following the transfer of the administration of this cura from the senate to the emperor it might be expected that an imperial procurator would be appointed to replace the former representative of the curatores (the praefectus curatorum alvei Tiberis) at Ostia. But apart from the appearance of the single procurator ad ripas Tiberis mentioned above, whose direct connection with its administration is uncertain, no new sub-officials of the cura are known for the first century.

Early in the Flavian period, however, the structure of the cura riparum et alvei Tiberis may have been modified. This is suggested by the fact that inscriptions recording delimitations of the Tiber banks under Vespasian bear the name of a single curator, only. Since the curator was of consular rank, the inscriptions of post Julio-Claudian date may indicate simply that, from the Flavian period on, the head of the cura alone had the right to formally represent the emperor in fixing the river boundaries. But the changed formula of these inscriptions perhaps accompanied a
more significant change than this. It is possible Vespasian abandoned the principle of collegiality altogether, and that from his reign a single consular was being appointed to administer the cura. The disappearance of the consular's senatorial assistants cannot, however, be established certainly before the second century. At some stage after A.D. 101 the equestrian post of adiutor curatoris is known to have existed, but the precise date when this assistantship was introduced cannot be determined. 63

The cura viarum, strictly speaking, concerned Italy rather than Rome, but under the Republic the maintenance of the major highways had been the responsibility of urban magistrates. 64 Down to 20 B.C. Augustus evidently considered that the cost of repairing the highways should be defrayed by victorious generals in possession of booty rather than made a burden on public funds, for Suetonius states: 'Quo autem facilius undique urbs adiretur, desumpta sibi Flaminia via Ariminò tenus munienda reliquas tripulibus viris ex manubiali pecunia sternendas distribuit'. 65 This, and a passage from the Res Gestae, 66 show also that Augustus took personal responsibility for some roads, and Dio, after mentioning that Augustus himself saw to the Flaminian way, goes on to state that 'the other roads were repaired later, at the expense either of the public (for none of the senators liked to spend money on them), or of Augustus, as one chooses to put it'. 67

In 20 B.C. (as had happened two years previously with the cura annonae) Augustus himself formally assumed this charge, and became commissioner of the highways in the neighbourhood of Rome. In that capacity he proceeded to
appoint men from the ranks of the ex-praetors to attend to the actual construction of the roads. As magistrates they were granted two lictors each; and although Augustus appears to have made the appointments personally, Dio's account implies that, as in the case of the curatores aquarum some years later, he made the appointments through the senate. Again, while Augustus continued to subsidize the cost of repairing the highways from his own funds, normally expenditure for this purpose would have come out of the public funds. This conclusion is supported by the issue of denarius in 16 B.C. commemorating an imperial subvention to the aerarium which was used to pay for road repairs.

From Tiberius' reign it appears that equestrians were regularly appointed to supervise particular Italian road-systems. The earliest of these officials seems to have been Q. Decius Saturninus, a curator viarum Labicanae et Latinae, whose inscription shows that his career was contemporary with Tiberius' reign. Next, an inscription erected under Claudius records an equestrian official who had been a curator viae No[m(entanae)]], a branch of the via Salaria. In some cases, at least, the appointment of such equestrian officials was probably due to the prominent position held by the men in question in their municipia, and was connected with the role that road-side towns were expected to play in the upkeep of the Italian roads.

An anecdote related by Dio concerning the emperor Gaius indicates that a board of senatorial curatores viarum continued to function under Tiberius, whose members were responsible for letting out the contracts for maintenance work on the highways. Dio's account also shows that public
funds were allocated to the highway commissioners for this purpose.\textsuperscript{75}

It is not clear whether these officials were already being allocated individually to particular road systems as opposed to their possessing collective responsibility for all the Italian highways, which seems to have been the system under Augustus.\textsuperscript{76} It is possible that in addition to the equestrian appointments mentioned above individual senatorial curatoriums of the major highways had now become customary.\textsuperscript{77} Seneca, in the Apocolocyntosis, mentions a senator who was a curator viae Appiae, which shows that the office existed under Claudius, if not earlier.\textsuperscript{78} Also, a curator of the via Aemilia could have held this post under Nero, although a Flavian date for his curatorship is equally possible.\textsuperscript{79} From Dio's account of Corbulo's attacks on the highway commissioners in the senate, it appears that they were responsible to it, rather than to the emperor directly. But Claudius evidently decided to assume direct responsibility for the maintenance of the highways in the immediate vicinity of the capital. For under Claudius a senator, P. Plautius Pulcher, was appointed curator viarum sternendar(um) a vicinis lectus ex auctoritate Ti. Claudii Caesaris Augusti Germanici.\textsuperscript{80} A similar post does not appear to be recorded again, and so Pulcher's appointment was probably an extraordinary commission, connected with road-works undertaken by the emperor.\textsuperscript{81}

There appears to be no evidence from the Flavian period which indicates the existence of a board of curatores viarum possessing collective responsibility for all the Italian highways. But from this period, and extending over a
considerable period after the first century, the curatorship of one or more of the major highways is frequently recorded as a praetorian office in the regular senatorial cursus. As also, under Trajan, a new body of highway officials emerges: the equestrian sub-curators, who were evidently sub-officials under the senatorial curators.

The sub-curators of the highways may have been appointed directly by the emperor. But senatorial commissioners of consular rank, like the curator alvei Tiberis et cloacarum in the second century, had the right to choose their own assistants. A first century inscription records that an equestrian official, L. Vibius Lentulus, had been the adiutor of the senator Pompeius Vopiscus C. Arruntius Catellius Celer, when (probably c. A.D. 80) the latter was commissioner of the roads, as well as the temples and public places (of Rome): οἴκων ναών ἱερῶν τόπων τε δημοσίων. It appears from Lentulus' inscription, therefore, that as curator Celer had combined the functions of commissioner of the highways with those associated with the charge of Rome's temples and public places. His competence over the highways was apparently general, but it must have been limited to the roads in the immediate vicinity of the city, as otherwise it is difficult to see how both his curae could have been administered together.

In general, however, the administration of the public works, places, and temples of Rome was administered as a single, unified cura. One inscription attests the appointment of a curator aedium sacr(arum) monumentor(um)que public(orum) tuendorum, which perhaps confirms Suetonius' inclusion of
the *cura operum publicorum* among the *nova officia* established by Augustus.\(^\text{87}\) The title of this magistracy (which precise titular formula is not recorded again\(^\text{88}\)) suggests that the curator's function was restricted to the maintenance of the existing public buildings and temples. The function of the *cura viarum* and the *cura aquarum*, also established by Augustus, was similarly concerned mainly with maintenance rather than the construction of new works.\(^\text{89}\) Also, the authority of this Augustan commissioner evidently did not extend to jurisdiction over public ground. Under Augustus, the function of delimiting public from private land was sometimes carried out by the consuls, sometimes by the *praetores aerarii*, and sometimes by the emperor personally.\(^\text{90}\)

As observed above, a similar procedure was followed with regard to the fixing of the boundaries of the Tiber banks.\(^\text{91}\)

In addition to the board of *curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis*, Tiberius set up the board of five *curatores locorum publicorum iudicandorum* which performed the function of delimiting private from public ground, also by the authority of a *s.c.*\(^\text{92}\) But as there is no record of this board either in the literary sources or in inscriptions after Tiberius' reign,\(^\text{93}\) it appears likely that its functions were transferred to other officials soon afterwards. Evidence relating to the functioning of a *cura* for the temples, public works, and places of Rome is in fact extremely sparse for the Julio-Claudian period. But the senator Q. Veranius was probably *curator aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque Publicorum* under Claudius,\(^\text{94}\) and the future emperor Vitellius held this office, perhaps under Nero.\(^\text{95}\)
An inscription dating from Titus' reign suggests that in this period the emperor controlled the construction of monuments in the capital. For in this inscription the negotiatores frumentari record that 'ex auctoritate Imp. Caesaris/ T. Vespasiani Aug./ in loco qui designatus erat per/ Flavium Sabinum/ operum publicorum/ curatore templum/ extruxserunt. The curator Flavius Sabinus (no doubt Titus' cousin) had possibly been nominated to the office by the emperor. This would indicate that the emperor had now assumed direct responsibility for the cura as a whole. Also under Titus, as we have seen, the consular Celer was given the combined functions of commissioner of the roads, public places, and temples (of Rome).

The principle of collegiality was retained in the administration of the cura aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum. Whereas only consular heads of the cura aquarum and cura alvei Tiberis are attested after the Julio-Claudian period, inscriptions dating from the second century show that the temples, public works, and places of Rome were placed under the charge of two senators, who were of consular or praetorian rank. The inscriptions indicate that one of the chief functions of the two curators was to authorize the allocation of public ground to privati for the purpose of erecting buildings and dedicatory stones.

For the maintenance of the streets of Rome the pre-existing Republican system of administration by a board of junior senators, the quattuorviri viarum curandarum, was retained under the Principate. But Dio records that after a serious fire (in 7 B.C.) the city streets were placed
under the charge of supervisors chosen from the people 'whom we call street commissioners' (= 'στενώμαρχοι'). These officials were the magistri vicorum, who are also mentioned by Suetonius. At the same time (7 B.C.) the urban firefighting force was transferred from the control of the aediles to the new officials. Augustus also divided the city of Rome into fourteen regions, but the supervision of the newly created urban divisions remained in the hands of senatorial magistrates: the aediles, who together with the tribunes and praetors were assigned by lot for this purpose. Later (in A.D. 6) Augustus organized the corps of vigiles for fire prevention, over which he appointed an equestrian commander (the praefectus vigilum). In Dio's time the funds for the support of this corps still came from the public treasury.

A series of inscriptions from the Columbarium Liviae (all of which can therefore be dated close to the Julio-Claudian period) record imperial slaves and freedmen organized in decuriae who have the title a regionibus urbis. But imperial slaves and freedmen with this title are not known from the latter part of the first century, and the existence of a special branch of the imperial administration for the supervision of the regiones (under an equestrian procurator) is not attested until after the middle of the second century. Moreover, it is not certain that the above mentioned slaves and freedmen of the Julio-Claudian emperors were directly involved in the administration of the urban regiones instituted by Augustus. Alternatively, they, and the curatores regionum who seem to have succeeded them, may have been responsible in some way for the
security of the other divisions of the city (vicatim), since the inscriptions indicate a close connection between the curatores regionum and the magistri vicorum.\textsuperscript{111}

As in the case of the cura aquarum, it is probable that for all the urban curae the aerarium continued to support some of the costs of the administration and maintenance work which devolved on them. By analogy, once again, with the cura aquarum imperial control over their administration did not entail complete transfer of expenditure to the fiscus.\textsuperscript{112} On the other hand, the example of the cura aquarum also shows that there was a growing tendency for the fiscus to take over a large part of the costs involved in regular maintenance work. Inscriptions show, for example, that the emperors were responsible not only for the construction of major new works and highways,\textsuperscript{113} but also for repairing existing works and roads at their own expense.\textsuperscript{114}

From Claudius' reign, the emperors may have assumed responsibility for keeping the streets of Rome paved. In the early years of the Principate this duty had devolved on the quaestors, but according to Suetonius, Claudius collegio quaestorum pro stratura viarum gladiatorium inuniuit'.\textsuperscript{115} Since it is not stated that Claudius transferred this charge to other officials, it is possible that he decided to assume it himself.\textsuperscript{116} At any rate, an inscription from Vespasian's reign commemorates the fact that at his own expense the emperor had repaired the city streets, which had fallen into disrepair due to neglect.\textsuperscript{117} There is no trace of imperial officials who were associated with the paving of the streets until much later,\textsuperscript{118} so it is not certain that the emperors regularly furnished funds
for their maintenance in the first century. But it was
probably due to frequent imperial expenditure on public
works and on the highways that freedmen of the Flavian
emperors, and of Trajan, were made *tabularii* of particular
road-systems, and of public works. Presumably the
emperors would have furnished their own personnel for
construction work and road maintenance undertaken with
private funds, as they did for the aqueducts.

The evidence on this question indicates, therefore,
that, in helping to finance the various *curae*, the emperors
continued to present their expenditure for this purpose in
the tradition of private assistance to the state, after the
model of Augustus. Even when this expenditure took the form
of contributions to maintenance on a regular basis, as
opposed to ad hoc subsidization, the moneys involved were
furnished from their private funds. In the same way,
Trajan, and perhaps Nerva before him, undertook to set up
alimentary institutions in the municipalities of Italy with
capital furnished from private resources. The emperors
also assumed responsibility for the *cursus publicus*. From
the time of Trajan and Hadrian equestrian officials were
appointed as *praefecti vehiculorum* to take charge of this
important service. But it was Nerva who initiated the
reform of the *vehiculatio*, as shown by the issue of the well
known coin inscribed 'vehiculatioe Italiae remissa'.

Much of the information concerning the administration
of the senatorial *curae* does not directly concern the
management of the public finances, as is the case with the
*cura alvei Tiberis*, in particular. Nevertheless, the
evidence discussed above does throw light on the respective
roles of emperor and senate in these areas of administration. Also, the evidence relating to the organization of the curae reveals that they were not all established along the same lines. The cura aquarum, on the one hand, can be described as a joint venture of the emperor and senate: Augustus nominated the curators, but his nominations were made through the senate; also, the regulations for the cura's administration were set out both in senatus consulta and imperial edicta and mandata. At the same time, however, even after the cura was instituted the emperor retained control over the distribution of the public water supply, so that in this respect the curators were his agents. In the case of the cura alvei Tiberis, on the other hand, in the space of three reigns formal control over its administration was transferred from the senate to the emperor. It appears that Tiberius' decision to relegate this branch of administration to the senate was found to be unsatisfactory in practice, and so Claudius decided to take direct responsibility for it himself. A similar development is found in the history of the management of the aerarium Saturni, which is discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 6
THE FUNCTIONS OF THE AERARIUM ADMINISTRATION
UNDER THE EARLY PRINCIPATE

In this chapter we will look at the question of how the aerarium was administered in the early Principate, surveying the officials appointed to administer it, the functions they exercised, and the changes that may have been introduced in this area between Augustus and Trajan. Also, we will look particularly at the question of how far the emperors in the early Principate may have encroached on the aerarium's prerogatives in controlling the public finances. But in looking at these questions, it will be emphasized that our sources indicate that the authority of emperor and senate frequently overlapped in the administration of the aerarium, and that while imperial intervention in treasury affairs probably grew into regular supervision of the aerarium administration by Trajan's reign, it appears that earlier the aerarium was not treated as an exclusively senatorial or imperial responsibility.

A brief history of the administration of the aerarium under the early Principate is given by Tacitus, who relates that Augustus at first relegated to the senatorial annual choice of two praefecti of praetorian rank for the post, but that this system was later modified because illicit canvassing was suspected. Following this, the aerarium remained under the charge of praetors selected by lot until Claudius reverted to the Republican system of having quaestors manage the affairs of the treasury. But Claudius did not simply restore the traditional system. The new treasury quaestors were not annual magistrates as former quaestors and then the praetors had been, but officials appointed for a period of three years. The emperor promised them exceptional promotion, and Dio states that some of these officials secured the praetorship immediately afterwards, and that others drew a salary according to the estimate placed upon their administration of the office. One of the new officials was [T. Do]mitius T. Decidius, whose inscription records that he held the praetorship after having been 'electus a Ti. Claudio Caesare [Augus] to Germanico qui primu[s quaes] tor per triennium citra [sorte]m praeesset aerario Saturni'. Thus Claudius' innovation meant that the aerarium was now administered by officials whose nomination to the post and subsequent advancement was controlled by the emperor.
Tacitus says that Claudius' system proved unsatisfactory because the young quaestors lacked the maturity for so important a first magistracy. In A.D. 56, following a quarrel between a tribune, Helvidius Priscus, and a treasury-quaestor, Olbutronius Sabinus, Nero decided to nominate experienced ex-praetors as praefecti to administer the aerarium. In A.D. 69, following the Civil Wars, praetors were once again in charge of the aerarium. But this reversion to the system of Augustus (which implies that the officials in question had been selected by lot from the senate) could only have been temporary: praefecti aerarii are attested from this period down to the middle of the fourth century. The office was a senior one in the senatorial cursus, falling between the praetorship and the consulship: in the first and second centuries it ranked equally with praetorian provincial commands. The normal period of tenure for the office was evidently at least three years, as in the case of Pliny the Younger.

Both in the Republican and imperial periods, the senatorial officials in charge of the aerarium had various minor officials under them. The most important among these officials were the scribae librarii quaestorii ad aerario who were organized in three decuriae presided over by sexprimi. Most of the scribae were free-born, and could even claim equestrian rank. Under the Republic they were nominated by the quaestors (although the consuls and praetors did intervene sometimes in these appointments), and under the Principate presumably by the officials who replaced the quaestors at the aerarium. In general, their function was to look after the financial and non-financial documents
which were housed in the treasury building: the most important of these non-financial documents were copies of *leges* and *senatus consulta*, which did not become valid until copies were deposited at the *aerarium*.  

The *scribae* were also sent out in pairs to join the staff of provincial governors, on which they served alongside the provincial quaestors. The practice of allotting *scribae* to the provincial quaestors was continued under the Principate. Presumably the quaestor and his staff prepared the accounts of the finances of the province to which they were allotted. As under the Republic these accounts no doubt had to be submitted to the *aerarium* at the end of a proconsul's term of office. There seems to be no direct evidence as to whether Augustus and his successors followed this procedure with respect to the provinces they governed through their *legati*. Since the emperors held their *imperium* for life their position can hardly be compared to that of an ordinary proconsul. But possibly they registered their provincial *rationes* with the *aerarium* from time to time as a formality. Moreover, the fact that the emperors regularly published *rationes imperii* (at least in the early years of the Principate) indicates that they had regular access to the records of the *aerarium* and the accounts of the senatorial provinces, in order to co-ordinate these with data concerning the finances of those areas of administration for which they themselves took direct responsibility.

Under the Republic one of the important functions carried out by the *aerarium* quaestors was the *locatio* of public contracts. In the *lex Iulia municipalis* dealing with the upkeep of the roads, it is stated that the
locationes were to be carried out by the aedile concerned through the quaestors, or other officials of the aerarium, who was also to allocate the money. This practice continued under the Principate. Dio writes (under A.D. 42) that when the praetors in charge of the financial administration had laid themselves open to charges, Claudius did not prosecute them but visited them when they were making sales and executing leases, and corrected whatever he regarded as an abuse. Dio's phrase: 'πυρασκουσι δὲ τινα καὶ μισθοσεν' would appear to include the locatio of contracts.

Another aspect of the jurisdiction of the aerarium officials was the recovery of debts owed to the aerarium either by communities or individuals. The activity of aerarium officials in this area is mentioned in the literary sources, and an anecdote related by Suetonius concerning Claudius while he was still a privatus illustrates how an individual could become indebted to the state: postremo sestertium octogies pro introitu novi sacerdotii coactus impendere, ad eas rei familiaris angustias decidunt, ut cum obligatam aerario fidem liberare non possit, in vacuum leg praediatoria venalis pependerit sub edicto praefectorum. That is, when Claudius was unable to meet his debt to the aerarium, his property was sequestered by the treasury officials and put up for sale by public proclamation according to the law.

It frequently happened that long-standing debts to the aerarium accumulated, and on several occasions the emperors declared a moratorium on these unpaid debts. In 28 B.C. Octavian cancelled all obligations to the public treasury
which dated from before the Battle of Actium, with the exception of those secured by buildings, and he burned the old notes of those who were indebted to the state. 30 Vespasian, also, is reported to have destroyed the records of old public debts, in A.D. 70; 31 and later Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius announced a remission of debts owing both to the imperial and public treasuries. 32 Claudius, on the other hand, is said to have appointed a board of three ex-praetors to collect the debts owed to the public treasury, in A.D. 42. 33 His initiative in setting up this board indicates that even before the aerarium administration was transferred to officials nominated by him, 34 the emperor would nevertheless intervene in its affairs when he felt such intervention was necessary.

In the early Principate, the aerarium officials evidently possessed independent jurisdiction over the selling-up of debtors' properties. Tacitus records (under A.D. 56) how a quarrel arose between Helvidius Priscus, then tribune, and Olbutronius Sabinus, a treasury quaestor, when Helvidius accused Olbutronius of being too rigorous in executing the law ('ius hastae') providing for the compulsory sale of debtors' estates. 35 It was after this affair that Nero intervened to transfer the management of the aerarium to experienced ex-praetors. 36 Just prior to these events, Tacitus states that following a dispute between a praetor and a tribune, the senate (after censuring the tribune) passed certain decrees placing a limit on the authority of the tribunes. 37 Among the proposals brought forward at the time one had a bearing on the functions of the treasury quaestors: the consul-
designate (L. Calpurnius Piso) proposed 'neve multam ab iis (= tribunes) dictam quaestores aerarii in publicas tabulas ante quattuor mensis referrent', during which period objections could be lodged for adjudication by the consuls.38 Thus although in this period the aerarium was being administered by officials nominated by the emperor, the senators evidently did not feel (at this stage, anyway) that they should refer every matter affecting these officials to the emperor.

The existence of public records listing outstanding debts of privati to the aerarium lent itself to another abuse - delation. According to Suetonius, it was because they were 'praecipuam calumniandi materiam' that Augustus burned the records of old debts;39 and a certain Paetus under Nero is described by Tacitus as 'exercendis apud aerarium sectionibus famousus'.40 Paetus had apparently made a practice of prosecuting people as state debtors, when in fact their names had been struck from the records. After Paetus' unsuccessful attempt to have Pallas and Burrus condemned for treason41 he was sentenced to exile,'et tabulae exustae sunt quibus oblitterata aerarii nomina retrahesat'.42 But delation of this kind was not eliminated, and Suetonius records measures taken by Domitian to discourage informers from bringing such prosecutions. In the first place, he cancelled the suits against those who had been posted as debtors to the aerarium for more than five years; secondly, he prohibited renewals of charges except within one year, and on the condition that an accuser who did not win his suit should be exiled.43
The earliest clear reference to the existence of a special court under the jurisdiction of the aerarium officials comes from the early part of Claudius' reign, when praetors still filled this position. Dio records (under A.D. 41) that Claudius frequently joined the consuls and the praetors, especially those in charge of the administration of the finances, in their investigations. Dio's account not only implies that Claudius had a special interest in the cases conducted by the praetores aerarii, but that he himself intervened in their conduct of the cases. Claudius reportedly transferred very few cases from the jurisdiction of the aerarium officials to other courts. But Nero, according to Suetonius, instigated a reform whereby cases connected with the aerarium were to be transferred to the Forum, and to the jurisdiction of a board of reciparatores. Pliny the Younger's reference to the presence of delatores at the aerarium in Domitian's time suggests, however, that cases involving treasury claims were once again being heard at the aerarium. Pliny's description of himself at work as praefectus aerarii early in Trajan's reign also shows that this office involved the exercise of jurisdiction: 'sedeo pro tribunali, subnoto libellos...'. It appears, therefore, that a special tribunal existed for the judgment of cases in which treasury claims were involved, and that (perhaps with the exception of part of Nero's reign) it was presided over by the officials who administered the aerarium. It is quite likely that the introduction of the lex Papia Poppaea under Augustus helped to make the establishment of this court necessary. Tacitus relates that the law had been passed in order to sharpen the penalties of celibacy 'et augendo aerario', and he remarks that although the new
law did not discourage childlessness, it did encourage
delation.\textsuperscript{53} Tiberius made an attempt to check the flood of
accusations by arranging for the establishment of a senatorial
commission (consisting of five ex-consuls, five ex-praetors,
and five other senators, chosen by lot), whose efforts in
disentangling legal complexities, according to Tacitus,
produced a temporary alleviation.\textsuperscript{54} Then under Nero
legislation was passed by which the rewards paid to informers
for denouncing violators of the Papian law were reduced to
one fourth the former amount.\textsuperscript{55}

\textit{Bona caduca} and \textit{vacantia}, and especially \textit{bona damnatorum}
might be transferred to the emperor.\textsuperscript{56} The earliest recorded
instance of an imperial claim to \textit{bona vacantia} comes from the
eyears of Tiberius' reign. The property of Aemilia Musa,
a wealthy woman, who had died intestate, was 'petita in fiscum',
although Tiberius decided to transfer the estate to Aemilius
Lepidus, a distant relation of the deceased.\textsuperscript{57} Tacitus
describes Tiberius' decision in this case as a 'grata
\textit{liberalitas}',\textsuperscript{58} but says nothing about the grounds for Tiberius'
claim on the estate.\textsuperscript{59} The actual seizures of property by
Tiberius which Tacitus records in the \textit{Annals} all relate to
confiscations following condemnations in the senate. The
first instance was the conviction of C. Silius for treason,\textsuperscript{60}
following which Tacitus states: '\textit{liberalitas Augusti
avulsa, computatis singillatim quae fisco petebantur}'.\textsuperscript{61}
Tacitus' account, then, strongly suggests that Tiberius was
simply recovering gifts which had, perhaps, been bequeathed
in \textit{Augustus'} will to Silius.\textsuperscript{62} Moreover, in the case of
Silius' wife, Sosia Gallia (who was also condemned), the
normal legal procedure applying to confiscations was carried
out.\textsuperscript{63}
Tiberius' action over the disposal of Silius' estate seems to have had some precedent in the trial of Cornelius Gallus under Augustus. Gallus, formerly a governor of Egypt, was condemned by the senate, and it was unanimously decreed by them that he should be convicted in the courts, exiled and deprived of his estate, and that the estate should be given to Augustus. Possibly a similar provision was also made following the condemnation of Seianus, since Tacitus implies that it was on the motion of the senate that 'bona Seiani ablata aerario ut in fiscum cogerentur, tamquam referret'. In this case, therefore, the property in question was transferred to the fiscus after the ordinary legal procedures regarding bona damnatorum (namely, confiscation to the public treasury) had actually been put into effect. In the case of Sextus Marius, 'the richest man in Spain', who was condemned and executed on a charge of incest, 'aurarias argentariasque eius, quamquam publicarentur, sibimet Tiberius seposuit'. But once again, the ordinary legal procedures had been carried out, and the mines declared public property ('publicarentur'); it was only then that Tiberius set them aside for himself. Senatorial authorization of the appropriation is not implied in this instance, and Tacitus would appear to be underlining what he considers was an irregular act on Tiberius' part - namely outright seizure of property which should have gone to the state.

According to Dio, in Tiberius' reign all informers received large sums from the public treasury, as well as from the victims' estates. This suggests that under Tiberius the disposal of bona damnatorum was usually handled
by the praetores aerarii, since it was the aerarium which paid out the rewards to the delatores. Thus the laws relating to confiscations probably remained unchanged, even if in some cases the emperor, not the aerarium, was the eventual beneficiary.

By the Flavian period it is doubtful whether senatorial sanction was either sought or given to the emperor's claims in every case. At any rate, it appears that under Domitian the fiscus regularly shared in the proceeds from bona caduca and vacantia, and especially bona damnatorum. According to Pliny the Younger, in Domitian's reign 'locupletabant et fiscum et aerarium non tam Voconiae et Iuliae leges, quam maiestatis singulare et unicum crimen'. Pliny appears to take for granted here the claims of the fiscus, criticizing mainly alleged abuses in the application of the treason law. But the laws governing the disposal of bona vacantia and caduca may not have been changed fundamentally. As suggested above, cases arising from the aerarium's claims to inheritances forfeited under the lex Papia Poppaea probably came before a special court presided over by the praetores aerarii. Under Trajan and later it appears that cases arising from the lex Iulia and lex Papia were still reported to the aerarium, even though the bona were liable to go to the fiscus. Moreover, the claims of the fiscus to bona caduca seem to have come before the praefecti aerarii in the second century, which again suggests that legally the fiscus was still unable to claim bona of this category on an equal footing with the public treasury.

By Trajan's time a special tribunal had been established for the purpose of deciding suits between privati and the fiscus. From Pliny's description of how
the fiscus' claims were decided under Trajan, it also emerges that earlier than this a procurator's court already existed for the purpose of adjudicating in such claims. The creation of procuratorial courts implies that the fiscus had acquired independent jurisdiction in some cases involving its own interests. But Nerva's institution of a tribunal presided over by a state magistrate provided an alternative to procuratorial jurisdiction. His institution of this court may have been aimed at checking the process whereby the fiscus was acquiring rights and privileges formerly invested only in the res publica and its magistrates.

The jurisdiction of the aerarium officials may even have been expanded in the course of the first century A.D., in order to give them competence in cases arising from the lex Iulia and lex Papia Poppaea. But there is little direct evidence for their role in the administration of the public finances in general under the early Principate. The occasional reference to their activities suggests, for example, that the salaries paid to the staff of a provincial governor (at least in the case of senatorial provinces) were accountable to the aerarium. From this it seems to follow that, as under the Republic, the officials in charge of the aerarium were in theory responsible for furnishing a promagistrate with the funds necessary for his administration. Even if these expenses were actually furnished from funds held on the spot in the provincial fisci, this would not affect the principle of accountability to the aerarium in Rome.

It is not known how far the emperors continued to acknowledge that they might be held 'in account' to the
The essential function of the aerarium was to be the depository of the treasure belonging to the state, and so the function of the aerarium officials was to make payments in and out as required. At no stage in the history of the aerarium did the officials who administered it direct financial policy: their function was limited to allocating funds as directed by the senate or the emperor. Thus under Augustus, the praetores aerarii were directed by a s.c. to pay out funds for the support of the assistants of the curatores aquarum. On the other hand, while they might present a report advising that the aerarium’s cash reserves had fallen to a low level, it was not their task to deal with the problem of the deficit.

By Trajan’s reign, not only did the emperor personally appoint praefecti to administer the aerarium, but his control over the public treasury is openly referred to by Pliny the Younger. In theory, the situation under Trajan presents a contrast with the earliest period of the
principate up to A.D. 44, when the officials who administered the public treasury (the praetores aerarii) were still selected by the senate. Thus Mommsen argues that in this early period the Princeps would have been obliged to obtain funds from the aerarium through the senate, but that once praefecti were appointed it followed that the aerarium administration was really assumed by the emperor, so that he could in fact dispose of the funds held in it as freely as the moneys held in his fiscus.91 But although Trajan may have controlled the aerarium more closely than his predecessors, as pointed out in this chapter, there is evidence of imperial intervention in aerarium affairs at every stage in the Principate. In particular, new legislation affecting the aerarium and its officials was generally initiated by the emperors, from the time of Augustus; although, in the Julio-Claudian period, at any rate, the senate could apparently initiate minor enactments to do with the aerarium administration.92 Thus, the history of the aerarium and its officials in the first century furnishes another illustration of the continual overlapping of 'imperial' and 'senatorial' authority in the business of administration. In the latter part of the first century there was apparently a progression towards more complete imperial supervision of the aerarium administration and its officials. Nevertheless, the senate in theory continued to control the public treasury. For although Pliny the Younger, in the Panegyricus, speaks of Trajan's control over it, at the same time he emphasizes that the aerarium was not the emperor's property, so that Trajan did not control it as closely as he did the fiscus, which was his property.93 In the following chapter, the question of how far the actual management of public funds was transferred from the aerarium to the imperial Palatine administration will be considered.
Augustus seems to have employed household slaves and freedmen to manage his correspondence and to put together accounts of the Empire's finances. Accurate information concerning the current financial position of the Empire would have been a necessary basis for forward financial planning, and Augustus also initiated the practice of regularly publishing accounts of the state finances. For the information which went into the compiling of these balance sheets, the emperor's accounting staff must have drawn on the records kept by the scribae attached to the aerarium, the reports furnished by the procurators sent out to the imperial provinces, and also the accounts compiled by the societates of the funds in their hands.

Since the 'breviarium totius imperii' bequeathed by Augustus listed 'quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis et vectigaliorum residuis', it seems certain that Augustus' personal accountants had access to all the above mentioned sources of information. But there is no indication that this embryo imperial financial secretariat had any official position in the public administration of the Empire: the slaves and freedmen in question were simply Augustus' private agents whom he employed, like any other high-ranking wealthy Roman, to assist him in the conduct of all his affairs. Even Augustus' use of his private secretaries to compile accounts of the funds in the aerarium
was not an innovation. Cato the Younger, after his term as quaestor, sent slaves to copy the financial documents in the treasury, and copies of these records were also available for sale. For the management of his private property and finances Augustus also employed equestrian agents. One of these agents, the grandfather of the future emperor Vitellius, is mentioned by Suetonius who calls him 'eques certe Romanus et rerum Augusti procurator'.

According to Tacitus, Tiberius' household during the first decade of his reign was modest, being limited to a few freedmen. But probably already under Tiberius the functions of the emperor's financial secretariat were becoming more specialised. A freedman of Tiberius, Antemus Ti. Caes. Aug. 1(libertus), is attested at Rome as 'a rationibus', that is, the official placed in charge of the emperor's accounts. Also, a slave of Tiberius is attested, again at Rome, with the title 'ad possessiones'. Presumably he was on the staff of a special bureau concerned with the management of the emperor's properties. At the same time, the appearance of a number of new domestic offices held by slaves of the familia urbana indicates that the management of the imperial household in Rome was acquiring more the character of a 'palace' administration.

No chests for the emperor's cash reserves are attested epigraphically for the early Julio-Claudian period; but the emperor must have had funds at hand both for domestic expenses and for expenditure on public works, as well as other forms of imperial subsidization of state expenditure. Claudius' a rationibus Pallas, like this emperor's other freedman secretaries, is treated in the sources as a
figure of considerable power and influence. Tacitus, indeed, states that Pallas was virtually controller of the Empire until he was discharged from his 'cura rerum' early in Nero's reign. But technically, Pallas was only the head freedman of Claudius' accounting staff. The notoriety of Pallas and his undoubtedly personal influence in palace affairs has perhaps given rise to an inflated picture of the actual importance of his office. It is true that by Nero's reign the freedman heads of the main departments of the imperial secretariat, namely the a rationibus, ab epistulis and a libellis, had acquired something of a ministerial status within the palace bureaucracy. Thus Decimus Junius Silanus Torquatus could be charged in A.D. 63 on the grounds that 'quin immo libertos habere quos ab epistulis et a libellis et a rationibus appellet, nomina summae curae et meditamenta'. But it has been argued that under Claudius the status of the imperial financial secretariat was enhanced in a more significant manner than this. One view is that the a rationibus in fact became the imperial treasurer, controlling through the fiscus a large percentage of the public finances which were henceforth managed quite separately from the funds in the balance of the aerarium. It is, however, difficult to accept Pallas' role as being virtually that of controller of a second public treasury. To accept this interpretation of his office it is necessary to disregard the straightforward meaning of the terminology used in a contemporary document to describe Pallas' function. For in A.D. 52 the senate passed a decree honouring Pallas in acknowledgement of his loyal
services as 'custos principalium opum'; in the same decree
Pallas is also described as 'praepositus rerum (Caesaris)'.
Thus it seems quite clear that in Claudius' reign the a
rationibus was regarded primarily as manager of the emperor's
private wealth.

On the other hand, like Augustus' accounting staff and
Tiberius' a rationibus before him, Pallas presumably was
responsible for compiling accounts of all public income and
expenditure, and he probably even advised Claudius on
budgetary policy. In addition to estimating expenditure,
Pallas and his predecessors and successors very likely
supervised the actual allocation of the sums of public money
which the emperor drew on to support the costs of the urban
curae he directed personally. In Claudius' time the cost of
the annona probably formed the bulk of the public expenditure
in Rome for which the emperor took direct responsibility.
Pallas' responsibilities in this direction seem to be
confirmed by Tacitus' statement that on being dismissed from
his office the freedman stipulated 'ne cuius facti in
praeteritum interrogaretur paresque rationes cum re publica
haberet'. This passage certainly implies that while in
office Pallas had been entrusted with public funds, and that
he wished to safeguard himself against a possible charge of
peculation. Tacitus' statement also implies that public
funds administered by officials responsible to the emperor
were still accountable to the state, and hence to the state
treasury, the aerarium. Since Pallas was not a public
official, but technically only the emperor's private agent,
it is true that he would not, officially, have had any
accounts to render to the state; although, like any
privatus, he could have been charged with owing money to the aerarium. It was presumably Nero himself who would technically have been accountable for the public funds handled by his palace bureaucracy. It is unlikely that the senate could have forced Nero to publicly account for his financial administration. But it does not follow from this that the emperor, at any rate in theory, was no longer accountable to the state for the public funds he administered in his various capacities (governor of a number of provinces, curator annonae, etc.)

Quite a number of freedman officials are recorded with the title a rationibus, most of whom were freedmen of Claudius or Nero. Not all of them could have been heads of the bureau before the office was transferred to an equestrian under Trajan, and the majority of them must have held subordinate positions under the head a rationibus.

Contrary to what has often been assumed, it is unlikely that Pallas' immediate successor as head of the central financial bureau was the father of Claudius Etruscus, who was dismissed from this office under Domitian. The father of Claudius Etruscus began his career as a Caesaris servus under Tiberius, in whose reign he was manumitted. He was thus an almost exact contemporary of Pallas, who was still a slave in A.D. 31. As an Aug. lib., the father of Etruscus accompanied Gaius to Gaul on this emperor's abortive British campaign. Under Claudius he received promotion: 'praecipuos sed enim merito surrexit in actus/nondum stelli gerum senior dimissus in axem/ Claudius...'. Weaver thinks that the words 'praecipuos actus' suit an independent position rather than a position as the
subordinate of Pallas, and that the father of Etruscus probably held a financial procuratorship in the East where he would later have become known to the future emperors Vespasian and Titus. Line 78 of Statius' poem '...et longo transmittit habere nepoti' can then be interpreted as a reference to a period of long duration away from Rome, from the accession of Nero to the outbreak of the Civil War. But if, instead, the father of Etruscus had been appointed a rationibus under Nero, the lines that follow ('quis superos...profundo') must refer to the reign of Nero and his predecessors Claudius, Gaius, and Tiberius. Weaver points out that the rapid and frequent change of leaders indicated by 'tot...tot...totiens mutata' in this section of the poem, contrasted with the preceding 'longo', describes more aptly the period of the Civil War, with reference to the emperors Galba, Otho and Vitellius. Also, if the father of Etruscus had held the senior post of a rationibus under Nero, it is very surprising that he apparently retained it under Galba, remained in office under Otho and Vitellius, and then continued to hold his position under the new dynasty. It seems far more likely that it was one of the Ti. Claudii Aug. lib. recorded with the title a Rationibus who succeeded Pallas in A.D. 55. The most probable candidate for at least the latter part of Nero's reign is Phaon, who is also mentioned in the literary sources as one of the freedmen close to the emperor. The father of Etruscus presumably remained at his procuratorial post in an eastern province, and did not return to Rome till A.D. 70 with Vespasian, or 71 with Titus. When he was appointed a rationibus he would have been 67 years old.
The father of Etruscus stood high in Vespasian's favour, for (despite his freedman status) the emperor allowed him to participate honourably in the Jewish triumph in 71, which perhaps also indicates that he had participated in the Jewish campaign while in the East. Then Vespasian (probably during his censorship held jointly with Titus in 73/74) honoured him with the grant of the ius anularum aureorum, and raised him to equestrian status. But in A.D. 82/83 the father of Etruscus suffered the fate that Pallas had under Nero: at the age of 80 he was banished, together with the other senior official in the a rationibus department ('curarum socius').

The father of Etruscus was the first equestrian a rationibus, since he evidently held the office for another nine years after his elevation to the equestrian order. But he was probably succeeded in the office by the freedman Atticus Aug. lib., whose senior status is indicated by the fact that he had former slaves of his own working under him. From Trajan's reign, however, the direction of the bureau was held by equestrians.

Within the Julio-Claudian period a special central bureau of the patrimonium was established. Freedmen of either Claudius or Nero (Ti. Claudii) are recorded as tabularii rat(ionis) patrimoni, and Vitellius (A.D. 69) appointed an equestrian, Sex. Caesius Propertianus, as 'proc. imp. a patrim(onio) et heredit(atibus) et a li[b]ell(is)'.

Propertianus (the earliest recorded equestrian head of a Palatine bureau) combined under his management not only the administration of the patrimonium and hereditary possessions of the emperor (the hereditates), but also the
imperial bureau of petitions (a libellis). But before the end of the Flavian period, the hereditates and the patrimonium were evidently no longer administered jointly: under Domitian an equestrian, Cn. Octavius Titinius Capito, held the combined posts of ab epistulis et a patrimonio. A certain Domitius Lemnus Aug. lib., procurator patrimonii et hereditatium has usually been dated to Domitian's reign, but he was actually a freedman of Nero, and more likely held his procuratorship prior to Domitian. The equestrian Capito continued to hold the post of ab epistulis under Nerva and Trajan, so it appears that from Domitian's reign equestrians were regularly appointed heads of some of the Palatine bureaux. From Hadrian's reign the now separate bureaux of the patrimonium and hereditates were definitely under the management of equestrian heads. A freedman of Marcus Aurelius with the title procurator patrimonii is known, and two freedman procurators of the hereditates are attested for the Antonine period. But these officials were probably deputy procurators, who were subordinated to the equestrian heads of the two bureaux.

The emergence of a special ratio patrimonii did not mean, however, that the duties of the a rationibus were now concerned solely with the administration of public funds. The head of the bureau of the patrimonium was presumably entrusted with the task of co-ordinating the administration of the imperial property located both in Italy and outside it. But the a rationibus estimated and allocated the liquid assets and produce accruing from the imperial property, as well as public funds under the administrative control of the emperor. His responsibility for allocating the private assets of the emperor is indicated quite plainly in Statius'
account of the duties devolving on the Flavian a rationibus, the father of Claudius Etruscus: 'partaeque per omnis/divitiae populos magnique impendia mundi/ quicquid ab auriferis eictat Hiberia fossis...'; '...quodque legit mersus pelagi scrutator Eoi,/ et Lacedaemonii pecuaria culta Galaesi/ perspicuaeque nives Massylaque robora et Indi/ dentis honos'. These lines can be best interpreted as referring to the production of gold from imperial mines, and other materials, either produced on imperial estates or purchased by the emperor, for the adornment of the imperial residences in Rome. It is unlikely that the Indian ivory mentioned by Statius, especially, accrued to the emperor as tribute. Moreover, as concluded in an earlier chapter, the imperial contribution to the cost of maintaining the aqueducts, which came out of the fiscus, actually represented a form of regular expenditure drawn on private imperial funds. The amount of this outlay was also calculated by the a rationibus: 'quid alti/ undarum cursus (i.e., the aqueducts)....' Thus there must have been a fairly close liaison between the a rationibus and the ratio patrimonii.

Neither the ratio patrimonii nor the bureau of the a rationibus possessed its own chest: no dispensatores or arcarii are recorded among their personnel. Therefore both these departments were evidently concerned chiefly with 'paper-work'. But before the end of the first century several imperially administered fisci are attested at Rome. Two of these chests were repositories for particular sections of the emperor's private finances. One of them was the fiscus libertatis et peculiorum, which received the revenues
accruing from the emperor's rights of inheritance over the property of his familia. Several inscriptions from Rome record imperial freedmen who were attached to this chest, including two procurators, two tabularii, and a librarius. One of the procurators possibly held this post before the end of the first century, and one of the tabularii was a freedman of either Claudius or Nero. The appearance of a Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. as a tabularius almost certainly dates the establishment of the chest either in or close to the Julio-Claudian period. Its continued existence well into the second century is indicated by the fact that the second procurator attested was a freedman of Antoninus Pius.

Another private chest recorded is the fiscus castrensis, which held the funds allocated for the upkeep of the imperial household in Rome. Certain inscriptions relating to the 'familia castrensis' show that the term 'castrensis' was applied to the residence (or residences) of the emperor, for the officials recorded quite certainly belonged to the emperor's domestic staff. The term 'castra' is also found in Juvenal in the sense of 'court': 'sed ex hoc/ tempore iam, Caesar, figuli tua castra sequantur'. The freedman Martialis who was a procurator of the fiscus libertatis et peculiorum also held (prior to this post) the office of procurator of the fiscus castr[ensis], perhaps during the first century. Also, several dispensatores of the fiscus castrensis are recorded. One can be dated to the first century if the restoration of his function is correct, but otherwise the inscriptions of the chest's dispensatores furnish no clue to the date of its establishment. The personnel of the (ratio) castrensis, however, date from the Julio-Claudian period, or, at the latest, from the early Flavian period. At its head,
presumably, was the procurator castrensis, and officials with this title are attested from the end of the first century. This bureau, through its staff of tabularii, evidently handled the paperwork connected with the management of the imperial residences, and probably worked in close association with the personnel of the household chest. But from the inscriptions evidence available, it would appear that the special household chest emerged after a special administrative personnel for the imperial household already existed. Also, by the second century a special department, the ratio thesaurorum, was in existence, whose procurator was probably entrusted with the overall charge of the treasures (gold and silver vessels etc.) belonging to the imperial household. Presumably there was also some liaison between these departments and chests and the bureau of the a rationibus: for, as Statius shows, the a rationibus was responsible for allocating the precious metals used for the adornment of the imperial residences.

During the Flavian period a special fiscus Judaicus existed. It is mentioned by Suetonius, who uses the term to denote the Jewish tax: he states that (under Domitian) 'praeter ceteros Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est'. The tax had been imposed by Vespasian on all Jews throughout the Empire, and its proceeds were diverted to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome. An inscription from Rome records a T. Flavius Aug. lib. who had held the post of procurator ad capitularia Judaerum, and who had previously been employed in the palace bureau of the ab epistulis. Thus it seems likely that under the Flavians an imperially administered chest and bureau for the tax existed at Rome. But no special officials of the tax are known from a later period, and it must be assumed that its administration was
handed over to other officials, who combined this function with their ordinary offices. 90

As shown in the previous chapters, from the Flavian period, and on an increasing scale in the second century, the imperial bureaucracy became involved directly in the work of public administration, both in Italy and in the provinces. 91 Again, there was the establishment of the special chest called the fiscus frumentarius. This chest, which was administered by imperial officials, evidently handled the funds allocated for the expenses of the cura annonae, 92 for which cura the emperors had taken responsibility since the time of Augustus. The fiscus Alexandrinus and fiscus Asiaticus, concerning the function of which no definite conclusions can be drawn, 93 may have been urban 'branch offices' of the provincial fisci of Egypt and Asia, administered by imperial officials, as Jones maintains is the correct interpretation of their function. 94 But it is equally possible that both these chests were patrimonial in character, and were repositories for private sources of income drawn by the emperors from the provinces of Egypt and Asia. These fisci were very probably all established by Trajan's reign: the fiscus Alexandrinus appears certainly to have existed before the end of the first century; 95 the fiscus Asiaticus was most probably in existence under Domitian; 96 and the fiscus frumentarius certainly existed under Trajan. 97 In addition, a procurator fiscorum transmarinorum can be dated to the Flavian period, if not earlier, whose post, like the procuratorships of the fiscus castrensis and the fiscus libertatis et peculiorum — and possibly the fiscus Alexandrinus and fiscus Asiaticus — may have been patrimonial. 98 The post seems to have been a junior one in the freedman cursus, 99 and possibly this procurator was subordinated to the bureau of the a rationibus. There must also have been some liaison between the a rationibus and the officials of the other chests discussed here. The fiscus frumentarius, which appears to have been the
cash-box of the praefectus annonae, was presumably a 'public' chest. But
But there must have been some level of contact between the bureau of the
rationibus and the officials who administered the finances of the cura
annonae, since, according to Statius, it was the task of the father of
Etruscus as a rationibus to estimate the cost of the dole. 100 Again,
if the fiscus Alexandrinus and fiscus Asiaticus were in fact
repositories for the surplus revenues brought in by the taxes imposed on
Egypt and Asia, the funds held in them were quite probably allocated
according to estimates drawn up by the a rationibus. It was the
a rationibus who calculated expenditure on the armies, 101 and the
surplus revenues produced by the wealthy eastern provinces no doubt
contributed to the cost of maintaining the legions. 102
The establishment of chests for particular branches of the imperial
financial administration no doubt reflects the growing complexity and
hence increased differentiation of functions, within the central Palatine
bureaucracy, although the a rationibus presumably remained responsible
for co-ordinating the various branches of finance (private or public)
administered through imperial officials.

The first equestrian a rationibus appointed under Trajan, L. Vibius
Lentulus, held prior to this office the post of procurator Loricatae,
which he was the first and only equestrian to fill. 103 The name of this
office derived from that of the statue of Julius Caesar (with cuirass)
which stood in the Temple of Castor. 104 This temple was the
depot at which the imperial funds were deposited, 105 and the
senatus consultum honouring Pallas had been affixed to the
statue of Caesar there. 106 Also, a freedman of the Flavians
(Martialis) is recorded who has the title of proc(urator)
Aug(usti) ad Castorem. 107 As private persons could deposit
property in the temple, also, 108 it appears that as late as
Trajan's reign the emperor had no special building for the
safe-keeping of his funds, and to parallel the function of
the Temple of Saturn in housing the aerarium. 109

Therefore, there is no direct evidence to show that the surplus
revenues produced by taxation, including the income from the imperial
provinces, were not still deposited in the aerarium Saturni, as late
as Trajan's reign. As stated above, the Palatine bureaucracy possibly
administered the funds earmarked for the expenses of the curae for which the emperors took direct responsibility — clearly, Pallas handled public funds. Yet the father of Etruscus, who served as a rationibus under Domitian, is presented by Statius as a superior kind of accountant to the emperor, rather than as the principal receiver and allocator of the public funds. In the early second century the imperial bureaucracy as a whole was becoming a complex organization, administering public revenues. But there is no evidence which would indicate that, by Trajan's time, the central Palatine bureaucracy had replaced the aerarium and its officials as the main Treasury organization of the Roman Empire.
CHAPTER 8

THE EMPEROR AND THE SENATE

It has been emphasized earlier in this thesis that Marcus Aurelius reportedly found it politic to publicly declare his acceptance of the principle that all public funds were the property of the senate and Roman people. The survival of this principle implies that from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius the senate, in theory at any rate, continued to have authority over the disposal of the public funds. In this chapter, the question of how far theory was translated into practice will be discussed: that is, whether the senate was able to exercise real authority over the administration of the Empire and its resources at any stage under the Principate. The role of the senate in government will be discussed against the background of the administrative changes discussed in the preceding chapters of this thesis, and the effect these changes may have had on the senate's ability to supervise the disposal of public funds will be examined, also.

By the arrangements made for the government of the provinces in 27 B.C., the financial administration of some of the provinces remained in the hands of quaestors who were accountable to the aerarium. Moreover, the aerarium officials were still selected by the senate in Augustus' reign. In 19 B.C. we find the consul Sentius Saturninus, who was sole consul for a period when Augustus was absent from Rome, adopting the rigorous regime of the
older consuls', exposing the 'fraudulent tricks' of the tax-collectors, and ordering the 'pecuniae publicae' to be deposited 'in aerarium'. But Velleius Paterculus describes the conduct of Saturninus as 'remarkable', and it is probable that his action was not paralleled by subsequent consuls, at any rate acting independently of the emperor. For although Augustus consulted the senate on questions of finance, there appears to be no recorded instance of the senate acting on its own initiative on an important matter connected with finance. Thus it was on Augustus' initiative that new curae were established for the maintenance of the highways near Rome and for the administration of the Roman water supply, as well as for the management of the grain supply.

Allocations of money to support all these curae would have been necessary. In the one instance where contemporary records survive the allocation was authorized by a s.c. The same procedure was evidently followed in granting allowances for other purposes, as in 22 B.C. when Augustus transferred the charge of all festivals to the praetors, and ordered that they were to be given a grant from the public treasury.

In A.D. 6, Augustus succeeded in getting the senate to adopt his new vicesima hereditatium, but went to great lengths to avoid the appearance of interfering with senators' rights to reach an independent decision on the matter. We do not know if he discussed with the senate the introduction (in the following year) of the sales-tax on slaves. The financial difficulties felt in A.D. 6 led to the establishment of a board of three consulars, who
were selected by lot from the senate to advise Augustus on the reduction of expenditure.11 The selection of this financial commission must have followed discussion in the senate, presumably led by Augustus, on the need to limit expenditure. In a formal sense, therefore, financial policy under Augustus was decided jointly by emperor and senate: that is, decisions appear to have been formally embodied in senatus consulta.12 But the evidence of the sources also indicates that it was the emperor, never the senate, who actually initiated policy-making.

Publicly Augustus seems to have deferred to the theory that the senate should control the public revenues. According to Dio, Augustus claimed in 27 B.C. that he was returning control of the armies, the provinces, the revenues and the laws to the senate,13 and in his funeral eulogy in A.D. 14 Tiberius claimed that Augustus' promise had been carried out.14 It appears that in strict theory, too, only the senate could recommend allocations of funds from the aerarium.15 And since the revenues produced by the tribute of the imperial provinces were regarded as being in the balance of the aerarium,16 Augustus could presumably have been held accountable by the senate for his management of these funds.17 Moreover, the vote of additional funds for the emperor's own spheres of responsibility (e.g., maintenance of the armies stationed in his provinces and the urban annona) would in theory have depended on the senate, even if this was a mere formality.18

Apart from regular expenditure on the administration and defence of the Empire, funds were sometimes required for the relief of cities struck by natural disaster, or,
again, for the support of impoverished senators. The sources mention that both Augustus and Tiberius often provided such relief at their own expense, and Dio says that the senators, also, gave relief to many cities. 19

Petitions for public financial assistance or for relief from taxation, whether they came from imperial or senatorial provinces, were discussed in the senate. When a number of cities in Asia were damaged by earthquake in A.D. 17, Tacitus speaks first of action by the emperor: Tiberius promised the Sardians who were most affected by the disaster ten million sesterces, and remitted their payments to both the aerarium and the fiscus for a five year period. From what follows, however, it is clear that the senate authorized the amount of relief allocated to the distressed cities: Tacitus states that it was decided to exempt the other badly damaged cities from payment of tribute for the same term, and to send out a special commissioner to administer the relief programme. 20

In A.D. 17, also, the imperial provinces of Syria and Judaea petitioned for a reduction of their tribute. Tacitus mentions their petition when referring to the then unsettled conditions in the Eastern part of the Empire, which he says Tiberius brought to the senate's attention. 21 Earlier (A.D. 15), Achaea and Macedonia had protested against the heavy taxes imposed on them, and it was decided (presumably by senatorial decree) to suspend their proconsular government for the time being and transfer both provinces to the emperor. 22 Later, in A.D. 23, on Tiberius' proposal the senate decreed three years' remission of tribute to the two cities of Cibyra (in senatorial Asia).
and Aegium (in Achaea, then imperial). It is possible that in the earliest period of the Principate the senate alone could authorise alterations in the level of taxation, although Dio, in listing the regulations laid down for provincial governors from Augustus' reign, indicates that the emperor and senate possessed co-ordinate authority in this regard.

In A.D. 17, apparently without prior consultation of the senate, Tiberius announced to it that due to the additional revenues obtained through the annexation of Cappadocia, he was able to reduce the one per cent auction tax. The question of this tax had been raised in the senate earlier, however, when there had been a public outcry against it. At that time Tiberius had pointed out to the senators that the revenues from the tax were necessary for the support of the aerarium militare, and it had been retained.

Tiberius does seem to have attempted to give the appearance, at least, of treating the senate as his genuine 'partner in rule'. Suetonius writes that Tiberius consulted the senate on all matters: 'Quin etiam speciem libertatis quandam induxit conservatis senatui ac magistratibus et maiestate pristina et potestate. neque tam parvum quicquam neque tam magnum publici privati negotii fuit, de quo non ad patres conscriptos referretur: de vectigalibus ac monopoliis, de exstruendis reficiendisve operibus, etiam de legendo vel exauctorando milite ac legionum et auxiliorum descriptione, denique quibus imperium prorogari aut extraordinaria bella mandari, quid et qua forma regum litteris rescribi placeret'. Tacitus, also, who emphasizes the withering away of the senate's authority
under Augustus (remarking that the emperor gradually absorbed the functions of the senate, the magistrates, and even the law\textsuperscript{30}) says that for some time the senate enjoyed considerable freedom and authority under Tiberius.\textsuperscript{31} Tacitus implies, also, that the emperor's position and wealth did not conflict with that of an ordinary magistrate ('\textit{rari per Italiam Caesaris agri, modesta servitia, intra paucos libertos domus}'),\textsuperscript{32} and that Tiberius did not permit his private procurators to claim a privileged position before the law.\textsuperscript{33}

But for Tiberius' reign, as for Augustus', the general picture obtained from the literary sources is that the senate failed to display any initiative on financial matters, and voted consistently in accordance with the emperor's policies. In theory the senate could, of course, vote funds independently of the emperor. But where such instances of senatorial 'initiative' are recorded in the sources, they concern relatively minor irregular allocations of public monies.\textsuperscript{34} Again, it seems significant that already under Tiberius the senate lacked sufficient resources to cope unaided with a financial crisis. In A.D. 33, an emergency arose because of a shortage of currency in circulation, and the senate failed to take effective measures to deal with the situation. Matters worsened until Tiberius came to the rescue by distributing one hundred million sesterces to special banks for the purpose of interest-free loans.\textsuperscript{35} Senators were appointed to administer these loans,\textsuperscript{36} but the money probably came out of the emperor's private resources.\textsuperscript{37}
The fact Augustus had assumed responsibility for compiling and publishing accounts of the Empire's finances, and the fact this was done through his household slaves rather than through the officials of the aerarium, must have adversely affected the capability of the senate to take the initiative in financial policy-making. Once the emperor had assumed that function, which was necessary for the effective budgetary control of the Empire's resources, the senators were no doubt less likely to make an independent effort in this direction. In Tiberius' reign they were apparently willing to follow the emperor's lead on financial policy. The senators must still have had access to the financial documents deposited in the aerarium, but they may not have had access to quite a lot of detailed financial information relating to the imperial provinces, even assuming that the emperor placed copies of his accounts in the aerarium itself. Once the emperors ceased to publish regularly the rationes imperii (perhaps after Gaius' reign), greater secrecy presumably surrounded the finances of the emperor's administrative spheres.

The sources indicate that the short reign of Gaius began well, since initially he treated the senators with deference; he also renewed publication of the accounts of the public funds which Tiberius ceased to publish following his retirement to Capri. Another of Gaius' policies was to re-establish the client kingdoms which had been annexed under Tiberius. Suetonius states that when Gaius restored the former kings, he granted them the sums which they would have received from taxation and other sources during the interval. Suetonius does not say so, but it is quite likely that the transfer of these
revenues back to the reinstated rulers was formally decreed by the senate, although presumably on Gaius' motion.

The sources are unanimous, however, that Gaius' rule soon became a tyranny, and that he wasted great sums of money which he attempted to recoup by initiating a policy of ruthless exactions and confiscations. It is also alleged that he attempted to increase his personal income by making wider claims to inheritances, and, according to Dio, tried a third method of raising funds: he enlisted the senator Gnaeus Domitius Corbulo as his accomplice and through him accused former highway commissioners of misappropriating public funds, and thus had them fined. Like the fines imposed on the highway commissioners, the 'vectigalia nova atque inaudita', which Gaius imposed at Rome, may also have been levied for the purpose of raising funds for the aerarium. But it appears that Gaius later appropriated this income for his own coffers; Suetonius says that the new taxes were at first collected 'per publicanos', but:

'deinde, quia lucrum exuberabat, per centuriones tribunosque praetorianos exercuit, nullo rerum aut hominum genere omisso, cui non tributi aliquid imponeret'.

Whether or not the emperor Gaius in fact dissipated a large amount of the wealth accumulated by Tiberius, it is difficult not to accept the testimony of the literary sources regarding his later contempt of the senate, and his disregard for the appearances of legality in the manner of his rule. Following his assassination the senate made a short-lived show of independence, and even after the Praetorian Guard had elevated Claudius to the imperial throne the consuls at first refused to accept this fait
accomplished, and for a time sent tribunes and other magistrates to order Claudius to submit to 'the people, the senate and the laws'. In view of the circumstances in which Claudius became emperor, it is hardly surprising that: 'imperio stabilito nihil antiquius duxit quam id biduum, quo de mutando rei p. statu haesitatum erat, memoriae eximere'. Both Suetonius and Dio speak of the respect of he accorded the senate, and the initial popularity of his reign.

As under Tiberius, financial relief and grants of immunity to provincial cities (at least in senatorial provinces) were decreed by the senate. But in Claudius' reign imperial control began to be exercised more directly in some areas of administration. Control over the Tiber banks was evidently transferred from the senate to the emperor, and Claudius assumed financial responsibility on a regular basis for the maintenance of new aqueducts completed in his reign. Again, not only did he supervise the praetores aërarii in their judicial functions, but in A.D. 44 he replaced them with quaestors nominated by himself. Moreover, the undoubted influence of Pallas, Claudius' freedman a rationibus, on the emperor's policies suggests that financial policy was largely decided outside the senate in Claudius' reign.

Furthermore, whatever the precise nature of the judicial powers granted to imperial procurators by the s.c. which was passed in A.D. 53 on Claudius' motion, in Tacitus' view, at least, the proposal marked a new and significant stage in the extension of judicial authority to non-senatorial magistrates. Clearly, Claudius felt it was necessary for the senate to authorise his decision that 'parem vim rerum
habendam a procuratoribus suis iudicatarum ac si ipse
statuisset'; this would seem to indicate that the delegation
of any aspect of the emperor's authority to his personal
agents required specific approval. The passing of this
decree also seems to mark a further stage in the acquisition
of special legal privileges by the imperial patrimonium.
But despite the emergence of significant new trends in his
reign, it appears that the senatus consultum was still
formally the basis for the ratification of imperial
initiatives in policy-making under Claudius. This appears
to have been the case in Nero's reign, also.

In Nero's first speech to the senate following his
accession he 'renounced everything that had occasioned
recent unpopularity'. His speech included a pledge not
to judge every kind of case himself, and to avoid the undue
influence of a few individuals behind closed doors; also,
that bribery and favouritism would be excluded from his house,
and significantly, an undertaking that in his reign 'domum
et rem publicam' would be kept separate. Evidently these
promises were made in response to senatorial dissatisfaction
with Claudius' reputed dependence on his freedman 'ministers',
and, it appears, a tendency to take too large a proportion
of judicial proceedings directly into his own hands. Nero
summed up his address by claiming that under his rule the
senate would preserve its ancient functions: that by
applying to the consuls people from Italy and the senatorial
provinces would have access to it; and that he himself
would look after the armies. To some extent, therefore,
Nero's statement of policy implies the principle of
dyarchy, by which the senate was to have a clearly defined
sphere of authority separate from the emperor's.\textsuperscript{71} His speech also appears to be the earliest recorded imperial statement recognizing such a division of functions. The fact that, for the first time since Augustus, gold and silver coinage was issued by \textit{s.c.} in the capital\textsuperscript{72} was perhaps a reflection of this policy. In A.D. 60/61, however, the issue of gold and silver by \textit{s.c.} ceased again.\textsuperscript{73}

Nero's initial promises were honoured, according to Tacitus: 'the senate decided many matters'.\textsuperscript{74} In A.D. 59, for example, the senate heard a protest brought before it by Cyrene, against the decision of a commissioner who had been appointed by Claudius to decide on ownership of previously royal estates there. The senate, however, referred the matter to the emperor.\textsuperscript{75}

But although such cases first came before the senate, there can be little doubt that throughout his reign Nero, not the senate, initiated financial policy-making.\textsuperscript{76} In the first place, in A.D. 56, following a dispute between a \textit{quaestor aerarii} and a tribune over the selling-up of the property of state debtors, Nero decided to place the treasury under the management of praetorian \textit{praefecti}.\textsuperscript{77} Next, in the following year, there was a series of imperial enactments including the payment of forty million sesterces into the \textit{aerarium 'ad retinendam populi fidem'}, and a reform in the method of collecting the four per cent tax on the sale of slaves (which was henceforth to be paid by the slave dealers).\textsuperscript{78} It is not certain from Tacitus' account whether the money paid into the \textit{aerarium} was in fact a special imperial subvention (as is usually assumed\textsuperscript{79}): the sum could have been transferred to Rome from deposits held at various provincial centres. But it seems certain that it
was Nero who ordered the money to be paid into the treasury. That Tacitus is speaking of action by the emperor is indicated by the fact he then goes on to say 'et edixit Caesar', with reference to the issuing of a prohibition against procurators or magistrates exhibiting gladiatorial and other displays in their provinces.

Further imperial initiatives in connection with financial matters date from the same year. In A.D. 58, Nero also issued his series of regulations designed to check abuses practised by the vectigalium societates. Some senators, though not necessarily the senate as a whole, were involved in advising the emperor on the question of these reforms. As in Ann. 13, 31, Tacitus prefaces his account of the regulations then published with the phrase 'princeps edixit'. The use of this phrase does not, however, exclude the possibility that the new regulations were promulgated through a senatus consultum. Earlier in the Annals Tacitus also used the verb 'edixit' with reference to Tiberius' statement to the senate on the need to retain the one per cent tax on auctions. By saying 'princeps edixit' of Nero in Ann. 13, 31 and 13, 51, Tacitus may mean that in these cases, too, the emperor handed down a decision which the senate acted on.

Later, in A.D. 62, Nero decided to appoint three ex-consuls to control the 'vectigalia publica'. It is probable that the senate participated in the appointment of this financial commission, also: Tacitus goes on to say that 'cum insectatione priorum principum qui gravitate sumptuum iustos reditus antissent: se annum sexcenties sestertium rei publicae largiri'. The only explanation for
Nero's remarks in this context seems to be that he wished to emphasize his own careful expenditure and his contributions to the state finances, because the management of the latter had not been sound. This interpretation of Nero's intentions would also explain the need to appoint a senatorial commission to investigate the public finances. This in turn would imply that, despite the fact Nero had personally appointed praefecti to administer the aerarium, the management of its finances was not regarded as primarily the emperor's responsibility (as appears to have been the case in Trajan's time). Thus down to the latter part of Nero's reign it appears that the senate continued to participate to some extent in financial decision-making, although this participation was mainly limited to following imperial initiatives. It is clear, too, that the senate carefully avoided making decisions on any matter which impinged on an area of administration controlled by the emperor.

The sources allege that in his last years Nero was not only a monstrous tyrant, but also frittered away the resources of the state. The accusations of his misappropriations of public funds are possibly exaggerated; although it seems certain that he confiscated many estates from senators condemned or exiled in these years, which properties the emperor Otho attempted to return to those victims who were still alive.

The role of the senate in the period of the Civil Wars was largely a passive one, as it was powerless to control events which were actually decided by the rival armies and rival claimants to the imperial office. With the victory of the Flavian party the senate again acquiesced in the new situation, but with some relief this time.
In A.D. 70, there was one faction among the senators who, led by Helvidius Priscus, wished to see the senate play a vigorous and independent role in government, including exercising control over the management of the public finances. Also, praetores aerarii were in charge of the treasury at this time; this suggests there had been a reversion (temporarily) to the system of administration instituted by Augustus, which left the selection of the aerarium officials in the hands of the senate. Yet the attitude of Helvidius Priscus was evidently not shared by the majority of the senators. While Vespasian was still in the East, the praetores aerarii 'publicam paupertatem questi modum impensis postulaverant'. The consul-designate proposed that because of the heavy burden of this 'cura' and the difficulty of finding a solution, the matter should be referred to the emperor. The response of the consul-designate to the situation is revealing, for it furnishes another indication that at an early stage the senate had become accustomed following the emperor's lead on any important financial question. Helvidius Priscus refused to accept the consul-designate's decision and counter-proposed that the matter should be dealt with 'arbitrio senatus', but his motion failed because: 'cum perrogarent sententias consules, Vulcadius Tertullinus tribunus plebis intercessit ne quid super tanta re principe absente statueretur'.

Shortly after this affair (but following the arrival in Rome of Mucianus and of Vespasian's son Domitian to take up his seat in the senate), the senate did in fact select by lot a board of commissioners who were entrusted with various duties, including the limitation of expenditure.
the proposal to appoint the board had some connection with the recently reported deficit of funds. But Tacitus seems sceptical that a real deficit existed. In recording the proposal subsequently made in the senate to float a public loan to raise funds, he remarks that 'Ceterum verane pauperie an uti videretur, actum in senatum ut sescentiens sestertium a privatis mutuum acciperetur, praepositusque ei curae Pompeius Silvanus. nec multo post necessitas abiit sive omissa simulatio'. Possibly the appointment of the senatorial commission was actually a compromise measure designed to appease those members of the senate who wished to see that body take a more active role in government. In this period Vespasian himself was apparently careful to accord the senate its traditional prerogatives, and Domitian and Mucianus may have been prepared to support a policy of appeasement towards Helvidius Priscus and his supporters.

Moreover, in the same period it appears that Mucianus had largely taken financial affairs into his own hands, as Dio says that he was occupied in depositing great sums of money in the aerarium from every source. Mucianus was evidently concerned to see that moneys owed to the aerarium from various sources were actually paid in, just as this had been done by the consul Gaius Saturninus in 19 B.C. when Augustus was absent from the city. For, even if funds were still available, after the chaos of the Civil Wars a firm hand would have been needed to place the public finances on an ordered and regular footing again. From Mucianus' efforts in this direction it would also appear that the aerarium was still the principal repository for public
funds. The success of Mucianus' efforts can perhaps be gauged from the fact that, soon after, Vespasian was able to begin a public works programme in Rome.\textsuperscript{109} The initiation of public building on a large scale suggests that there was now no serious shortage of funds in the capital.

Despite Vespasian's reputation for meanness and even rapacity,\textsuperscript{110} the sources emphasize that he spent the funds he amassed not on himself but on public concerns, 'for the needs of the people'.\textsuperscript{111} From this emphasis on Vespasian's personal frugality as contrasted with his public spending on a munificent scale, it seems that in these respects, as well as in others, he was consciously imitating the Augustan model.\textsuperscript{112} Indeed, as a 'new man', whose position had been seized by military force, he no doubt felt it necessary (particularly at the beginning of his reign) to recall the best aspects of the Augustan Principate in his own rule,\textsuperscript{113} and also to avoid offending traditionalist attitudes which persisted among members of the senatorial order.\textsuperscript{114}

Nevertheless, in Vespasian's reign new developments point to increased imperial control over certain areas of administration. It seems probable that Vespasian dispensed with the board of senators who had previously administered the \textit{cura alvei Tiberis}: in place of five commissioners a single consular head of the \textit{cura} is attested, who, like the former board from Claudius' time on, acted by the emperor's authority.\textsuperscript{115} The administration of public buildings and works may also have come under imperial direction in Vespasian's reign.\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, Vespasian seems to have
centralized the mint organization to a greater degree than his predecessors, and his policy affected the issue of aes by s.c., as well as the issue of gold and silver coinage by imperial authority. 117

The introduction of new imperial slave and freedman officials into the public financial administration cannot be attributed definitely to Vespasian, since the available epigraphic evidence attesting such new officials cannot be dated with certainty to his reign. 118 Nevertheless, the literary sources show that Vespasian pursued a policy of closely regulating both his private income and the state's income. 119 Therefore, this emperor was very likely responsible for encouraging stricter bureaucratic control over the administration of finance, which in turn would have promoted the growth of a more complex civil service than had existed previously. Too little is known about Titus' short reign to assess this emperor's policies; 120 but under Domitian the tendencies of Vespasian's reign were definitely furthered. Not only did Domitian make changes in the imperial 'palace' bureaucracy (appointing an equestrian head to the bureau of the patrimonium 121), but he appointed the first equestrian procurator XX hereditatum. 122 A bureau attested at Rome for the supervision of the tax appears to date from the Flavian period, and the equestrian procurator was presumably appointed to direct it. 123 Again, it is likely that by the end of the Flavian period imperial freedman officials were being employed in the administration of the portoria. 124 Since the senate never developed a parallel civil service of its own, the development of the imperial bureaucracy in this direction eventually brought the administration of all sources of state income into its own hands. 125
Suetonius' insistence that Domitian became 'rapax' because of a need for funds ('inopia') is perhaps a distortion of the facts of his reign. The early stages of Nerva's reign, and afterwards Trajan's reign, are characterized by impressive financial liberality, which suggests that there had not been a serious financial crisis in the years immediately preceding Nerva's accession, when Domitian's struggle with the senate reached its climax. Moreover, in the Panegyricus, Pliny the Younger implies that Domitian retained the properties he confiscated, rather than selling them off to raise cash. Thus Domitian's series of confiscations should perhaps be regarded principally as a political weapon.

To some extent, the acrimony which Domitian's reign aroused among members of the senatorial order may have resulted from the virtues which Suetonius allows him, namely the elimination under his rule of favour and corruption, especially at the level of provincial administration. Suetonius indicates that Domitian coerced the urban magistrates and provincial governors into good behaviour, and the senators possibly resented Domitian's surveillance of their conduct in office as unwarranted interference by the emperor in their traditional spheres. Quite apart from his conflicts with the extremist group of 'Republicans' led by Helvidius Priscus the Younger, Domitian may have treated a number of senatorial officials with a degree of arrogance which aroused their antagonism.

If Domitian betrayed arrogance towards the senatorial order, his successor Nerva, who was in fact the senate's own nominee for the imperial office, followed a conciliatory
policy. For example, Nerva returned the income from the urban water-rentals to the control of the aerarium, a source of income which Domitian was accused of appropriating for his own coffers. Domitian may simply have transferred this revenue from the control of the curator aquarum to his own financial staff because it had been mismanaged by the senatorial officials. But his action was in direct contravention of the principle that public revenues properly belonged to the 'Roman People': therefore, Nerva 'iustitia' restored the revenue to them. Also, Nerva is reputed to have done nothing without the advice of the leading senators.

The senatorial 'Economy Commission' appointed in his reign, which was set up by the authority of a s.c., was apparently the first such body appointed since the abortive commission established in A.D. 70; and there seems to be no record of a later one. Yet Nerva's reign did not give universal satisfaction: one conspiracy against him is reported, and one senator is said to have complained 'that it was bad to have an emperor under whom nobody was permitted to do anything, but worse to have one under whom everybody was permitted to do everything'.

Trajan was also hailed as a 'liberator', under whom the senate once again enjoyed dignity and freedom of discussion. Yet it is clear from the style which Pliny adopts towards the emperor that he was in fact addressing an autocrat on whose goodwill the 'freedom' of the senate actually depended. In Trajan's time real authority belonged to the emperor, not the senate. This authority included control over the management of the public finances: it was Trajan who controlled the administration of the aerarium, and Trajan
who dictated financial policy. Contrasting the alleged 'autocratic' behaviour of Domitian with Trajan's 'democratic' attitudes, Pliny lays down the principle that a 'good' emperor should be prepared to publish accounts of his expenditures; but it is equally obvious from what he says that there was no way of compelling an autocrat to render an account.

Moreover, while Trajan (unlike Domitian) was careful to conciliate the senatorial order, he in fact, in his administrative policies, continued and developed trends which had emerged in the Flavian period. Within his reign imperial officials began to collect the vectigalia directly, and equestrian officials were introduced for the first time into areas of administration over which formerly senatorial officials had had sole charge. These changes were carried further under Hadrian, in whose reign the imperial bureaucracy appears to have been enlarged. From this period on, therefore, the imperial bureaucracy increasingly assumed control of the administration of nearly all public revenues.

As the control of the imperial bureaucracy over public finance was extended and strengthened in the second century, the importance of the aerarium as the central treasury of the Empire no doubt declined proportionately, and the participation of the senate as a body in financial policy-making must have become almost negligible. When Dio says that Marcus Aurelius asked the senate to vote him funds, but adds that this was not because the emperor did not already have such funds at his disposal, he is apparently aware of a discrepancy between the real state of affairs and Marcus'
avowal of the principle that all the public revenues belonged to the senate and the Roman people. Marcus could no doubt afford to proclaim this 'polite fiction' because he did in fact have absolute control over all aspects of public finance.

In effect, the senate lost its supervisory powers over administration in general, even in Italy. From the history of the senatorial curae it appears that the original administration by boards of senators tended to be replaced by that of a single senatorial head who, like the praefecti aerarii, was most likely nominated by the emperor directly. Moreover, under Trajan, special senatorial commissioners who, like Pliny the Younger, were sent out to senatorial provinces were appointed by the emperor, even if their appointment was ratified by the senate. In the end, the senate was also deprived of an effective share in legislation. It has been emphasized above that in the Julio-Claudian period the senatus consultum remained the vehicle through which the emperor had new enactments, which he himself initiated, ratified: for example, the s.c. Claudianum affecting the status of slave and freedman 'marriages', and Claudius' extension of judicial powers to his private agents. It was not until the second century that imperial ordinances (edicta, mandata), or constitutiones as they came to be called, gained recognition as established rules of law; but eventually imperial constitutiones became the regular form for legislation.
CHAPTER 9

THE TERM 'FISCUS' IN THE SOURCES OF THE EARLY PRINCIPATE

In the previous chapters of this thesis, specific instances of the use of the term fiscus in the sources of the early Principate have been discussed. In each case it has been argued that, contrary to the views of many modern scholars, the term fiscus does not denote a second treasury of state controlled by the emperor. In this chapter we shall draw together the specific usages of fiscus cited above, and propose that in every instance this term can be interpreted as fitting the conclusions reached by the preceding survey of the actual administration of public finance in the period from Augustus to Trajan. A complete analysis of all uses of fiscus in the period concerned is not attempted; but a broad classification of the basic meanings of the term is given immediately below.

The ordinary meaning of the word fiscus in the literature of the late Republican and early imperial periods was a chest in which money was kept or transported. In this sense the term is found in Seneca and Suetonius as well as in Cicero.

In the Verrine Orations Cicero says, for example, that 'unum illud et hominibus certis, ex quibus omnia comperti, reperiebam: fiscos compluris cum pecunia Siciliensi a quodam senatore ad equitem Romanum esse translatos, ex his quasi X fiscos ad senatum illum relietos esse comitiorum meorum nomine, divisores omnium tribuum noctu ad istum vocatos'. Seneca writes, 'cui contingit habere rem non quamlibet, hunc non quemlibet dixeris; qualia quisque habet, talis est.

fiscus tanti est, quantum habet; immo in accessionem eius venit, quod habet'. Suetonius records that Claudius summoned the plebs to help fight a serious fire in the city, and 'positis ante se cum pecunia fiscis ad subveniendum hortatus est, repraesentans pro opera dignam cuique mercedem'.

Josephus speaks of the estates of the Jewish prince Archelaus being confiscated 'τοὺς Καίσαρος θηραυρούς'. Chests in which public funds were deposited were equally termed fisci. The Republican lex repetundarum laid down certain regulations for a quaestor's fisci, and Tacitus describes how in A.D. 14 the mutinous troops in Germany took possession of the fisci containing the funds allotted to Germanicus as military commander.
Thus the term *fiscus* and equivalent Greek terms (Θησαυρός or ημιοτέυον) could be used to denote any sort of cash repository. In one place Cicero appears to refer to the *aerarium Saturni* by the term *fiscus*, and much later Dio refers to both the imperial and public treasuries as ἡμιοτέυος Θησαυροῦ. In official terminology the term *fiscus* also acquired the meaning of a provincial treasury or chest. For the Julio-Claudian period there is the inscription of a slave of Tiberius, who is said to have been in the service of the *fiscus Gallicus* at Lugdunum; also, the Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander (A.D. 68) contains references to the φίσχος, and in the context of this provincial document the term very likely denotes the chest of the province of Egypt. Again, when Suetonius says that the *breviarium totius imperii* left by Augustus listed *quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis*, this phrase indicates the money actually in the *aerarium*, together with the revenues deposited at the administrative headquarters of each province. Moreover, in several places where *fiscus* appears in the literary sources in the context of provincial affairs, the term most likely denotes such a local chest. For example, when Tacitus says that Galba "reditus Lugdunensium occasione iarae in fiscis verteret," he probably means that the emperor had cancelled the city's privilege to collect certain municipal taxes for its own use, and had transferred the income from these sources to the provincial *fiscus*. In taking this action Galba was following a precedent set by Tiberius, who is said to have deprived many cities of the right to collect their own revenues.
Suetonius states that Augustus refused Livia's request to grant Roman citizenship to a certain Gaul, and offered instead to grant him immunity from paying tribute because 'se passurum fisco detrahi aliquid, quam civitatis Romani vulgari honorem'. Since it would, in fact, have been the chest of the Gaul's province that stood the loss of his tribute, it is quite reasonable to conclude that this is what Suetonius meant. The application of the term fiscus in such a context would have been clear to any Roman, and so there would have been no need to add the qualification 'fiscus provinciae'.

Pliny the Elder's statements that the balsam plantations of Judaea were cultivated by the fiscus, and that a certain Annius Plocamus farmed the Red Sea vectigal from the fiscus, can be interpreted in the same way. It is possible that Annius Plocamus had held his concession since Augustus' day, when the revenues of Egypt were definitely held to be accountable to the aerarium Saturni; and there is no reason to suppose that under Augustus the revenues of all the Gallic provinces were not accountable to the aerarium, too. On these grounds it is difficult to conclude otherwise than that Suetonius and Pliny were actually speaking of provincial fisci, which could be regarded as branches of the aerarium. In Pliny's day the balsam plantations may, on the other hand, have formed part of the emperor's private property; but since Pliny observes that these plantations now paid tribute along with the Jewish people, it is probable that they were in fact being cultivated for the profit of the public financial administration of the province.
By transference of its original meaning, a 'money chest',
*fiscus* came to mean an individual's personal wealth.²⁴
Valerius Maximus says that Julius Caesar 'aes alienum
Pompeii ex suo fisco solvi iussit'.²⁵ 'Fiscus suus' also
became one of the terms²⁶ used to denote the emperor's
private fortune: in recording that Augustus had rented the
hill called 'Leucogaeus' near Naples, Pliny the Elder writes
‘extatque divi Augusti decretum quo annua ducena milia
Neapolitanis pro eo numerari iussit e fisco suo, coloniam
deducens Capuam...'.²⁷ It is at least possible that Pliny
had copied the actual wording of the decree here.

Seneca considered the relationship of the emperor to
his *fiscus* to be an apt illustration of his point concerning
the existence of different categories of ownership:
‘Caesar omnia habet, fiscus eius privata tantum ac sua: et
universa in imperio eius sunt, in patrimonio propria’.²⁸
Writing after the Julio-Claudian period, Josephus says that
the imperial procurator of Jamnia (c. A.D. 36) sent soldiers
to exact a debt which Prince Agrippa owed ‘Ηγουμένος τῷ
Καίσαρος’,²⁹ – this phrase probably expresses a similar
concept: that is, it denotes the *fiscus* which was the
property of the emperor. It may have become customary even
before the end of the Julio-Claudian period³⁰ to refer to
the imperial wealth as 'the fiscus', without any qualifying
pronoun to indicate the emperor's ownership of his private
resources. But as late as Trajan's reign an inscription was
set up to commemorate the construction of an aqueduct by
this emperor from the resources of 'fiscus suus'.³¹

When Pliny the Elder says that in Judaea the fiscus
'cultivated' and 'sold' balsam,³² and that Annius Plocamus
'Maris Rubri vectigal a fisco redeemerat',³³ he appears to
use the term 'fiscus' in the sense of a financial organization which was also in some sense a 'legal person'. Boulvert thinks that the term could be used in the sense of a financial/legal institution only with respect to the imperial fiscus. In his view, the fiscus of an imperial province could not be regarded as an institution, being simply a cash repository which was at first dependent on the aerarium Saturni, and later (from Claudius' reign) on the imperial fiscus. But as argued in this thesis, there is not sufficient evidence to support the assumption that during the first century A.D. the imperial fiscus emerged as a second treasury of state. Also, in practice (especially in Egypt), the provincial administrators negotiated contracts to farm out the collection of taxes and other public revenues on behalf of the fiscus of the province. Contrary to Boulvert's opinion, it is not really surprising that a provincial chest should be viewed as a kind of financial/legal institution. From Hadrian's time advocates fisci were actually attached to the provincial fiscus in Asia and Phrygia.

On the other hand, it is true that during the first century fiscus, without qualification, became the customary term for the imperial treasury; also, since the fiscus and the aerarium are frequently coupled in the literary sources, it appears that in the eyes of the authors they were financial institutions of comparable importance. But as Pliny the Younger clearly shows, the aerarium and the fiscus were regarded as contrasting rather than parallel institutions.

Pliny points up the contrast in Pan. 36, 3, because he had a particular point to make: namely, that Trajan controlled the fiscus more strictly than the aerarium.
because the *fiscus* was his own property, and he felt he could manage it with a freer hand than the *aerarium* which was 'public' property. But usually there was no reason for an author to underline the distinction between the *aerarium* and the *fiscus*, although it is sometimes implied, as when Tacitus says that Tiberius 'sibimet seposuit' the mines of Sextus Marius although they had been declared public property (*'publicarentur'). In Dio, the term *τὸ βασιλικὸν* seems to correspond the most closely to this concept of a special imperial treasury which was distinguishable from the *aerarium*; and twice he uses the phrase *τῷ βασιλικῷ καὶ τῷ δημοσίῳ*.  

The writers of Trajan's day and later do not as a rule, then, say 'fiscus suus' in speaking of the imperial treasury: Pliny the Younger praises 'the fiscus' for its fair dealings in the matter of grain purchases for the urban *annona*; Suetonius states that Claudius complained 'de fisci exiguitate'; and Tacitus writes that the property of Aemilia Musa was 'petita in fiscum'. The absence of the personal pronoun in these and other passages of the same writers does suggest that in their time the *fiscus* was regarded as an impersonal institution rather than the property of a particular emperor. The reason for the emergence of this concept seems fairly clear: from the time of Gaius, who had asked the senate to set aside Tiberius' will, the imperial property passed from emperor to emperor as such, without regard to the rules of inheritance under private law. Again, Gaius had secured exemption from the *lex Iulia* and the *lex Papia Poppaea* to enable him (although he had no issue) to accept inheritances; and as early as Augustus
it appears that the senate might transfer the estate of a condemned man to the emperor in special circumstances.51

In Tiberius' reign it seems that imperial claims to bona damnatorum were recognized fairly regularly, although, in theory, probably each claim of this kind had to be authorized by the senate.52 In the second century the claims of the fiscus to bona caduca and bona damnatorum were recognized in the legal procedure governing confiscations, although all cases involving claims to bona caduca evidently had to come before the praefecti aerarii in the first place.53 Moreover, by a s.c. passed on his initiative, the emperor Claudius had enabled his procurators (even those who managed his private property, according to Tacitus) to share in his powers of jurisdiction.54

Even during the Julio-Claudian period, therefore, the fiscus of the emperor was acquiring legal privileges which set it apart from the property of an ordinary privatus: it was no longer strictly private in character, despite the fact that as late as Trajan it was not yet acknowledged to be a public treasury which possessed equivalent status to the aerarium.

These tendencies were important for the subsequent history of the fiscus, which eventually did replace the aerarium as the chief treasury of the Roman state. Moreover, by the end of the first century the fiscus had already assumed such an important role in supporting state expenditure, and in financing public works and social welfare,55 that it could, at any rate, bear comparison with the public financial resources.
CHAPTER 10

CONCLUSION

In this thesis we have examined the main areas of Roman administration in which the management of public income and expenditure was involved – the provincial administration, the collection of the indirect taxes, the administration of the grain supply, as well as other aspects of the administration of the city of Rome and its environs. In examining these various areas of administration in the early imperial period, we have looked at the degree to which imperial control was exerted over them through the use of officials (whether they were senators, equestrians or members of the familia Caesaris) who were directly responsible to the emperor.

One of the main conclusions which has emerged from this survey of public financial administration is that the development of an extensive and specialized imperial bureaucracy for the management of the public revenues was a rather gradual process. In the imperial provinces some imperial officials, including freedmen and slaves of the familia Caesaris as well as equestrian procurators, were used from the beginning of the Principate for public business. But during the first century the numbers of these officials appear to have been small in most areas of the Empire. The imperial bureaucracy in the provinces began to expand under the Flavian emperors, particularly in Africa, where a large number of imperial estates had been acquired, and also in some other provinces (e.g., Spain, Asia). But only from the second century is there enough evidence to show that a fairly
extensive staff of officials of various grades was employed at a large number of provincial administrative centres throughout the Empire. Presumably, in the first century, the provincial administration had been run generally without recourse to a large permanent bureaucracy controlled by the emperor. It can only be conjectured, however, whether imperial officials began regularly to assume public, in addition to patrimonial, financial functions in the senatorial, as well as in the imperial, provinces.

Again, it is only from the Flavian period, but to a far greater extent from the second century, that the emergence of systematic bureaucratic supervision over the vectigalia can be traced definitely. Moreover, although the system of direct collection of the vectigalia by imperial officials appears to have been initiated by Trajan, it was not until the reign of Marcus Aurelius or Commodus that the collection of the portorium in the large customs districts of the Empire, and the collection of the quattuor publica Africæ, were transferred permanently to imperial functionaries.

The gradual nature of these developments has been stressed because it has often been assumed that as early as the Julio-Claudian period the financial administration of the Roman Empire was largely controlled by the emperor and his officials. Also, the relatively late emergence of extensive control over the taxation system by the imperial bureaucracy makes it appear unlikely that by the end of the Julio-Claudian period there was a need for a second public treasury, separate from the aerarium, which was controlled by the emperor.

Moreover, the fact that imperial officials eventually began to carry out public duties in senatorial as well as in imperial provinces in connection with the raising of the indirect taxes, and possibly the direct taxes too, suggests
that it is wrong to assume that the growth of the imperial bureaucracy led to the emergence of two quite separate public financial organizations, one of which was dependent on the aerarium and the other on the fiscus.

The history of the administration of the aerarium, the annona and the various senatorial curae indicates that here, also, there was a good deal of overlapping between 'senatorial' and 'imperial' spheres, both in theory and practice. Overall imperial responsibility for the urban grain supply meant that, in practice, there could not have been a complete separation between the responsibilities of the praefectus annonae, whose duties included procuring and storing grain for the dole, and those of the senatorial praefecti frumenti dandi, who were formally in charge of distributing the dole. The appointment under Trajan of an imperial procurator at the porticus Minuciae, where the distribution of grain to the Roman people took place, points to increased imperial supervision over the distribution of the dole; but the senatorial praefecti continued to preside over the distributions. With the cura aquarum it is not possible, even in a formal sense, to distinguish sharply between 'imperial' and 'senatorial' responsibilities: Augustus nominated the senatorial curators, but his choice was 'approved' by the senate; and senatus consultas as well as imperial directives were issued to regulate the distribution of the public water supply. The history of other senatorial curae reveals a tendency for the emperor to assume closer control of their administration as time went by, a tendency which is particularly apparent in the history of the cura alvei Tiberis. But it should be
emphasized that from Augustus to Trajan, whenever the emperor contributed funds for the maintenance of the roads and other public services it is stated that these funds came out of private resources. It seems likely that, conversely, all public funds used to support the curae continued to be formally in account to the aerarium, as was the case with the cura aqvarum.

Even in the early years of the Principate, when the administration of the aerarium was in the hands of officials selected by the senate, the emperors sometimes intervened in treasury affairs. Under Claudius and Nero the aerarium officials began to be nominated by the emperor, but the senate continued to act (apparently on its own initiative) on matters affecting the treasury. In the Julio-Claudian period, therefore, the aerarium administration was evidently not treated as a senatorial or imperial responsibility exclusively. During the latter part of the first century, on the other hand, there appears to have been a progression towards fuller imperial control over the aerarium, since Pliny, in the Panegyricus, refers openly to Trajan's control over it. Nevertheless, in the same passage Pliny shows that the aerarium was not the emperor's property, so that Trajan did not control it as closely as he did the fiscus, which did belong to him. Moreover, in strict theory, as Marcus Aurelius' request to the senate to vote him funds for the war against the Marcomanni illustrates, the senate still retained the sole right to vote funds from the public treasury.
In the latter part of the first century the imperial palace bureaucracy was expanding with respect to the administration of the imperial patrimonium and hereditary possessions, and we also find the emergence of special fisci for the private funds of the emperor, namely the fiscus castrensis and the fiscus libertatis et peculiorum. The fisci transmarini, which existed by the Flavian period, may also have been private chests. There is no direct evidence which indicates the function of the fiscus Alexandrinus and the fiscus Asiaticus, and Jones' theory that they were urban 'branch offices' of the provincial fisci of the affluent provinces of Egypt and Asia must be regarded as inconclusive. Both these chests, too, may have been purely patrimonial in character. Of the two chests, the fiscus Alexandrinus seems certainly to have been established before the end of the first century, and the fiscus Asiaticus was most probably in existence under Domitian. But although Jones' theory regarding the function of these fisci is inconclusive, the existence of at least one imperially administered chest for public funds is indicated by Trajan's reign, namely the fiscus frumentarius, which evidently held the funds set aside for the expenses of the cura annonae. There was apparently a tendency, therefore, for some of the public funds under the administrative control of the emperor (in this case in his capacity as curator annonae) to be held separately from the funds directly under the management of the aerarium officials. But there is no evidence that by Trajan's time the imperial bureaucracy at Rome had supplanted the aerarium administration as the principal receiver and allocator of the revenues of the Empire.

The detailed accounts of senatorial proceedings contained in the Annals of Tacitus show that in the Julio-Claudian period, at any rate, the senators were consulted on financial matters. But even in the earliest period of the Principate the role of the senate as a body in shaping financial policy seems to have been largely a passive one. The senators consistently followed imperial initiatives in formulating financial decisions, and apparently did not
attempt to make policy independently of the emperor. In the *Panegyricus* Pliny implies that in his time budgetary policy was fully under imperial control, and attributes to Trajan personally measures aimed at reducing repressive taxation. As the imperial bureaucracy increasingly assumed control over the administration of the public revenues in the second century, the position of the *aerarium* was probably reduced mainly to that of a reserve fund which could be drawn on in emergencies. But down to the second century it retained its status as the central treasury of the Roman state. As we have emphasized throughout this thesis, the fact that under Trajan the *fiscus* could still be contrasted with the *aerarium* shows that it was not regarded as possessing parallel 'public' status to the latter.

By Trajan's time the *fiscus* was no longer in fact strictly private, since it was acquiring certain legal and judicial privileges which had been formerly the prerogative of the state. Moreover, in the literature of the early second century it is generally treated as an impersonal financial institution rather than the property of a particular emperor. One consequence of this tendency was the establishment of a special *res privata*, probably under Antoninus Pius. The *res privata*, or 'patrimonium privatum', was evidently established for the management of the emperor's personal property as distinct from the imperial *patrimonium*, which had become 'crown property'. Again, during the latter part of the second century, the control exerted by the imperial financial administration over the public finances evidently began to have repercussions
on the development of Roman law. The jurist Ulpian, writing under the Severan emperors, accepts that state revenues could be in account to the fiscus: he defines the publicani as those 'qui publico fruuntur...sive fisco vectigal vel tributum consequuntur'.

But even the jurist Ulpian did not regard the fiscus as a fully 'public' institution. Expressing a doubt as to whether an interdictum prohibitorem to ensure a person's right of way in a public place might be applicable to fiscal properties, he writes: 'Hoc interdictum ad ea loca, quae sunt in fisci patrimonio, non puto pertinere...res enim fiscales quasi propriae et privatae principis sunt'. Ulpian's words 'res enim fiscales quasi propriae et privatae principis sunt' indicate that in his time the fiscus was not regarded, strictly speaking, as the private property of the emperor. The passage as a whole, however, indicates that the fiscus was not looked on as an institution whose rights, in all respects, were equivalent to those of the aerarium Saturni.
FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1 In analysing the epigraphic evidence relating to imperial freedman offices associated with public finance I have not as opposed, e.g., to Boulvert, EAI. pp.19-20, n. 5) assumed that in the absence of evidence to the contrary we may in general conclude that a freedman held his post under the emperor whose name he bore. Since there are known exceptions to this rule, it seems advisable to use it with caution, especially in cases where there are only one or two such inscriptions to suggest under which emperor a certain office was established: this applies particularly to Ti. Claudii Aug. lib., as will become apparent in the body of this thesis. But the names of imperial freedmen can at least help us date an office within one generation.

2 As is assumed, e.g., by A.H.M. Jones, Studies p.111.

3 CIL XI. 3309: Trajan records the construction of an aqueduct 'impenisa fisce sui'.

4 Pan. 36.3: 'at fortasse non eadem severitate fiscum qua aerarium cohibes: immo tanto maiore quanto plus tibi licere de tuo quam de publico credis'.

5 As in Pliny, Pan. 36, 3. For discussion of modern scholarly interpretations of the term fiscus in the literature of the late first and early second centuries see Ch.1.

6 See again Ch.1; cf. Ch.IX.

7 The extent to which the fiscus, during the first century, began to acquire certain legal and judicial rights which had formerly been the prerogative of the state will be discussed in Ch.VI.

8 See Conclusion (Ch.X).

9 See, e.g., Jolowicz pp.374-5 for a discussion of these new developments: from the middle of the second century onwards it was recognized by the jurists (see Gaius, Inst. 1.5) that the emperor could himself make law.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1


4. KV 3, pp.2-3 (citing Augustus' terminology in the Res Gestae).

5. See again Staatsrecht II, p.998, with note 1.

6. Seneca, de Ben 7, 6, 3.

7. Hirschfeld, KV 3, p.4, n.1, remarks that Seneca 'gebraucht zwar das Wort ganz synonym mit dem kaiserlichen Patrimonium, aber versteht doch wohl darunter sämtlichen der Verfügung unterstehenden Gelder'; also see pp.11-2.

8. See KV 3, p.3ff.

9. KV 3, pp.7-8. Hirschfeld also argues that in the second century the emperors were careful to administer separately their private property and the property of the fiscus (p.9).

10. See M. Rostovtzeff, RE VI (1909) art. fiscus, col. 2385-2405; DE III (1898-1902), pp.96-139.

11. See DE art. fiscus, p.96; as in Seneca, de Ben 7, 6, 3.

12. DE art. fiscus, p.97.

13. The evidence for this conclusion is based on CIL VI, 5197, which is dedicated to a slave of Tiberius (Musicus Ti. Caes. Aug. Scurransus), who had been a disp(ensator) ad fiscum Gallicum provinciae Lugudunensis.


On the basis, e.g., of the known salaries of the legionaries, of the soldiers in the Praetorian cohorts, together with officers' salaries, plus a third of this amount again which he allows for transport and commissariat costs, Frank arrives at a figure of 260,000,000 sesterces annually for expenditure on the army. He allows a tenth of the cost of supporting the legions and the troops of the allies for expenditure on the navy ( = 22,000,000 sesterces), and 24,000,000 sesterces for expenditure on the urban corn dole. Since this last figure is calculated on the basis of 60 modii of grain per year to 250,000 men (see R.G. 15), at a cost of c. one denarius per modius, this figure should, however, be c. 60,000,000 sesterces. Frank believes that so long as Augustus and Agrippa spent lavishly on games and buildings the aerarium's outlay here would have been relatively little - a few million sesterces per annum. The cost of the salaries now paid under Augustus to procurators and other men in the civil service would also have been small, in his opinion. Therefore, Frank concludes that it would be difficult to prove that the aerarium could have spent as much as 400,000,000 annually, though it paid for the armies. The aerarium's income, on the other hand, would have exceeded 400,000,000. According to Plutarch (Pompey 45) its income in 62 B.C. was about 340,000,000 sesterces (= 85,000,000 drachmas). Even though Caesar had reduced the Adriatic tribute by about 13,000,000, Gaul contributed 40,000,000 (Suet., Iul. 25), Egypt as much (Vell. 2, 39), and Spain, Numidia, Dalmatia, and Galatia brought in some new revenues. See Frank, op. cit., pp.144-5; also ESAR V (1940), p.4ff. Garzetti, in his article in Athenaeum (1953), p.308, with n.4, criticises Frank's estimates on the grounds that his figures are largely hypothetical; cf. the tables appended to his article for Garzetti's own estimates of the income and expenditure of the Empire under Augustus.


In connection with the definition of 'fiscus' proposed by Last, it might be noted that G. Cardinali, 'Amministrazione territoriale e finanziaria', in Augustus, Studi in occasione del bimillenario augusto, Acad. die Lincei. V (1938), pp.176-8.
virtually returns to Mommsen's theory of 'dyarchy' in his view of the Augustan financial organization. Cardinali holds that the income and expenditure of the imperial provinces were in Augustus' sphere, as the finances of the senatorial provinces were in the senate's sphere, though he rejects Mommsen and follows Hirschfeld in stating that the Princeps would not have regarded the revenues of the imperial provinces as his own. Again, he asserts that a central imperial treasury (the fiscus) did not exist under Augustus. Instead, he emphasizes that the existence of provincial fisci in Augustus' reign cannot be doubted (being attested in Suetonius, Aug. 101, 4, e.g.), and he argues that these fisci belonged in the emperor's sphere, constituting the imperial finances in opposition to the senatorial financial administration which was still centred on the aerarium Saturni. According to Cardinali, the evolution from fisc to fisci was nothing more than an internal development which took place within the imperial financial administration. Cardinali's contribution to the debate on the fiscus is discussed by Garzetti, Athenaeum (1953), pp.309-11. The article was also reviewed by Last, JRS (1938), p.214ff.

28 Last, JRS (1944), pp.51-2. The phrase 'fiscal office' is used by Last to mean 'the staff which, under the direction of the Princeps, carried on the central administration of the Fiscus in Rome, together with the building which was its business-address if it had one' (p.51).

29 op. cit., p.52.
30 op. cit., p.53.
31 op. cit., p.56.
32 op. cit., p.58.
34 C.H.V. Sutherland, 'Aerarium and Fiscus during the Early Empire', AJP (1945), pp.151-70.
36 JRS (1933), p.144.
38 op. cit., pp.159-60. Sutherland cites Tacitus, Ann. 6, 19, as the most significant instance in this regard: that is, when, in A.D. 33, 'aerarias aurariasque eius (i.e., Sextus Marius), quamquam publicarentur, sibimet Tiberius seposuit'.
39 loc. cit. The term fiscus in the sense described by Sutherland occurs in Ann. 2, 47; 2, 48; 4, 20; 6, 2 and 17. The relevant passage in Seneca is de Ben. 4, 39, 3: 'Sponsum descendam, quia promisi; sed non, si spondere me in incertam iuubeis, si fisco obligabis'.
Sutherland also refers (pp.160-1) to the growing importance of imperial procurators in the administration of finance in the provinces, which he sees as an important contributing factor in increasing imperial control over state finance at the central treasury itself.

For the changes introduced in the management of the aerarium see Dio, 50, 24, 1-2; Suetonius, Claud. 24; Tacitus, Ann. 13, 29. Cf. Ch.6, for discussion.

For Pallas see Dio, 51, 30, 6b; Pliny, Ep. 7, 29; 8, 6; Suet. Claud. 28; Tac., Ann. 13, 14. The functions of the 'a rationibus' will be discussed in Ch.7.

Claudius' role in reforming the administration of the annona and frumentationes will be discussed in Ch.4. For the removal of the quaestor Ostiensis, see Suet., Claud. 24.

There has been considerable controversy over the interpretation of Claudius' action; this will be referred to in Ch.6.

Sutherland refers here to Nerva's efforts to clear the fiscus of its illegal acquisitions (i.e., the properties confiscated under Domitian); also, to this emperor's establishment of a senatorial economy commission which 'suggests that once more the aerarium was recognized as possessing its own responsibilities'; see Dio, 68, 2, 1-2; Pliny, Ep. 2, 1, 9; Pan. 62.

Sutherland also describes the principatus of Trajan and his successors as 'a benevolent autocracy governing through a willing bureaucracy'.


De Laet, pp.119-20; p.363ff.

De Laet, p.364.

Athenaeum (1953), pp.315-6.

JRS (1950), pp.22-9. Studies in Roman Government and Law (1960), ch.6 pp.101-4. Jones (p.106) argues that the assumption that Augustus would naturally be entitled to use the revenues of his provinces runs counter to the whole conception of Republican finance, whereby all revenue went theoretically to the aerarium.
loc. cit. - Jones refers to the institution by Augustus first of praetorian praefecti aerarii and then of praetores aerarii (Dio, 53, 2 and 32); Claudius' return to management by quaestors who were, however, to be selected by him (Dio, 60, 24, 1-3; Suet., Claud. 24; Tac., Ann. 13, 28-9; ILS 966-7); and Nero's reversion to praetorian praefecti, now selected by him (Ann. 13, 29).

op. cit., p.103-4. Jones maintains, also, that his analysis makes intelligible Plutarch's phrase "ἐκ τῶν ταμιεύων καὶ παρὰ τῶν τελωνίων" (Pomp. 25) - namely, that Pompey was authorized to draw money from the provincial fisci and from the local agents of the publicani in all the provinces in which he operated. Again, it also explains, in his view, the famous phrase of Suetonius: 'quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis et vectigaliorum residuis' (Aug. 101, 4). In other words, Jones considers that this document, which is called 'breviarium totius imperii' shows a distribution of funds corresponding to Republican practice - first, the amount of money held in the aerarium, secondly, the funds held in the various provincial fisci, and, thirdly, the outstanding balance of the indirect taxes in the hands of the publicani.


op. cit., p.106.

Velleius Paterculus (2, 39, 2): 'Divus Augustus praeter Hispanias aliasque gentis, quarum titulis forum eius praenitet, paene idem facta Aegyptio stipendiaria, quantum pater eius Galliis, in aerarium reditus contulit'.

op. cit., p.105. Jones adds that Augustus did in fact render an account, according to Suetonius (Gaius 16: it is stated here that Augustus regularly made public rationes imperii, a practice which had been discontinued by Tiberius but resumed by Gaius); yet in his opinion, the fact that Tiberius, 'who in general kept rigidly to constitutional forms', omitted in the later years of his reign to publish the rationes imperii supports the view that they were not regularly required of him (op. cit., n.22).

Valerius Maximus writes (7, 2, 11) that Julius Caesar: 'aest alienum Pompeii ex suo fisco solvi iussit'.

As in Seneca, de Ben. 7, 6, 3; see Jones, op. cit., p.108.

As in the case of the fiscus frumentarius and fiscus castrensis, respectively; on which see Jones, op. cit., p.110.

As in Seneca, de Ben. 4, 39, 3, which Jones (op. cit., p.108), describes as the earliest appearance of the term in literature in 'its third and most general sense'. In this sense, too, Jones interprets the use of the term fiscus in Pliny the Elder, H.n. 6, 84 (writing of a certain
Annius Ploca to Maris Rubri vectigal a fisco redemerat', under Claudius); H.n. 12, 123 (where Pliny states that the balsam of Judaea fetched 300 denarii the sextarius, 'vendente fiscus'); 12, 113 (where he says of the balsam 'seritque nunc eum fiscus'). Again, Jones considers that the term may be used in this sense in two Greek inscriptions of the Julio-Claudian period — one from Lycosura in Achaea (SIG 7, 800), and in the Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander (A.D. 68), from Egypt (OGIS, 669); although in these two cases Jones suggests that it is possible στοχας denotes the provincial chest.

Cf. Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, p.97, who as noted above makes the point that, because a large proportion of the provincial chests came to be administered by imperial agents, the term fiscus continually acquired the meaning of a chest managed by the emperor through his officials.

For a literary record of such a payment by the emperor, see Pliny, H.n. 18, 114, where he describes the chalk quarry called the 'Collis Leucogaeus', which was located between Puteoli and Naples, and which had been leased by Augustus: 'extatque divi Augusti decretum quo annua ducena milia Neapolitanis pro eo numerari iussit e fisco suo, coloniam deducens Capuam...'; as Jones, op. cit., p.108, points out, however, unfortunately we cannot be sure that the decree actually used the phrase 'e fisco suo'.

G. Boulvert, who in summing up the stage reached in the palace administration under Claudius, argues that 'Deux organismes comptables, la ratio patrimonii et le bureau a rationibus permettent de distinguer deux masses de fonds dans ceux que detient l'empereur; fonds privés et les fonds publics'. He goes on to conclude, however, that 'Le prince n'a pas de local spécial destiné à recevoir son trésor, rôle que joue le temple de Saturne pour les fonds publics de l'aerarium. Tous les fonds disponibles sont déposés par les diverses caisses impériales au temple de Castor qui reçoit également les dépôts des particuliers'. See Esclaves et Affranchis impériaux (1970), pp.189-90. On the role of the temple of Castor he cites Juvenal, Sat. 14, 259ff., and refers to Hirschfeld, KV3, p.4, n.4. The question of the management of public funds by the a rationibus under Claudius and Nero will be discussed in Ch.7.

F. Millar, JRS (1963) p.32, suggests that fisci might refer to arrears of taxation due to the provincial fisci (and hence theoretically to the aerarium); or, perhaps, fisci here is shorthand for 'aerario et fisco'. Dio, on the one hand, records that Hadrian remitted τα ἀφελθόμενα τῷ ΤΕ θαυμάκιτα τῷ δημοσίῳ τῷ Ἄφροισιν' (69, 8, 12) — i.e. to both the imperial and public treasuries, while the HA, on the other hand, records that Hadrian remitted to private debtors in Rome and Italy immense sums of money owed to the fiscus, and in the provinces, 'ex reliquis ingentes summas remisit' (v.Hadr. 7, 6).
He writes, op. cit., p.111, that Vespasian's arrangements seem to have remained substantially unchanged till the end of the Antonine period: that during all this period there was no single fiscus at Rome, but such imperial funds as were kept in the capital were stored in a number of fisci, the Alexandrinus and the Asiaticus holding the surplus of Egypt and Asia, the Judaicus holding the proceeds of the Jewish poll-tax, the frumentarius the special fund of the praefectus annonae, the castrensis the emperor's personal moneys. Substantially, the evidence relating to the central imperial administration from the Flavian period into the early second century bears out Jones' conclusion that officially there was not yet a single imperial treasury at Rome in this period. The probable dates of the establishment of the fisci Alexandrinus and Asiaticus will be discussed in Ch.2 (notes 126-7); the fiscus frumentarius will be discussed in Ch.4 (pp. 74-5), and the fiscus castrensis in Ch.7 (pp.117-18). The fiscus Judaicus is mentioned by Suetonius, Dom. 12, 2, where the term is actually used in the sense of the 'Jewish tax'.

op. cit., p.111.

Jones, op. cit., pp.111-2, cites Pliny the Younger, Pan. 42, where he considers the terms are coupled together to denote the public finances in one sentence ('locupletabant et fiscum et aeraarium non tam Voconiae et Iuliae leges quam maiestatis singulare et unicum crimem'); Pan. 36, where the terms are contrasted ('at fortasse non eadem severitate fiscum qua aeraarium cohibes: immo tanto maiore, quanto plus tibi licere de tuo quam de publico credis'); also Frontinus de Aq. 118, where it is stated that the wages of the 'familia publica' employed on the maintenance of the Roman aqueducts came from the aeraarium, while those of the familia Caesaris came from the fiscus. With regard to this passage Jones, op. cit., n.60, admits that the distinction made here goes back to Claudius (who, Frontinus records, De Aq. 116, first introduced the familia Caesaris). He argues, however, that the distinction then meant something different: the emperor's slaves were his private property, and would naturally be maintained out of his private funds - his fiscus 'in the Julio-Claudian sense'.

These phrases occur in the following passages: Ann. 2, 47 (in which Tacitus states that because of the damage suffered by the city of Sardis in Asia due to a severe earthquake in A.D. 17, Tiberius promised to remit 'quantum aeraario aut fisco pendebant in quinquennium'); Ann. 6, 17 (in which Tacitus states that one of the causes of a shortage of cash in circulation in A.D. 33 was that numerous convictions and sales of property had concentrated currency 'in fisco vel aeraario'); Ann. 6, 2 (where Tacitus states that 'bona Seiani ablata aeraario ut in fiscum cogerentur, tamquam referret'); also in Suetonius, Vesp. 16, 3 (in which it is stated that Vespasian's reputed rapacity was thought by some to have been due to the 'summa aerarii fiscique inopia').

op. cit., p.112.
Eespecially in Ch.2 (pp.46-7); Ch.3 (pp.60-1); Ch.4 (pp.72-3; pp.75-6); Ch.7 (pp.120-1).

Athenaeum (1953), p.324.

op. cit., p.325.


Ann. 13, 14 ('sane pepigerat Pallas ne cuius facti in praeteritum interrogaretur, paresque rationes cum re publica haberet').

See again Sutherland, AJP (1945), pp.159-60.

Cf. again Jones, Studies p.111, especially.

See again Frank, ESAR V, p.41; Sutherland, AJP (1945), p.163; De Laet, Portorium, pp.363-4; also see Hirschfeld, KV3, e.g., pp.53-76 (tribute and the census), pp.77-120 (the indirect taxes).

F. Millar, 'The Fiscus in the First Two Centuries', JRS (1963), pp.29-42.

op. cit., p.29.

de Ben. 7, 6, 3.

op. cit., p.29.

H.n. 18, 114.

H.n. 12, 113; 123. These balsam plantations, originally 'agri regii' according to Pliny (presumably of the Seleucids, Millar comments), had been presented by Marcus Antonius to Cleopatra, and rented from her by King Herod (see Josephus, B.I. 1, 361). Millar (op. cit., p.30) considers it likely that on the death of Cleopatra they fell to Octavian as booty and were retained as his private property. Millar points out that a similar fate befell the Cyprus copper mines, which had been restored to Cleopatra by Antonius, became Augustus' private property (of which he gave a half-share to Herod - Jos., A.I. 16, 128), and were still imperial property in the middle of the second century when Galen collected specimens there (citing Galen, ed. Kühn, 14, 7).

Millar concludes that it is possible to regard such properties as falling to Augustus by analogy with manubiae, on the grounds that 'although the view has recently been expressed that manubiae were not the property of the Imperator, but of the State, and that his rights were (in effect) restricted to the choice of some public purpose to which to devote them, the evidence seems to me to prove the opposite, that the Imperator did take manubiae as his property - and the role of manubiae as one source of Augustus' impensae as recorded in the Res Gestae is well known'. Against Millar's view, however, it might be argued that the Res Gestae show precisely that the Imperator did in fact devote his manubiae to public purposes. On this question see F. Bona, 'Su[ ] concetto di "Manubiae"', Stud. et Doc. Hist. et Lur. (1960), p.105.
'The "fiscus" and its Development', JRS (1966), pp.75-91.

With reference, e.g., to the term in Egyptian documents; see op. cit., p.77, with note 18. Millar only observes briefly (op. cit., p.30 n.10) that not all the various fisci recorded need be regarded as subdivisions of 'the Fiscus', meaning the emperor's treasury.

JRS (1966), p.75.

de Ben. 7, 6, 3.

See again Jones, Studies, p.112.

Citing Ann. 2, 47; 4, 20; 6, 2; 17; Pliny, Pan. 36; 42; cf. Frontinus, de Aq. 118; Suet., Vesp. 16, 3.

JRS (1966), p.78.

op. cit., p.82.

op. cit., p.75.

Brunt, op. cit., p.88, points to the procurators who at first supervised the publicani collecting the inheritance tax and later, 'if the orthodox view is sound', collected it themselves, and those who from the second century administered the collection of the portoria. The role of imperial officials in the administration of the indirect taxes will be discussed in Ch.3.

The only testimony relevant to first century financial arrangements which Brunt can cite is Suetonius' statement that Augustus refused citizenship to a tributary Gaul, but offered to exempt him from tribute, 'affirmans facilius se passurum fisco detrahii aliquid, quam civitatis Romanae vulgari honorem'. (Aug. 40, 3-4). Brunt holds that in this passage fiscus without qualification cannot easily be interpreted as standing for the provincial fiscus. On the other hand, since it was the provincial fiscus that would presumably have stood the loss of the man's tribute, it is possible that this is what Suetonius meant. Pliny, H.n. 6, 84, in which it is said that the fiscus leased the 'Maris Rubri vectigal', also deals with a provincial context (i.e., a tax farmer from Egypt), and can probably be interpreted in a similar way. H.n. 6, 84, is discussed more fully in Ch.3, p.54.

As Millar comments on this phenomenon, JRS (1963), p.36. The acquisition by the fiscus of bona damnatorum is discussed in Ch.6 (p.102ff), where it is stressed that under Tiberius such properties appear to have been transferred to the emperor by decree of the senate, after the normal process of sequestration by the aerarium had already been carried out.

See again Jones, Studies p.108; Brunt, op. cit., p.75.
105 Pliny, Pan. 36, 3.


107 RHD (1970), pp. 430-1. In n. 4 he remarks that 'sans penser que dès l'origine le fiscus, fusion des fisci eux-mêmes publics, ait compris des biens patrimoniaux, je pense qu'il est difficile de ne pas admettre bientôt une certaine intégration de ces biens patrimoniaux dans le fiscus'.

108 H.n. 6, 84.


110 loc. cit., with n. 8, in which he cites Frontinus, de Ag. 118, and Pliny, Pan. 36, 3 and 42, 1.

111 op. cit., p. 432, citing Suet., Vesp. 16, 3.

112 loc. cit. He considers that in the Life of Claudius (Ch. 28), where the phrase 'ut quaerente eo quondam de fisci exiguitate' occurs, Claudius complains of the low state of the funds in his own chest, and that here 'le terme fiscus n'a pas la moindre signification institutionelle, mais un sens matériel'. Again, this interpretation is in Boulvert's view confirmed by a preceding passage, Claud. 18, in which the term is used in the plural ('ac positis ante se cum pecunia fiscis'): these fisci are simply strong-boxes, from which Claudius payed out on the spot suitable rewards to those members of the plebs who assisted in fighting a fire then raging in the city. Two passages in the Life of Nero are, Boulvert admits, more difficult to interpret. In one of them, 44, 2, Suetonius states that Nero imposed an irregular levy of one year's rent on the tenants of apartment houses in Rome for the benefit of the fiscus, and in the other passage, 32, 2, Suetonius speaks of the seizure by the fiscus of the estates of testators who failed to mention the emperor in their wills. With regard to both these passages, Boulvert concludes that although they refer to methods of acquisition certainly not available to ordinary citizens, they do not refer to public revenues: 'Néron crée tout simplement des ressources pour son fiscus, et rien ne dit que ce fiscus n'est pas sa caisse privée'. The term fiscus does not occur in the Life of Tiberius, but twice in the Life of Augustus. Where Suetonius states that Augustus left an account of 'quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis et vectigaliorum residuis' (Aug. 101, 4), Boulvert argues that the fisci mentioned here were those of the imperial provinces, 'pour lesquels le prince rend des comptes'. In Aug. 40, 3-4, where Augustus writes that Augustus was more willing to grant a certain Gaul freedom from tribute and stand the loss to the fiscus, than to grant him the privilege of Roman citizenship, Boulvert argues that here, too, a provincial chest is meant. Cf. note 102, above where I have argued for the same interpretation of this passage.
113 op. cit., p. 436.

114 loc. cit.

115 op. cit., pp. 436-8. Boulvert interprets fiscus in the context of Hist. 1, 46; 58 and 90 as indicating the private chest of the emperor, and in Hist. 4, 72, as denoting a provincial chest controlled by the emperor.

116 op. cit., p. 438, with n. 47.

117 Cf. op. cit., p. 431, n. 8, citing Pan. 36, 3 and 42, 1; on Frontinus see op. cit., n. 35; Boulvert's interpretation of Frontinus, de Ag. 118 is disputed in Ch. 5 (pp. 81-2).

118 Pan. 36, 3.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1 See again, e.g., Hirschfeld, KV\(^3\), pp.53-76, 77-120; Tenney Frank, ESAR V, p.41; Last, JRS (1944), p.59; Sutherland, AJP (1945), p.170; Jones, Studies, p.107; Brunt, JRS (1966), p.75, Boulvert, RHD (1970), pp.430-1.

2 Dio, 53, 12, 1-3.

3 Dio, 53, 12, 4-9. According to Dio's account, at this time the imperial provinces comprised Tarraco and Lusitania in Spain, all the Gauls (that is, Gallia Narbonensis, Gallia Lugdunensis, Aquitania and Belgica), as well as the territory which contained Upper and Lower Germany, together with Syria, Cilicia, Cyprus and Egypt; afterwards (23 B.C.), Dio continues, he gave back Cyprus and Gallia Narbonensis to Egypt, and took Dalmatia instead. Cf. Strabo, c.840, who adds that the client kingdoms, also, were included in the emperor's portion. The senate's provinces are listed as Africa, Numidia, Asia, Greece with Epirus, the Dalmatian and Macedonian districts, Crete and the Cyrenaic portion of Libya, Bithynia with Pontus, Baetica and Sardinia. Dio then goes on to say that he enumerated these territories separately because in his day each one was governed as a separate province; but he adds that in the beginning some were administered two and three together.

Later in Augustus' reign, when Sardinia was threatened by pirates it was given a military government under an equestrian commander (in A.D. 6 - see Dio, 55, 28, 1); also, by the end of Augustus' reign, five administrative districts had been substituted for the province of Illyricum: namely, Raetia, Noricum, Lower Illyria or Pannonia, Upper Illyria or Dalmatia, and Moesia. E.T. Salmon, A History of the Roman World, 6th ed. (1968), pp.78-9, lists the imperial provinces at Augustus' death as comprising Dalmatia (then called Upper Illyricum), Lower Germany, Upper Germany, Moesia, Pannonia (then presumably Lower Illyricum), Syria, Tarracoensia (or Hispania Citerior) - all consular provinces; Aquitania, Belgica, Galatia, Lugdunensis, Lusitania, Pamphylia (perhaps part of Galatia in Augustus' time) = the praetorian provinces; Alpes Maritimae, Judaea, Noricum, Raetia, Sardinia-Corsica = the equestrian provinces. Egypt also must be included among the equestrian provinces (see below p.30). Cilicia was incorporated with Syria under Tiberius (Salmon, p.136). The senatorial provinces at Augustus' death appear to have been Achaea, Africa, Asia, Baetica, Bithynia, Crete-Cyrene, Cyprus, Gallia Narbonensis, Macedonia, Sicily. Africa and Macedonia still retained armies under Augustus (see following note).

4 Dio, 53, 13, 2-5. In fact, however, the army in Africa remained under the command of the senatorial proconsul until the senate requested Tiberius to send his own legatus to take charge of operations against the rebel Tacfarinas (Tacitus, Ann. 3, 32; 34). Then, under Gaius, the command of the African forces, together with the region of Numidia which was detached from the proconsular province, were
transferred permanently to an imperial legate (Dio, 59, 20, 7). Achaea and Macedonia became imperial from A.D. 15 to A.D. 44, being combined with Moesia into one large province (Tac., Ann, 1, 76). But at some point after the beginning of the Christian era, Macedonia became a demilitarized area, and the defence of the frontier of the region was transferred to the governor of Moesia (see e.g., Larsen, ESAR IV, p. 438). Afterwards, in A.D. 44, Claudius restored Achaea and Macedonia to the senate (Suetonius, Claud., 25, 3; Dio, 60, 24, 1). Also, even in the earliest period of the Principate, the method of selecting senatorial governors by lot might be suspended, and the emperor intervene to secure the appointment of a suitable man, if, for example, the province in question was threatened by a foreign invasion (see Salmon, op. cit., pp. 76-7; Tac., Ann, 3, 32: 'Neque multo post missis ad senatum litteris Tiberius motam rursum African incursu Tacfarinatis docuit, iudicioque patrum deligendum pro consule gnarum militiae, corpore validum et bello suffecturum'). Dio, too, remarks (53, 14, 4) that some emperors sent out men of their own choosing to the senatorial provinces, and allowed certain of them to hold office for more than a year.

5 See again note 3, for the equestrian provinces under Augustus. On the title of praefectus, see Jones, Studies, pp. 117-8.

6 Jones concludes (loc. cit.) that under Claudius (with the exception of the prefectship of Egypt) the title of praefectus, originally borne by equestrian governors, was displaced by that of procurator. Syme, however, observes that the terms proc. et praef. occur conjoined for governors of Sardinia in the reigns of Vespasian and Domitian, and later (citing CIL X, 8023; ILS 5350; CIL X, 7580 = ILS 1358); see JRS (1962), p. 92. In Claudius' reign the title proc. pro legato appears too: see Pflaum, 'Principes de l'administration romaine impériale', Bulletin de Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg (1958-9), p. 181. Also see Philo, Leg. ad Galium 38, who describes Pilate as 'one of the prefects appointed procurator of Judaea'. Jones, Studies, pp. 124-5, points out that Philo's statement illustrates the dual character of the prefectship.

7 Jones, Studies, p. 119.

8 Jones, Studies, p. 121. For the troops under the command of the praefectus Aegypti see Strabo, c. 797. M. Humbert, Aspects de l'Empire romain (1964), p. 97, takes the view that the prefect is none other than the nominee of the emperor, a private procurator given public authority. He argues that this was done on the basis of a special lex which attributed to the prefect an imperium pro legato, which, for Ulpian, gave him the powers of a magistrate, and, for Tacitus, the power to dispense justice. Ulpian's text refers to the 'imperium, quod ad similitudinem proconsulis lege sub Augusto ei datum est' (Dig. 1, 17, 1); Tacitus, Ann., 12, 60, writes: 'Nam divus Augustus apud equestres, qui Aegypto praesiderent, lege agi decretaque eorum perinde haberii iussaret ac si magistratus Romani constituissent.' On these passages also see Jones (Studies, pp. 121-2), who refers as well to a passage from Modestinus which states: 'apud praefectum Aegypti possum servum
manumittere ex constitutione divi Augusti' (Dig. 40. 2, 21). Jones agrees that there appears to be a contradiction between this text and the one which is attributed to Ulpian; for if there was a lex conferring 'imperium ad simuludinem proconsulis' on the prefect of Egypt, it would seem unnecessary for Augustus to give him the jurisdiction mentioned in the constitutio. He himself argues, however, that legis actiones, including manumissio vindicta, adoptio and tutoris datio, were not regarded as normal forms of jurisdiction, which could be exercised by any holder of imperium, but as peculiar to magistratus Romani (citing Dig. 40. 1, 14; 2, 1, 8, 18 e.g.); therefore doubt might have arisen whether the prefect, to whom a special imperium like that of a proconsul had been granted by law, was a magistratus Romanus capable of legis actiones, and it was on this subsidiary issue that Augustus gave a ruling. Humbert (p.97) is also of the opinion that the constitutional regularity of the prefect is due to this function of imperium.

Velleius Paterculus (2, 39, 2) states that Augustus, in making Egypt tributary, thereby enriched the aerarium.

R.G. 27.

Prologue to the Gnomon, as in H Stuart Jones, Fresh Light on Roman Bureaucracy (1920), p.11.

The evidence for Augustus' reign is collected by Millar, 'Augustus, the Senate, and the Provinces', JRS (1966), pp.162-4. The edicts of Augustus from Cyrene (Ehrenberg and Jones, Documents no.311) constitute, as Millar says, the standard example of imperial intervention in a senatorial province; but there are other instances which throw light on the relations between Augustus and cities in senatorial provinces. In 6 B.C., for example, two ambassadors came from the city of Cnidus to accuse a man already deceased and his wife of the murder of another citizen of the place. Augustus states in his letter to the city that he ordered Asinius Gallus (the proconsul of Asia) to make an investigation, and then heard the case himself (Syll. 3, 780 = Abbot and Johnson, no.36 = Ehrenberg and Jones, no.312). Under Tiberius, Tacitus reports how (in A.D. 23): 'factaque auctore eo senatus consulta, ut civitati Cibyricae apud Asiam, Aegiensi apud Achaian, motu terrae labefactus, subveniretur remissione tributi in triennium' (Ann. 4, 13). Asia was of course a senatorial province, while Achaea was then imperial. Tacitus implies here that Tiberius initiated the motion after the receipt of petitions from the provinces. From a later period, Millar p.166) cites a case from Trajan's reign reported by Pliny the Younger (Ep. 5, 20; 6, 15; 7, 6; 10): the Bithynians first accused Q. Varenus before the senate, and then sent ambassadors to the emperor with a decree from the concilium stating that they were dropping the case. One of the ambassadors also appeared before the senate - 'causas abolitae accusationis exposuit, postularitque ne cognitioni
Caesaris praejudicium fieret'. Trajan undertook to enquire into the intentions of the province.

13 Jones, Studies, p.106. It should also be stressed again (cf. Ch.1) that in Jones' opinion (p.105) Augustus would in theory have been accountable for all the revenues allocated to him.

14 Hist. 4, 74. Stevenson (p.155) remarks concerning this passage that if it was the case that the 'Three Gauls' contributed to the support of the armies of the Rhine, it would be incredible if Narbonensis paid nothing.

15 Jos., B.I. 2, 383.

16 Hist. 3, 8: This passage, therefore, indicates that the eastern provinces produced surpluses which might be drawn on by Italy and the western provinces. Presumably already under Augustus the Gauls and Asia played an important role in helping to finance the less productive but expensive provinces. It is not difficult to understand, then, why Augustus felt it necessary to have his own accounting staff keep a balance-sheet of all the current revenues of the Empire, wherever they were actually held (see again Suet., Aug. 101), on the basis of which information he would be able to ensure that income and expenditure were balanced. It was also clearly on the basis of detailed knowledge of the expected amount of income that Tiberius could insist before the senate in A.D. 15 that the res publica was not equal to the burden of paying out discharge bonuses to the troops unless they served a full twenty years, and that the one per cent auction tax also had to be retained (Tac., Ann. 1, 78).

17 Dio, 53, 15, 1; also see Strabo 840.

18 Dio, 53, 15, 3.

19 Ann. 4, 6. This forms part of a summing-up by Tacitus of the way in which the Empire had been administered during the first decade of Tiberius' reign. In some areas of the Empire, however, it is likely that the collection of the direct taxes had already been taken out of the hands of the publicani. In the province of Asia Julius Caesar had earlier removed the collection of the tithe from the Roman societates, converted the levy into a fixed tribute and transferred its collection to the municipalities of the province. (See Dio, 42, 6: 'In any case he did away with the tax-gatherers...and converted the amount accruing from the taxes into a joint payment of tribute'. Cf. Appian, B.C. 5, 4, addressing the representatives of the cities of the provinces: 'For he turned over to you the collection of the taxes from the cultivators of the soil'.) Such changes may have been extended to other provinces under Augustus: in Sicily he abolished the tithe (decumana) and introduced a fixed levy, along with other changes in the system of taxation (see Rostovtzeff, RE, art. frumentum, p.152, and Scramuzza, ESAR III, p.345).
Procurators were also employed under Augustus for making disbursements to the troops stationed in their provinces, as indicated for Spain by Strabo (167: ἐν οἴκῳ καὶ ἐπίτροποι, τοῦ Καίσαρος, Ἰππικοὶ ἄνδρες, οἱ διανέμοντες τὰ χρήματα τοῖς στρατιώταις εἰς τὴν διοίκησιν τοῦ βίου).

Brunt (JRS 1966, p. 87 n. 82) observes that the Hama inscription (McCrum and Woodhead, Documents of the Flavian no. 466) suggests that procurators also became responsible for military transport and supplies - functions which still later (second century) were discharged by praefecti vehiculorum and occasionally by special officers concerned with the military annona (Pflaum, Carrières, pp. 1040, 1052, 1064, 1080).

Dio, 54, 21, 5. On Licinus see also Suet., Aug. 67; Seneca, Apocol. 6; Juv., Sat. 1, 108-9. Boulvert (EAI, p. 49, with n. 230), as against Hirschfeld (KV3, p. 377, n. 7), believes that Licinus did officially carry the title of procurator, since he certainly had authority over the raising of the Gallic tribute. Only Dio actually gives him the title of procurator: Seneca says of him only that 'Lugduni multis annis regnavit', while a scholiast (Probus) on Juvenal writes that 'manu missus et deinde curationi Galliarum ab Augusto praepositus eas spoliavit' (Scholia, ed. P. Wessner, Teubner 1967, on Sat. 1, 109). Boulvert considers that the appointment of a freedman to this post was exceptional, and that Augustus and his successors preferred as a rule to employ equestrians for financial procuratorships of a province. No other freedman procurators are known certainly for the Julio-Claudian period. Equestrian procurators known are Sabinus (cf. p. 35, below - at any rate probably equestrian), P. Caninius Agrippa, Herennius Capito (cf. p. 33, below), Coponius, Iunius Cilo (cf. note 33 below), and C. Iulius Aquila (cf. note 33, below); see Pflaum, Carrières, pp. 13-77 passim. With respect to Licinus position, Pflaum, however, remarks 'Il est éminemment regrettable que, pour cette époque ancienne du principat, nous n'ayons aucun autre témoignage sur les procurateurs chargés des finances dans les autres provinces impériales, car nous saurions ainsi, si l'emploi d'un affranchi était alors la règle, ou si l'on avait fait une exception en faveur de ce Gaulois'. - 'La mise en place des procurateurs financières dans les provinces du Haut-Empire romain', RHD. (1968), p. 384.

CIL VI, 5197. A dispensator was always an imperial slave, part of a procurator's supporting staff. The vicarii mentioned in the inscription were Musicus' own slaves, who evidently assisted him in his capacity as cashier, as his secretaries a manu ('Dicaeus a manu'; 'Mutatus a manu').

E.g., 'Nobilis Tib(erii) Caesaris Aug(usti) ser(vus) aeq(uator) monetae' (CIL XIII, 1820).

It is probable, however, that the accounts of the public funds and those of the revenues accruing from the imperial patrimonium were handled separately. This may have been the case in Egypt at the end of the Julio-Claudian period: line 21 of the Edict of Tib. Julius Alexander reads, 'αὔτον τοῦ δὲ τὴν ἀναφασατοὺς ἀνακατέφθοντος τῇ κτῆματα τῶν ἀνησυχίαν ἣν η'
The text quoted is from G. Chalon, L'Édit de Tiberius Julius Alexander (1964), who comments on the fluidity of the terminology used in these passages p.113, n.14 bis, and p.126, n.13: he concludes that φίσκος, 'the account of Caesar', and the public account' are parallel terms. Brunt (JRS 1966, p.91) also regards these terms as being equivalent. Certainly, it is not clear from the context in which the term 'the account of Caesar' occurs in the Edict, whether the Governor is referring here to lands which had been sold by the emperor as private property, or which had been sold by the state (c.f. Chalon, p.154). But the possibility that Καίσαρος λόγος in fact denotes a separate private account of the emperor, as opposed to the account of the public provincial administration, cannot be excluded (see again Chalon, p.154, n.4, where the views of several modern scholars on the interpretation of the term are cited; on the distinction between 'public' and 'patrimonial' revenues in Egypt see also Boulvert, EAI, pp.50-1, and Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, p.123). At the same time it is possible, as Brunt argues (JRS 1966, p.77), that the provincial fiscus in an imperial province was both 'public' and 'private' in so far as the procurator handled both public and patrimonial funds, and in the course of time these funds were probably fused. Moreover, in Egypt, the idiólogos, who occupied the third rank in the official hierarchy after the prefect and the iuridicus (Strabo, 797), was in charge of a special account which dealt with various categories of irregular revenues (notably confiscated or forfeited properties), which might fall either to the public or to the patrimonial branches of the administration. The idiólogos was assisted by imperial slave violici or dispensatores (ἐκλογεύς). See Stuart Jones, Fresh Light ..., pp.12-13 and pp.26-32; Hirschfeld, KV³, pp.352-4; Boulvert, EAI, pp.50-51 with nn.238-41, who briefly refers to the divergences in modern opinion concerning the nature of this institution.

25 A.I. 18, 158. Herennius Capito is described by Philo as a collector of revenue in Judaea (leg. ad Gaium 30: φέρων ἐκλογεύς), and is given the title of procurator in AE 1941, no.105.

26 A.I. 18, 31.

27 See E.M. Smallwood, Leg. ad Gaium p.261; and Pflaum, Carrières no.9.

28 B.I. 2, 111-2.

29 A.I. 18, 1-2.

Ann. 4, 15; cf. Dio, 57. 23, 4-5: he (Tiberius) brought Capito, who had been procurator of Asia ("τῆν Ἀσίαν ἐπιτροπέως αὐτῷ"). . . before the senate, and after charging him with employing soldiers and acting in other ways as if he had held supreme command he banished him: ὅποιος τοὺς τά ταυτοκρατοικα χρήματα διοικοῦσι πλέον οὐδὲν ποιεῖν ἢ τὰς νενομισμένας προσόμους ἐκλέγειν καὶ περὶ τῶν διαμαρθύντων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς νόμους ἐξ οὗ τοῖς ἱδρώταις δικάζεσθαι.' See also AE (1924) n90, for Capito's position. Also note Jos., A. i. 16, 26: here a definite distinction is drawn between the tribute owed by the Chians, on the one hand, and the money (rents?) which they owed to the procurators of Augustus: and Tac., Ann. 2, 47: Tiberius released Sardis from its obligations 'aerario aut fisico...in quinquennium'.

Tac., Ann. 13, 1. The title procurator for Celer is found in inscriptions (AE 1924, 79a and b).

As observed by Boulvert, EAI, p.51. As Boulvert also remarks (ibid., note 244), it is difficult to obtain a picture of the extent of Augustus' estates in the region of Asia Minor, since the majority of inscriptions relating to imperial officials are later. There are, however, some indications of the extent of imperial possessions in the area in the Julio-Claudian period. For example, Dio (54, 29, 5) records that Augustus inherited the Chersonese on the Hellespont from Agrippa, and an inscription from there dated to A.D. 55 is dedicated 'populo et familiaris Caesaris nostri' (CIL III, 7580). It is also known that Augustus owned copper-mines on Cyprus (previously granted to Cleopatra by Marcus Antonius): Josephus states that Augustus gave Herod half the revenue from them, as well as charge over the other half (A. i. 16, 45). Mommsen believed that CIL X, 7351 testified to a procurator of Augustus in Cyprus, but the 'pro Caesar[s]' is now usually restored as 'pro[legato] Caesar[s]' (Pflaum. Carrières, p.7; Jones, Studies, p.118). Again, a tabularius ('accountant') is recorded at the marble quarries at Synnada in Phrygia under Nero (published in Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, 1928-37, IV, 53: see Broughton, ESAR IV, pp.652-4; these quarries seem also to have been inherited by Augustus from Agrippa - Boulvert, EAI, pp.51-2, citing Fiehn, RE, IIIA, art. Steinbruch, col. 2278). In Asia, at Sari Çam, a procurator of Claudius is known, as well as freedmen of Claudius or Nero (IGRP. IV, 1179 = 1331; 1347 and 957). Imperial procurators of the senatorial province of Pontus-Bithynia are also known, but not until the reign of Claudius: Iunius Cilo (A.D. 49 - see Tac., Ann. 12, 21 and Dio, 61, 33) and C. Iulius Aquila (A.D. 58 - CIL III, 346; Pflaum. Carrières, no.21). Aquila had been awarded praetorian insignia in A.D. 49 for military successes in the east, but his duties as Nero's procurator in Pontus were the supervision of road repairs, which, as Pflaum points out, were presumably being carried out at the emperor's expense (cf. Ch.5, p.87). It is, then, not until the Flavian period, and especially the second century, that there is substantial evidence of the existence of a network of imperial domains and administrative centres. (See D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor (1950), pp.568-9, 1425-6).
See above, p. 32.

See above, note 21.

Quirinius, governor of Syria in Augustus' reign, is a famous example; see above, p. 33; cf. Josephus, A.I. 17, 13; 18, 1-2; Luke, 2, 2. Special senatorial legati were also appointed for this purpose.

See Pflaum, Carrières, n. 4 on Volusenus Clemens, who ' [censum] accepit missus a divo Augusto' (CIL XI, 6011).

Josephus, A.I. 17, 221-2. A famous incident of this nature took place under Nero: the emperor had to send a personal (freedman) representative to Britain to try to settle the differences between the governor and the procurator; see Tacitus, Ann. 14, 38-9.

On the use of troops by procurators, see Brunt, Latomus (1966), p. 464; Jones, Studies, p. 124.

Plutarch, Galba, 4, claims that Galba was unable to protect his Spanish province from exploitation by the procurators. Sherwin-White (The Letters of Pliny, Oxford 1966, pp. 588 and 597) claims that procurators were always independent of the governor, and quotes Pflaum (Carrières, p. 157ff.) for the suggestion that a principal function of procurators was to spy on the senatorial governors. But under Augustus there is relatively little mention of influential provincial procurators, Licinus excepted (see again Pflaum, RHD 1968, p. 384). Therefore, as Grant (op. cit., p. 129) argues, the development whereby procurators became 'influential spies, instead of co-operative lieutenants and subordinate economic advisors' is likely to have come later.

As Pflaum, RHD (1968), p. 387 emphasizes.

In this article, Pflaum (pp. 370-1) furnished a list of known procurators from the Julio-Claudian period, which illustrates these changes in titular formulae.

At the beginning of Nero's reign we know of two procurators of Asia, P. Celer and Helius (a freedman) - Tacitus, Ann. 13, 1; AE (1924), 79a and b. Boulvert, EAT, p. 110, comments concerning this pair that 'Il s'agit donc bien d'un couple de procurateurs de condition inégale: nous voyons de nombreux exemples à une époque de peu postérieure'. On the question of the co-existence of these pairs of procurators, also see P.R.C. Weaver, 'Freedmen Procurators in the Provincial Administration', Historia (1965), pp. 460-9. Boulvert (p. 112, with n. 120) suggests further that we may deduce the existence of such a pair of procurators under Claudius, in connection with the affair of the Anaunii: CIL V, 5050, dated to A.D. 46, from near Trent, reads: 'In rem praesentem misi Plantam Iulium amicum et comitem meum quem cui cum, adhibitis procuratoribus meis qui[s]que in alia regione quique in vicinia erant, summa cura inquisierit et
cognoverit...'. Later, under Trajan, Pliny the Younger, in his correspondence with the emperor, reveals that Bithynia had both an equestrian procurator (Virdius Gemellinus) and a freedman procurator (Maximus); see Ep. 10, 27; 28.


Boulvert, EAI, p.120; cf. above, p.32; a slave of Tiberius who was dispesator ad fiscum Gallicium provinciae Lugdunensis (CIL VI, 5197).

Boulvert, EAI, p.107, note 84; p.115, p.118.

Boulvert, EAI, p.117. The adiutores tabulariorum were generally freedmen, while other subordinates who presumably assisted the tabularii and a commentarii (e.g., librarii) might be either slaves or freedmen (Boulvert, p.119).

The title adiutor seems to have been introduced first in the departments of the Palatine bureaucracy at Rome, towards the end of the first century; see Weaver, 'The Slave and Freedman "Cursus" in the Imperial Administration'. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. N.S. 10 (1964), p.89ff.

Boulvert, EAI, p.121.

See again p.32, above.

Despite the popularly held view, recently reiterated by Boulvert, EAI, p.107ff., that the provinces possessed a highly developed financial bureaucracy from the reign of Claudius.

See Boulvert, EAI, pp.115-21, with notes; also see Weaver, JRS (1968), pp.118-23.

AE (1956), n.23 (from Tarraco): Favor Aug(usti) lib(ertus), tabularius p(rovinciae) H(ispaniae C(riteriors). His freeborn children are named C. Iulius, Aquilinus and Iulia Favorina, from which Boulvert, EAI, p.52, n.248, deduces that the name of the freedman himself was C. Iulius, and was therefore manumitted by Augustus or Gaius. Weaver, however, who shows that the nomina of wives and children alone, without additional criteria, are of little or no chronological value (JRS 1968, pp.110-2), would place the inscription no earlier than Hadrian on the basis of Favor's occupational title 'tabularius p(rovinciae)' (op. cit., pp.119-20). Weaver shows that all examples of officials with the title tabularius provinciae which can be firmly dated (either by their imperial gentilicium or by reference to a particular emperor, or to an equestrian of known date) belong to the second century or early third century.

Furthermore, in view of there being several examples of freedman of Hadrian with this occupational title, he argues that the new style of nomenclature was introduced for senior tabularii in the provinces under this emperor (op. cit., pp.118-20). A similar dating pattern emerges for a commentariis provinciae (op. cit., p.120-1). In the case of
senior dispensatores provinciae, and arcarii provinciae, this style of nomenclature may have been introduced slightly earlier, under Trajan (op. cit., pp.121-3). Weaver also deduces that the titles ex tabulariis, ex commentariensibus, and ex dispensatoribus were then introduced for subordinate posts (op. cit., p.118, p.123).

53 CIL VI, 8574: Coenus August(i), arcarius provinciae Belgicae, whose son is named C. Iulius; cf. Weaver, JRS (1968), p.122, who dates the inscription to the second century on the criteria of Coenus' occupational title.

54. Another case where the wife's name cannot be used as an indication of date is CIL III, 12298: Callistus Aug. lib., ab commentariis Epirii et Achaiae, who makes the dedication with his wife Claudia Primigenia. The province of Epirus was created under Nero, which furnishes a terminus post quem for the inscription, but it is otherwise undatable. CIL III, 258 (from Ancyra), which records Victor Aug. lib., a co[m[m?] prov.[G]a[lat(iae)] is not dated by Boulvert (EAI, p.118, nn.155, 158), but Weaver takes the occurrence of 'provincia' in the occupational title as an indication of mid-second century date or later (JRS 1968, p.121).

55 CIL II, 4183 (from Tarraco): Tib. Claud[ius...Aug. lib.], tabularius[s...]; cf. II, 4518: [C]1(audius) Felicissimus, whose post has been restored as [t]abularius provinciae [Tar]ra[c][o][n][ensis], and whom Boulvert identifies as another Ti. Claud. Aug. lib. (EAI, pp.115-6, n.137). But the occupational title tabularius provinciae would indicate a date in the second century (see again, JRS 1968, p.119). It should also be noted here that analysis of the relevant inscriptions indicates that the post of tabularius (in contrast to freedman procuratorships which were generally held late in a freedman's career) was held as a rule soon after manumission (normally at the age of thirty). Thus, the imperial gentilicium of a tabularius is a fairly good indication that the post was held during the reign of the manumitting emperor, or soon afterwards; see Weaver, 'Freedman Procurators in the Imperial Administration', Hist. (1965), pp.462-3.

56 Pliny, H.n. 33, 145.

57 An inscription from Achaea, originally dated to A.D. 41/2, but more recently to A.D.1/2, states that a certain Nicasippus τῶν Δεσποινῶν Ὀλυμπικῶν ἐνίκατος μεθεός ἔχοντος/προσαχθέν, τῶν θεημάτων μὴ πεσόντων τοῖς μυστηρίοις, ἀπέδωκεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱδιου βίου του φίλου... (SIG^4, 800 = SIG^3, ibid.). For the new date see A.J. Gossage, 'The date of IG V (2), 516 (SIG^3, 800)', PBSA (1954), p.51. Gossage (p.55) refers to a letter from A.H.M. Jones in which it is suggested that φίλος here may denote 'the emperor's financial department, including his private revenue', and citing as a possible parallel Jos., A.I. 16, 26, where it is related that when Agrippa visited the eastern provinces in 14 B.C. King Herod
accompanied him and also interceded for some of those who sought favours from Agrippa; and that he gave financial assistance to various cities, including the Chians on whose behalf he paid 'τὰ πρὸς τοὺς Καίσαρος ἐξιπτρόπους χρήματα' and whom he released from the ἐλεφασία. If δικαιος in SIG IV, 800, does refer to the private chest of the emperor (as Millar, JRS 1966, p. 32, assumes), the inscription would furnish the earliest contemporary use of the term in this sense that we have. The occurrence of the term in an inscription of Augustan date, from a province which was then senatorial, would not be surprising if we regard the statement of Tacitus, that Tiberius released the city of Sardis from its debts to both fiscus and aerarium (Ann. 2, 47), as in fact reflecting Julio-Claudian terminology.

But according to Pflaum, RHD. (1968), p. 375 (in contrast to Carrières, p. 1070), there is no imperial procurator of Achaea who can be dated earlier than Claudius' reign. His conclusion is based on the occurrence of the term provinciae in the inscription of P. Caninius Agrippa (proc. Caesar. Aug. prov. Achaiæ), which was published in Corinth VIII, 2 (1951), nos. 65-6; the use of the term, in Pflaum's opinion, excludes the reigns prior to Claudius. If Pflaum is correct, it is possible that imperial interests in Achaea were acquired only after the reign of Augustus. In that case, the term δικαιος in SIG IV, 800, might denote the local provincial fiscus (as Jones earlier conceded, Studies, p. 108 = JRS 1950), or even (although I do not know of a parallel usage) an independent municipal chest.

An imperial dispensator is known from Achaea before the end of the first century - CIL III, 563 (cf. 12289) from Euboea in Achaea records 'Thamyrus Aug. disp.' The name of 'Claudia Aug. lib. Dynamis', who is also recorded in the inscription, should date it to the reigns of Claudius-Nero, or to within a generation of the Julio-Claudian period. Also see CIL III, 556, from Athens: 'dis manibus Q. Turranio Maximo/praeceptori/et/amico bonorum/consiliorum/Sagaris Alcimi Aug. ser./vernae arcaei provinc./Achaiae vicar./merenti memoria'. Weaver, JRS (1968), p. 122, dates it to the second century on the basis of Alcimus' status indication, 'Aug. ser. verna'; cf. CQ (May, 1964), p. 139.


See above, note 3. However, 'Dalmatia' and 'Pannonia' only definitely replaced the name 'Illyricum' in official terminology from the Flavian period; cf. below, Ch. 3, pp. 51-2.

Several inscriptions of dispensatores and arcarii either lack dating criteria or furnish insufficient data for more than approximate dating, as with CIL III, 4797: 'd(eo) i(nvictae) M(ithrae)/Diadumenus/Nicolaus Aug./disp(ensatoris) arcar(ius)/regn(i) Noric(i)' - no definite indication of date, though Weaver would classify it as belonging to the second century (JRS 1968, p. 122); III, 7132: Paulus Aug. verna, arkar(ius), from Ephesus - the spelling 'arkarius' indicates a second century date; III, 12379: Serapicus Aug. n., disp(ensator), from Noesia - the status indication 'Aug. n.' is not common until after Hadrian (Weaver, 'The
Status Indication of the Imperial Slaves', CQ May, 1964, pp.138-9); VI, 1429 (=31562): Faustinus ser(vus),
ark(arius) ex Africa - the spelling 'arkarius' is
characteristic of second century inscriptions; VI, 8575:
Antiochus Aug. n. Luconianus, ark(arius) provinciae
Africae - his status indication ('Aug. n.') and the spelling
'arkarius' point to a second century date, but as he is also
a vicarianus (Luconianus) with second cognomen he should be
dated prior to Hadrian, probably to Trajan's reign (Weaver,
JRS 1968, pp.121-2); VIII, 21012, from Mauretania Caesaris:
'[...] Aug[usti dis]pensa[tor]' - lacks dating criteria;
X, 7588, from Carales: Diadumenus Aug. ser. disp(ensator)
 provinciae) S(ardiniae) - no reliable indication of date
(cf. Weaver, JRS 1968, p.122); XIII, 1824, from Lugdunum:
Felicianus Aug. n. verna, ex dispensatoribus - the status
indication 'Aug. n. verna' is characteristic of the Severan
period (cf. Weaver, CQ May, 1964, p.139); ILS 4376a:
'Her[j]mes Aug. d[ispensator]', from Belgica - lacks dating
criteria.

Other inscriptions of dispensatores and arcarii furnish
clear indications of second century or later date, as with
CIL XIII, 1818: 'Faustus quond(am) Augustor(um) ex
dispensatoribus' (from Lugdunum) - at the earliest M.
Aurelius; XIII, 5371: Martianus Aug(ustor)um n(ostorum)
ver(na), ex disp(ensatorum) (from Belgica) - at the earliest
M. Aurelius; III, 6772: Chresimus Aug(ustor)um n(ostorum),
dispensator, and Callimorphus, arkarius eiusdem (from
Cappadocia) - at the earliest M. Aurelius; VI, 8577: a
disp(ensator) 'divi Marci provinciae Ciliciae'; III, 7130:
a freedman of Trajan, 'Repenti[nus qui dis]pensavi[t in
prov]incia Asia' (from Ephesus); III, 6077: Apollonius
Aug. n. verna, arcarius provinciae Asiae - this inscription
records the 'collegia lib(ertorum) et servorum domini
nostri)...magnum et Minervium tabulariorum et Faustinianum
et commentaresium et decurionum et tabellariorum', and the
college names from the empress Faustina indicates a date not
before Antoninus Pius; III, 6075: a mutilated inscription
(again from Ephesus), the last lines of which appear to read
'[Ly]cus Augustorum/ser. a/diutor tabul. pr[ov.
Asiae/...] or ark. mag. o.' - for the last line Mommsen
suggests ex dispensatore arcae et magistrum officialium;
also AE (1932), 2: an arkarius, from Baetica, of Severan
date.

61 Strabo, Geog. 17, c.797. See again note 24, above.
62 Lines 21-2 (= Chalon, L'édit de Tiberius Julius
Alexander, p.28).
63 Line 21.
64 Line 13: 'Διόπερ καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτως ἔγγον τινα εἰς τελωνείαν
μή μικρώσων οὕτω ἔξω, εἷςδε τούτῳ συμφέρειν καὶ ταῖς κυριακαῖς
ψυχῶς τὸ μετὰ προθεμίας ἐκόντας πραγματεύεσθαι τούς δυνατοὺς.'
65 See Brunt, JRS (1966), pp.90-91, who emphasizes that the 'use
of the novel term θησίως ... signified that formally Egypt was
originally at least deemed to be subject to the Roman people.' Cf.
note 24, above.
66 R.O. 27.
67. Brunt, for example, comments on the edict that naturally, to the subjects of Egypt, the power of Caesar obscured the Roman state of which he was formally the agent (JRS 1966, p.91).

68. See again p.38.


70. Cf. above, note 57 (an imperial dispensator is known from Achaea, who must have held this post at the latest under the Flavians). Imperial interests in Asia were evidently already important under Tiberius, since in his reign the procurator in Asia was powerful enough to "usurp the governor's authority" (Tac., Ann. 4, 13). Cf. above, note 34, for the known evidence relating to property in Asia Minor owned by the Julio-Claudian emperors.

71. Geog. c. 798.

72. See chs. 3 and 4, below, dealing with the administration of the revenues drawn from indirect taxation, and the administration of the annona.

73. See e.g. Hirschfeld, KV3, p.69; Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, pp. 107-108; Boulvert, EAI, p. 80. According to Tacitus, in the first decade of Tiberius' reign publicani still collected the provincial tribute (Ann. 4, 6). Suetonius seems to imply that Tiberius was responsible for eliminating tax exemptions and the rights of both civitates and privati to collect revenues and work mines: "plurimis etiam civitatibus et privatis veteres immunitates et ius metallorum ac vectigalium adempta" (Tib. 49, 2); but he does not refer specifically to the companies of publicani. In referring to the collection of vectigalia by municipalities, Suetonius presumably means that independent sources of revenue, particularly town-dues, were now appropriated by the Roman administration (see De Laet, Portorium 1949, p. 352, n.3). Similarly, Suetonius implies that ownership of mines was increasingly transferred to the state. It might be noted that Strabo (Geog. c.148) writes that the majority of gold-mines were owned by the state, but that silver-mines were still in private hands. On the basis of the notorious case of Sextus Marius (Tacitus, Ann. 6, 19), whose Spanish gold and copper mines were appropriated by Tiberius, it appears, also, that this emperor initiated a policy of transferring the Empire's precious metal resources to direct imperial control. That Tiberius cancelled immunities is indicated for the Gallic provinces: we find the Aedui and the Treviri listed by Pliny the Elder (H.n. 4, 105-109), who is using Agrippa as his source, as foederati and liberus, respectively, while under Tiberius both complain of the endless taxation imposed on them (Ann. 3, 40); see Grenier, ESAR IV, pp. 499-500.
74. See Boulvert, EAI, pp. 79-80.

75. It is reasonable to suppose that with the imposition of a fixed tribute it was found possible to do away with the services of the societates. This development had been initiated by Julius Caesar, who in Asia introduced a fixed tribute in place of the tithe, and handed over its collection to the municipalities of the province (see Appian, B.C. 5, 4; Dio, 42, 6). Afterwards, Augustus eliminated the tithe in Sicily (see ESAR III, p. 345); cf. above note 20. From Africa, however, two inscriptions of early imperial date mention the decumani of that province (CIL VI, 8585 and 8586); there is also an inscription of Augustan date which records the mancipes (stipendiorum) ex Africa (CIL VI, 31713): the mancipes make their dedication to the provincial quaestor. On these inscriptions, see Hirschfeld, KV3. On the subject of the provincial land in Africa to stipendium or vectigal, see e.g. Broughton, The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis (1968), pp. 65-66.

76. From a comparison between Tacitus, Ann. 4, 6 and Ann. 13, 50, where only the vectigalium societates are mentioned, it has been argued that the companies contracting for the direct taxes disappeared between the reigns of Tiberius and Nero (See Hirschfeld, KV3.). But as Mattingly, Imperial Civil Service, p. 105, points out, Ann. 13, 50 does not prove that no other societates were in existence.

77. For such an assistant see AE (1935), 5 (from Emerita, in Lusitania): Titus Pompeius Albinus, adiutor T(itii) Decidi Domitiani, procuratoris Caesaris Augusti; cf. CIL XII, 2327, in which Albinus is given the title of subproc. prov. Lusitaniae. Pflaum dates Albinus' subprocuratorship between A.D. 54 and 68, (RHD 1968, pp. 375-378).

78. There is some evidence of imperial ownership of land here from the Julio-Claudian period: Pliny, H.n. 18, 95, states that a procurator of Augustus sent the emperor an enormous head of wheat grown in Byzacium, and later another to Nero. Again, the vicarius of a vilicus of Augustus built a teloneum on an estate near Byzacium at his own expense (CIL VIII, 12314); Broughton, Romanization, p. 164, suggests the vicica of an estate of Claudius near Calama as a parallel (CIL VIII, 5364; 17500).

The existence of tractus and regiones is not attested in the titles of imperial officials of the Flavian period from Africa; although Boulvert, EAI, p. 214, nn. 64-5, argues that these territorial divisions must have emerged under the Flavians (see note 84, below).
80. The Henchir-Mettich inscription (CIL VIII, 25902), which deals with the provisions of the lex Manciana relating to those who bring unsurveyed land under cultivation, and the relations between vilicus and conductor. The saltus Blandianus mentioned in the inscriptions from this area (see also VIII, 25943, and 26416 - Hadrian) was probably named for Rubellius Blandus, whose son Rubellius Plautus was executed at Nero's orders in A.D. 62 (Tac., Ann. 14, 57-9). Rubellius Blandus was the husband of Julia (daughter of Drusus and thus granddaughter of Tiberius) and was closely associated with the imperial house (e.g. he was one of Tiberius' commission of five to assess losses caused by the fire at Rome in A.D. 37: Tac., Ann. 6.45). His son Plautus was wealthy and could be represented to Nero as a possible rival for imperial power.

81. Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1092.

82. See Tac., Hist., 4, 48-9 on the development of the administration of this province in Julio-Claudian times, and the conflict between senatorial proconsul and imperial military legatus.

83. See n. 84, below. Weaver (Hist. 1965, p. 467) thinks that Massa probably held the title of 'procurator tractus Carthaginensis'.

84. Equestrian procuratores provinciae Africæ tractus Carthaginisci are attested from Trajan on (see Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1093; CIL VIII, 25902, 1; 25943, 3; 25943, 4, 5-6; 1269; cf. 14763). Subdivisions of this tractus, each with its own administration managed by freedmen, are indicated in the following inscriptions: CIL VIII, 12883: an adiutor tabularia mensa Vagensi, from the reign of Pius or later; VIII, 13188: an adiutor tabularia mensa Thucidensis from the reign of Pius or later; VIII, 12892: a dispensator regionis Thuggensis; VIII, 12880: ex proc(uratore) reg(io) Uchi tanae; VIII, 12879: "dis manibus sacrum/ Hypnus pius vixit/ annis XXIII hic situs est/ Asiaticus lib. proc./ regionis Assuritanæ/ pio alumno bene de se/ merito fecit". Alongside the tractus Carthaginensis also appear the regio Hipponensis, regio Thevestina, and the regio Hadrumetina. The first two are joined, and are called saltus in two inscriptions from Calama and Hippo Regius, respectively; these inscriptions honour T. Flavius Macer, proc. Aug. praediorum saltuum Hipponensis et Thevestini (ILAAlg I, 285; ILS, 1435; ILAAlg I, 3992; Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1094 and n. 98 dates this office between A.D. 98 and 117). The regio Hipponensis is attested under an equestrian procurator much later, again joined with Theveste (Clodius Galba, between A.D. 203 and 204; see
Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1095 and nos 244 and 244 bis). In another inscription it is joined with the region of Hadrumetum (CIL VIII, 7039: *a proc. dioecesos reg. Hadrum. et Thev.*, dated by Pflaum between A.D. 138 and 161, Carrières, p. 1094 and n.158).

The word tractus is never used to describe the territory about Hippo (see Broughton, Romanization, p. 164), while Theveste is not recorded as a tractus until the time of the Severi; even then its administration was joined with the separate province of Numidia under the same procurator (CIL VIII, 7053; see Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1095 and no.275). Also, the word tractus appears never to have been used to designate the territory about Hadrumetum, whose terminology remained unsteady, shifting from *regio* (CIL VIII, 11174, 7039, and 23068, ranging from mid second century into the third - Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1094), *dioecesis* (CIL VIII, 7039, 23068 and 23219), and *provincia* (CIL XIII, 1684a, dated by Pflaum between A.D. 161 and 180 - Carrières, p. 1094). Thus the evidence ranges over a long period of time, and it indicates that the administrative divisions which formed were not fixed, but retained a certain amount of fluidity. Heywood (ESAR IV, p.89) comments that the origin of the estates themselves, and of the principles on which they were administered and managed, was not an administrative act, but a long historical process conditioned by the country and the times.

Freedman procurators are recorded too, though not earlier than the second century: M. Ulpius Augustorum lib. Probus, *proc. ... et Africae reg(ionis) Thevest(inae) (CIL XIV, 179*).

Tyrrenius lib., *proc. reg. Thevestinae* under Commodus (CIL VI, 790); Malchio, Augusti proc. lib., whose date is uncertain (ILAlg I, 89; see Boulvert, EAI, p. 214, nn. 64-65). These freedmen procurators were presumably subordinated to the equestrian heads of the three administrative divisions. Boulvert (loc.cit.) argues that the appointment of freedmen to these districts must have preceded the appointment of equestrian heads, who in one case combined two districts under their jurisdiction (namely Hippo and Theveste). Boulvert's conclusion is based on the assumption that this sort of dual management usually arose from the appointment of an equestrian over several freedmen (cf. p. 107). Therefore, since equestrian appointments of this kind date from Trajan in Africa, he places the introduction of freedmen procurators under Vespasian. But in the absence of inscriptions attesting freedmen procurators of the first century, Boulvert's argument, though not implausible, can only be regarded as a hypothesis.

The tractus Carthaginiensis also had a freedman procurator, attested in CIL VI, 8608: "d.m./ Basso Aug. lib./
prox. ab epistulis/ Graecis proc. tractus/ Carthaginiensis/ Fabia Q. f. Priscilla/ marita piisimo ..."; his son was named Claudius Comon, but this is not a valid indication of first century date, though Boulvert appears to accept it as such (EAl, p. 193, n.699). Cf. preceding note: Baebius Massa (equestrian) may have held the title of procurator tractus Carthaginiensis at the end of the Julio-Claudian period; cf. note 83, above. Weaver, Hist. (1965), p. 464, would give the freedman Bassus an Aurelian date.

85. Although, as Boulvert (EAI, p. 193) observes, it is difficult to tell whether the officials in question belonged to the bureau of the province, or to the district bureau of the emperor's private estates.

86. Hist. 1, 76. He relates how Africa, led by Carthage, acknowledged Otho as emperor without waiting for the authority of the proconsul, because "Crescens Neronis libertus (nam et hi malis temporibus partem se rei publicae faciunt) epulum plebe laetitiam recentis imperii obtulerat et populus pleraque sine modo festinavit. Carthaginem ceterae civitates secutae". Cf. Hist. 1, 7: the procurator Trebonius Garutianus executed Clodius Macer, the military legate of Africa, at Galba's orders; also Hist. 4, 50: the procurator Baebius Massa (later a notorious informer under Domitian - see e.g. Pliny, Ep. 7, 33) was instrumental in the murder of the proconsul, Lucius Piso.

87. CIL VIII, 12590: T. Flavius Aug.lib. Laetus, tabularius; 12597: T. Flavius Aug. lib. Tertius, tabularius; VIII, 12639: T. Flavius Daphnus Aug. lib., agrimensor.; 12638 (probably a freedman, also): T. Flavius Apsens, me(n)sor agr(um). For a full list of the inscriptions from Carthage (CIL VIII, 12590-13214, inclusive), which range into the second century and later, see Boulvert, EAI, pp. 193-196, nn.701-717. Many, however, do not furnish precise dating criteria. Apart from the tabularii cited here, dispensatores and a commentarii were also employed at Carthage.

88. H.n. 5, 113; 146-147.

89. As also Pliny's reference to a regio Milesia (H.n. 11, 95) and the tractus Oroandicus. Later, however, an equestrian procurator of the regio Chersonesi is attested under Trajan (C. Manlius Felix, c. A.D. 104 - Pflaum, Carrières, n. 64), when this district was joined to the province of Asia; again, Pliny the Younger (Ep. 10, 27) states that the freedman procurator of Bithynia was despatched to the regio Paphlagoniae to purchase wheat; also see AE (1903), n. 117, which has been restored as "Phrasis Aug. lib. proc. reg(ionis) Paphlag(oniae)".
90. See Rostovtzeff, *DE art. fiscus*, pp. 100-101; Boulvert, *EAI*, p. 217, pp. 293-294. Freedmen of M. Aurelius are attested (e.g. *CIL III*, 348) who have the title procurator of the provincia Phrygia. Presumably the estates of the whole area were under their administration.

91. Marble marks from these quarries are dated from A.D. 68 to the third century (see Broughton, *ESAR IV*, pp. 652-54). The earliest attested official at Synnada is a slave of Nero, who is recorded in a bilingual inscription in which he is cited as a tabularius (*MAMA IV*, 53).

Other inscriptions from this area, however, cannot be dated earlier than Nerva and Trajan: Marianus. M. Ulpius Aug. lib., proc. (*CIL III*, 7046; 7048); cf. "Χρήσιμος ἀπελευθέρως ἐπίτροπος λάτομεν [λαον]", under Nerva, who is recorded in an inscription from Tralles in Caria (*CIL III*, 7146); cf. *AE* 1927, n. 97, from Ephesus.

92. *IGRP IV*, 1297 and 1738.


94. *CIL II*, 1179.


96. *CIL II*, 3271 (from Castulo); the name of the official is unknown.

97. Two long inscriptions from Lusitania deal with the administration of the mines at Vipasca. The one first discovered is the *lex metalli Vipascensis* (*CIL II*, 5181; *FIRA I*, p. 502), which may date from the beginning of the second century. The second inscription discovered, the *lex metallis dicta* (*FIRA I*, p. 498) dates from between A.D. 117 and 138. Boulvert (*EAI*, p. 212, n. 49) uses the analogy of the *lex Manciana*, which in Africa preceded the *lex Hadriana* and
regulated the administration of estates in that province, to argue for a pre-Hadrian (even a Flavian) date for the first *lex metalli*. He writes: "Si la seconde de ces deux inscriptions relate un règlement datant de l'époque d'Hadrian (1.5), il est plus difficile de dater la première: le fait qu'il y soit fait allusion à une *lex metalli* dicta antérieure (1.50) ne nous oblige pas à considérer cette inscription comme faisant suite à la *lex de l'époque d'Hadrian*: une *lex est sans doute intervenue sous Vespasian et a précédé celle de l'époque d'Hadrian comme en Afrique la *lex Manciana* a précédé la *lex Hadriana*".

The actual working of the mines was in the hands of *coloni*, free men to whom portions of the mine shaft were rented. The regulations of the *lex* were concerned with the relations between the *coloni* and the *conductores*. The latter leased the collection of the rents and received a certain percentage of the revenue. On the renting of the mine shafts see FIRA I, p. 500, 1.20: "colonis inter se eas quoque partes puteorum, quas a fisco emerint". The mine area as a whole was placed under the administration of a procurator whose seat appears to have been at Vipasca. In the *lex metalli Vipascensis*, reference is made to the imperial slaves and freedmen who assisted the procurator, and who were exempted from paying toll for the use of the baths in the mine area: "Excipiuntur liberti et servi /Caesaris qui protratoris/ in offi /ci/ is erunt ..." (CIL II, 5181, 1.23); cf. Boulvert EAI, p. 219, n. 109.

The system of exploitation of imperial properties through *coloni* only developed towards the end of the first century. Previously, direct exploitation through imperial agents, namely the *vilici*, was the usual system. *Vilici* are mentioned in the Henchir-Mettich inscription from Africa: "Ex fructibus qui eo loco nati erunt, dominis au/ /conduct/oribus vilicisve eius f(undi) partes e lege Manciana praestare debentur hac condicione ..." (CIL VIII, 25902). In Italy, it appears that even after Vespasian numerous estates or *praedia* (especially those near Rome) continued to be exploited directly through *vilici* (e.g. CIL VI, 276: Daphnus Imp. T. Caesar Aug. Vespasiani ser., pecul(iaris), vilicus praedior(um) Puduecanor(um), under Titus; cf. VI, 745: Victor, vilicus praedior(um) Maecianor(um), under Commodus. Nevertheless, as the system of exploitation through *coloni* was extended (see e.g. Pliny, Ep. 3, 19, as an illustration of this change in agrarian conditions), the role of the *familia* of slaves appears to have diminished. Thus the function of the *vilici* became associated with maintaining relations with the *coloni* (see e.g. Boulvert, pp. 222-223, with nn. 113-118). The development of new methods of administration, management and exploitation
of imperial domains perhaps explains why, in the course of the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, it was found necessary to issue the series of new regulations recorded from the African estates, especially.

99. As Boulvert believes it does (EAI, p. 212, n. 49).

100. H.n. 12, 111: "Sed omnibus odoribus praefertur balsamum, uni terrarum lудaеae concessum, quondam in duobus tantum hortis, utroque regio ..."; 12, 113: "seritque nunc eum fiscus, nec umquam fuit numerosior"; 12, 123: "Nec manifestior alibi fraud. Quippe milibus denarium sextarii empti, vendente fisco trecentis denariis, veneunt; in tantum expedit augere liquorem".

101. H.n. 12, 112: "servit nunc haec ac tributa pendit cum sua gente ..." Boulvert (RHD 1970, pp. 430-431) asserts that a provincial fiscus could not be regarded as other than a material chest, and that the conception of fiscus as a legal entity (as in the phrase, "vendente fisco", in H.n. 12, 123) could apply only to the imperial fiscus, which Boulvert regards as a second public treasury possessing parallel status to the aerarium (cf. above, ch. 1, p. 25-6). But in practice, the agents of a provincial fiscus must frequently have negotiated contracts, and sold or exploited public land. Therefore, it seems only logical to suppose that a provincial chest, as well as the imperial fiscus itself, could be conceived of as a legal entity. Also see below, ch. 3, p. 54, on this question.

H.J. Loane, "Vespasian's Spice Market and Tribute in Kind", CP (1944), p. 17, argues that the balsam production was one source of tribute in kind, which under Vespasian may have been sent directly to Rome and sold by the agents of the imperial fiscus. Loane (p. 14) cites in this connection the famous passage of Statius (Silvae 3, 3, 86-95), in which various products including citrus wood from Massylia in Africa, gold from the Spanish mines, grain from Africa and Egypt, and Indian ivory are all described as having been entrusted to the charge of the father of Claudius Etruscus, the a rationibus of the Flavian emperors. But while these products and materials were undoubtedly dispensed under the supervision of the imperial a rationibus (cf. ch. 7), they cannot all be regarded as "tribute" in the technical sense of the term, as, for example, the Indian ivory mentioned by Statius. Again, the Spanish gold referred to in the poem probably came from the mines of Baetica, which had been incorporated in the patrimonium of the emperor after their seizure by Tiberius (see again Ann. 6, 19 - for a discussion of the legal status of such confiscated goods, see ch. 6, p. 102ff).
Jospehus (B. I. 7, 216) actually states that after the Jewish War the emperor instructed the newly appointed legate of Judaea, Bassus, and the procurator Laberius Maximus, to lease all the Jewish territory, which he reserved as his private property ("δόθην αὐτῷ τὴν χώραν φυλάττων "). A.H.M. Jones, however, interprets this passage as echoing the principle that the land of a conquered people belonged to the Roman state, unless and until a city was constituted on it - as in the case of Carthage under the Republic; and Josephus, it might be noted, states that Vespasian founded no cities in Judaea except for a veterans' colony at Emmaus. In Jones' view, the Jewish land would in strict law have been ager publicus, and he considers that the reference to Vespasian's personal possession is due to the confusion, particularly in provincial minds, between the emperor and the Roman people (Studies, ch. 9, pp. 148-149: JRS 1941). It cannot be excluded that the balsam plantations, as the former property of the Jewish kings (H.n. 12, 111), did pass into the private ownership of the emperor; but Pliny's reference to them "paying tribute" (H.n. 12, 112) makes this difficult to accept.

102. See above, p. 41.

103. See above, note 91.

104. See above, p. 42.

105. See Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, pp. 103-104; Boulvert, EAI, p. 229.

106. See above, note 93.

107. At Carthage, several imperial officials are attested whose titles suggest that they were responsible for the management of tribute: Ionicus Aug. lib., tabularius trib(utorum) (CIL VIII, 24703); Sterceius Caes. n. ser., adiut(ori) tabul(arii) trib(utorum) (CIL VIII, 12884); Herma Aug. ser., dispensato(ri) a tributis (CIL VIII, 1023). Unfortunately, there is no definite indication of the dates of these officials: the use of the slave-status indication "Caes. n. ser." is known from Vespasian on, although it is more characteristic of second century than first century inscriptions; the form "Aug. ser." is common in African inscriptions, though it is rare elsewhere (see Weaver, CQ May, 1964, p. 36, p. 39).

108. Cf., above, note 87.

109. The earliest inscription of an imperial official at Ephesus which can be dated within narrow limits appears to be CIL III, 7130: it is dedicated by a freedman of Trajan to a procurator of this emperor. Possibly this freedman
("Repenti[rum qu] di[s pensati in provinciana Asia") made the dedication because he had served under the procurator during the latter's term in Asia. Other inscriptions of imperial officials at Ephesus date from about the middle of the second century (e.g. CIL III, 6075, 6077, 7127).


111. Boulvert (EAI, p. 228, with note 150) attributes to Vespasian, "reorganisateur par excellence en matière financière", the appointment for the first time of imperial exactores, generally imperial slaves, who seem to have been entrusted with supervising the collection of tribute in the cities of imperial and senatorial provinces alike. Only one of these slaves, however, can probably be dated to the Flavian period: Donatus Caesaris Aug(usti)7 Salvianus, exactor tributorum in Hel(vetiae) (CIL XIII, 5092), from Aventum in Upper Germany. The form "Caesaris Aug." in the status-indication of slaves is most characteristic of the period Augustus-Tiberius, and does not appear to have survived the Flavian period; see Weaver, CQ (May 1964), p. 135, cf. pp. 138-139. Weaver includes CIL XIII, 5092 among the examples of the form which are probably Flavian (p. 135, n. 10).

The other inscriptions of slave exactores are second century in date: Felicissimus Aug(ustorum) n(os)trorum, exactor (CIL, VIII, 2228), at the earliest under M. Aurelius and L. Verus, from Masculae in Numidia; Reginius7 verna Augustorum, exactor (EE VIII, 307-308), at the earliest under M. Aurelius and L. Verus, from Brigantium in Tarraconensis; Craterus Caes(aris) n(ostri) serv(us) ver(na) exactor r(ei) p(ublicae) Nacol(ensium) (CIL III, 349), under Commodus, from Nacolia in Phrygia. A praefectus equitum, who was also exact(or) tribut(orum) civitat(ium) Gall(iarum), is attested, too (CIL XI, 707); since he was a centurion in the legio XXI rapax, which seems to have been disbanded under Trajan, the inscription can probably be dated prior to the reign of Marcus Aurelius (see Hirschfeld, KV, p. 76, with n.2).

112. M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Grœsianus (died at the age of 45) tabularius in the provinces of Lusitania, Lugdunensis and Aquitanica (CIL II, 3235); M. Ulpius Placidus Aug. lib., tabularius a rationibus me(n)s(a)e Ga(llicarum) (CIL VI, 8581); M. Ulpius Fortunatus Aug. lib., tabularius in Lugdunensis (CIL XIII, 1826).

Cf. a "Tib. Claudius Aug. lib." recorded as a tabularius at Tarracca, in Hispania citerioris (CIL II, 4183); see above, note 55.
Weaver, JRS (1968), p. 119 points out that Gresianus (CIL II, 3235), however, may not have held his provincial posts until Hadrian, since he had first filled the post of tabularius XX hereditatium (cf. ch. 3, note 76) after his manumission by Trajan.

Arabia Petraea received an equestrian procurator immediately (L. Valerius Firmus, towards A.D. 108; AE 1930, n. 92; Pflaum, Carrières, n. 86); but the earliest attested clerical officials are P. Aelius Aug. lib. Puteolanus, tabularius (AE 1908, n. 150, from Gerasa), and Eutyches Augustorium lib., adiut(or) tabul(arius) (AE 1930, n. 95, from Gerasa).

New financial districts were formed under Trajan by the separation of Pannonia-Dalmatia into the three provinces of Dalmatia, Pannonia Superior and Pannonia Inferior (see e.g. Boulvert, EAI, p. 273, with n. 68). Equestrian procurators for the region of Dalmatia-Pannonia are attested from Galba down to A.D. 104, and then a proc. provinciae Dalmatiae seems to be attested soon after A.D. 106/7 (CIL III, 8716, as restored by Pflaum, Carrières n. 92). An equestrian proc. provinciae Pannoniae inferioris is recorded between A.D. 117 and 161 (CIL XIV, 5352; VIII, 20684; see Pflaum, n. 132), and one of Pannonia Superior towards A.D. 164 (CIL III, 4117).

The freedman officials recorded from these provinces are, for Dalmatia: freedmen procurators: M. Aurelius Augg. lib. Hermes, proc. (CIL III, 2077, from Salona); Tyrannus Aug. lib. proc. (AE 1902, n. 35, from Gubereoli).

Imperial clerks: Diogenes Aug. lib., tabularius provinciae Dalmatiae (CIL III, 1993, from Salona); [.] Aelius Aug. lib. [tabul(arius)?] provinciae Dalmatiae (CIL III, 14689, from Salona) - a freedman of either Hadrian or Antoninus Pius; and possibly CIL III, 14945 (from the col. Claudia Aequum), which may record a [tabularius?] provinciae Dalmatiae.

Where the imperial gentilicium does not occur, the occurrence of provincia in the occupation title of the officials in question very likely indicates a date in the second century-(cf. note 52, above).

Pannonia Superior:
freedman procurators: M. Ulpius Aug(ustorum) lib. Probus,
proc. province(iae) Pannoniae superioris (CIL XIV, 176);
Tyrrenius lib., proc. ... Pannoniae superioris (CIL VI, 790), under Commodus.

Inscriptions attesting freedman clerks attached to the administration of this province either lack dating criteria, or cannot be dated earlier than M. Aurelius.
Freedman and slave officials of the provincial administration are not known from Pannonia Inferior. Boulvert (EAI, p. 273, n. 68) argues that their existence can, however, be deduced from the fact that officials from Pannonia Superior are careful to mention that they were attached to the bureau or chest of the upper province. Boulvert (p. 274, n. 69) considers, also, that the apparent absence of any record of officials attached to the financial administration of Dacia is due to the administrative reorganization of this territory, carried out after Trajan; see Pfaum, Carrières, pp. 1065-1067, for the administrative divisions which appeared from Hadrian's time. Officials attached to the administration of Dacia's gold mines are known, however: these officials include a freedman of Trajan recorded at Ampelum (CIL III, 1312).

114. CIL III, 2082, from Salonae, recording Amemptus Caesaris Aug., disp(ensator), should not be dated later than the Flavian period on the basis of the slave status indication "Caesaris Aug." (see Weaver, CQ May, 1964, p. 135, with n. 10 - cf. note 111, above); CIL III, 8684, also from Salonae, which records Trophimus ser. Amandianus, dispensator, was erected under Trajan; cf. III, 1839: Atimetus Ulp(iani), disp(ensator).

115. See above, p. 39.

116. See again EAI, p. 107. Boulvert believes that an extensive and systematized imperial bureaucracy existed in the provinces from Claudius' reign.

117. As indicated above (cf. note 52), from the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian the term "provincia" appears in the titles of slave and freedman officials employed in the provincial bureaucracy; see Weaver, JRS (1968), p. 118, p. 123. This change in titular formula, as Weaver says, was evidently adopted in order to distinguish between senior and junior grades in the provincial bureaucracy. The fact that the new style was not introduced until the second century indicates that it was only under Trajan and Hadrian that the number of officials employed at provincial centres became sufficiently large to warrant such a titular distinction between senior and junior posts. It should be noted again, also, that this form of titular distinction appears to have been adopted first by the dispensatores and arcarii, under Trajan (see Weaver, op. cit., p.122) and then, probably from Hadrian's reign, by the tabularii (op.cit., pp.119-120).

118. As at Ephesus, in Asia (cf. above, p. 44, note 109), as well as at centres such as Lugdunum, in Gaul, and at Tarraco and Emerita, in the Spanish provinces of Hispania citerioris (Tarracoensis) and Lusitania (cf. above, note 112; also see, e.g., CIL II, 485 and 486 - two
freedmen of Hadrian, recorded as tabularii at Emerita; II, 4089 - a freedman tabularius who made a dedication to Antoninus Pius, at Tarraco).

119. Cf. p. 44 above.

120. In a passage from Philostratus (v. Soph. 2, 1; 548), it is stated that when the outlay on the aqueduct of Alexandria Troas had reached 7,000,000 drachmae, "οἱ τὴν ᾿Ασσαν ἐπιτροπεύοντες" kept writing to the emperor that it was a scandal that the tribute received from 500 cities should be spent on the fountain of one. Broughton (ESAR IV, p. 564) argues that the "500 cities" denotes the province of Asia, citing Philostratus, Apoll. Tyan. ep. 58, 1; 362K, and Jos., B.I.2, 16, 4.

121. As indicated earlier in this chapter regulations affecting the imperial provinces continued to be issued by S.C.C., while the emperors sometimes dealt with matters affecting cities outside their provincia. See again Millar, JRS (1966), p. 162 ff., pp. 165-166.

Nero's statement to the senate, following his accession, that he would look after the armies under his control, while the senate was to receive delegations from the senatorial provinces and Italy (Tacitus, Ann. 13, 4) does look like an attempt to lay down some sort of formal division between the "rights" of emperor and senate over their respective "spheres". On the other hand, Nero's promise may have been aimed chiefly at ensuring that municipal delegations addressed themselves as of old to the senate rather than directly to the emperor, as frequently happened in practice (Millar, op.cit., p. 166). In any case, later we find the senate, on Nero's initiative, issuing a decree which forbade provincial assemblies to send to Rome votes of thanks, either to imperial or senatorial governors ("pro praetoribus prove consulibus": Tac., Ann. 15, 22).

122. The introduction of imperial officials into this area of administration will be discussed in the following chapter.

123. AE (1932), n. 58: "dis manibus/ Euprositus/ Aug. lib./ proc. fiscorum/ transmarinorum/ Elpidi lib./ optime/ de se meritae/ fecit". S.nders, "Some inscriptions in Rome", MAAR (1932), pp. 79-80, dates the inscription to the Flavian period from the character of its letters, though he would not exclude an earlier date.
See Jones, Studies, p.110.

Sanders (op. cit., p.80) doubts that the *fisci transmarini* refer to a treasury for the provinces "across the seas", although the most common meaning of "transmarinus" is purely general, "across the sea". Sanders objects that Euprositus was not a man of note, as would have been the case if he were in charge of several great treasuries. He suggests, firstly, that "fisci" in this context is a technical term, and does not refer to a number of chests. Secondly, he suggests that Euprositus was really in charge of a special tax, namely a tax imposed on traders or other people coming to Rome or travelling through the Empire. He considers that a little support for his view of the subordinate character of the procuratorship of the *fisci transmarini* is furnished by the fragmentary inscription CIL VI, 8515: "Martialis August. lib[er] / tabularius / proc. fiscorum / [et] fisci castr[ensis . . . / pr]oc. h[ered. / fisc]i lib[ertatis . . .]". In Sanders' view the inscription can be restored more fully as: "Martialis August. / . . . / tabularius [s a rationibus] / proc. fiscorum / [transmarinor. / et] fisci castr[ensis . . / pr]oc. h[ereditatium / et fisc]i lib[ertat. et peculior.]". There is little doubt that Martialis' career is given here in ascending order, which therefore suggests that the procuratorship of the *fisci transmarini* was junior to the other procuratorships he held. The inscription of Martialis gives no internal evidence of date.

The grade of the procuratorship of the *fisci transmarini* may have been relatively junior, as Sanders argues. But its function was not necessarily associated with the administration of a particular tax: the use of the plural "fisci" is more easily explained if the term denoted particular "strong-boxes", or "money-chests" (in the sense the term "fisci" is used by Suetonius, Claud. 18, 2, e.g.). Euprositus (and possibly Martialis) may simply have been responsible for the chests in which money was transported from overseas provinces.

The earliest approximately datable reference to an official of the *fiscus Alexandrinus* appears to be the inscription of an (unnamed) imperial slave who was employed as an *aditus (or) tabulariorum (fisci) Alexandrinorum* (CIL VI, 5744): the inscription comes from the Vigna Codini, from which all inscriptions reportedly belong to the first century (see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 369); another inscription, from Puteoli, is dedicated to M. Ulpian Proculeius *tabularius fisci Alexandrinorum" Domitiani Caesaris verna, Augustor(um) libertus" (AE 1901, n. 171), who probably held this post under Trajan; for a discussion of the formula "Augustor(um) libertus" in the nomenclature of freedmen in the first century and down to the co-regency of M. Aurelius and L. Verus, see Weaver, "Augustor(um) libertus", Hist. (1964), pp. 188-198.

The office of procurator fisci Alexandrini perhaps goes back to the Flavian period, but T. Flavius Aug.
lib. Delphicus, who proceeded from the post of tabularius a ratio/ibus to the procuratorships of the rationes thesauri and hereditates (on which offices see ch. 7, p. 114, p. 118) and then the fiscus Alexandrinus (ILS 1518), could have held this last post in the second century.

In addition, one of two lead dies found in the Tiber has on the obverse the head of the emperor Antoninus Pius, and the inscription "fisc. Alex."; the other die (or seal) has on it the inscription "fis/Aie", which Hirschfeld (KV 3 p. 369, n. 5, p. 370, n. 5) regards as standing for "fis(ci A(lexandri)"

127. Two procurators of the fiscus Asiaticus are known: one has been dated to Domitian, and the other to Marcus Aurelius; see Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, p. 125. The date of the first procurator has been based on an inscription dedicated to "Herm(æ)/ Aug. lib. / a cubiculo Domitiae Aug.", "patri piiissimo et indulgentissimo", by Fortunatus, filius, proc. fisci Asiatici (CIL VI, 8570). The same Hermes, however, is recorded (with the same title) in another inscription, on which Dessau (ILS 1834) comments on the occurrence of the spelling of "puerr." in line 3 of the text: "Nota geminatam litteram ultimam, pluralis significandi causa; id quod vix umquam ante Hadrianium reperitur". The inscription reads: dis manibus/ Pieri Aug. 1. praec(onis?)/ puerr. Caes/ oris n./ Flavia Nice coniunx/ b. m. titulum cum valvis/ aeneis d(e) s(uo) p(osuit) permissu Hermae/ Aug. 1. a cub. Domitiae Aug." Again, Domitia Longina may still have been alive in A.D. 130 (see Bowersock, "Suetonius and Trajan", in Hommages à Marcel Renard 1969, p. 123). But although, on these grounds, CIL VI, 8570 is possibly second century in date, the fact that Domitia is called "Augusta" in this inscription, and also in ILS 1834, would seem to indicate that they both date from Domitian's reign.

An adiutor tabularii and a commentarii of the fiscus Asiaticus are also recorded: Glycerus adiut. tab. fisci Asiatici (CIL VI, 8571), and Pierus Caesaris vern(a) a commentariis fisci Asiatici (VI, 8572); the form "vern(a)" is rare before Hadrian (see Weaver, CQ May, 1964, p. 137, p. 139). Finally, an adiutor fisci Asiatici is recorded, who probably held this post under Commodus (CIL VI, 8577: "...../ Hadriani/ disp. divi Marci provinciae Cili/ciae patri et Aeliae Zoe sororl/ Salvius Aug. lib. adiut./ fisci Asiatici fecit.").

128. One view is that the fiscus Asiaticus was a chest for the poll-taxes of the province of Asia; see Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 71. This view would make the chest analogous to the fiscus Judaicus, which term was used to denote the Jewish tax imposed after Jerusalem fell in
A.D. 70 (Dio, 66, 7, 2; cf. Suetonius, Dom. 12, 2: among other taxes "Iudaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est"). Similarly, the fiscus Alexandrinus has been viewed as a chest for the Egyptian poll-tax (see Hirschfeld, p. 370). This view is rejected by both Hirschfeld and Rostovtzeff. Rostovtzeff (DE art. fiscus, pp. 125-26) considers that the fiscus Alexandrinus was established to receive the taxes imposed on the Alexandrians, the "πολλὰ τέλη" which Dio states had fallen into disuse, but were renewed by Vespasian when that emperor visited Alexandria in A.D. 70, and also imposed new taxes on the Alexandrians (Dio, 66, 8, 3-5). A similar interpretation of the chest's function is proposed by Boulvert (EAI, p. 231, with n. 173). But it seems unlikely that a special fiscus and administration was created just to receive the tribute collected from the Alexandrians; and the same criticism applies to the interpretation of the fiscus Asiaticus as a chest for the poll-taxes of Asia. A procurator fisci Alexandreae is recorded from the early second century (Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1087; cf. n. 77), but his title may only reflect the fact that the financial administration for the whole of Egypt had its centre in Alexandria. Also, an inscription from Rome records an imperial freedman tabularius fisci Alexandrinus reliquo.

Again, in Boulvert's view (EAI, p. 231), the fiscus Asiaticus received the surplus revenues from the tribute collected on the imperial estates in Asia. Finally, there is Jones' view that the clue to the origin of both fisici lies in the fact that Asia and Egypt were the two provinces which produced a substantial surplus over the costs of their own administration or the needs of neighbouring provinces, so that cash must have been regularly shipped to Rome from both provinces (see again Studies, p. 110).

129. As shown by Tac., Hist. 3, 8. See above, p. 31.

130. See above notes 123 and 124: Sanders prefers to date AE (1932), n. 58 in the Flavian period, although he would not exclude an earlier date; while CIL VI, 8515 (recording Martialis Aug. lib.) gives no internal evidence of date.

131. See ch. 7, p. 117, with note 76.
132. See again note 124. It might be noted, also, that the posts held by Martialis following his procuratorships of the fisci transmarini and fiscus castransis were definitely patrimonial - the procuratorship of the hereditates and the office of procurator fisci i libet. et pecul. if the restorations of the text given here are sound; cf. ch. 7, p. 114 and pp. 116-117, on these offices.

133. See Dio, 71, 33, 2 (= Xiph.).
CHAPTER 3 - FOOTNOTES


2. Livy, 7, 16, 7; 27, 10, 11.

3. S. J. De Laet, Portorium (1949), pp. 102-104, citing some literary references to the activities of these companies of publicani under the Republic.

4. Dio, 55, 25, 28. The tax applied only to the property of Roman citizens.

5. Ann. 1, 78.

6. Dio, 55, 31, 4: the tax is described here as "τὸ τε τέλος τὸ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρᾶξιν". On Dio's terminology see Hirschfeld's comments, KV³, p. 95 with n. 3.

7. Dio, 55, 26, 5 ("καὶ εἰς καὶ νῦν οἱ νυκτοφύλακες οὕτως ἤσιν τῶν τρόπον ὅτι ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων ἐτι μόνον ἄλλα καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων στρατευόμενοι, καὶ πείχη τε ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἔχουσι καὶ μεσθάν ἐκ τοῦ διημοσίου φέρουσιν.")


9. Dio, 55, 25, 4-6.

10. Dio, 56, 28, 4-6.


13. The extent of imperial control over financial policy is discussed in ch. 8.


21. Portorium, p. 255. There has been a considerable difference of opinion among scholars over the nature of the quattuor publica, however. One view is that the quattuor refer to a single impost, namely the portorium of Africa, but that the province's territory was divided into four tax districts (see e.g. Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 78; Abbot and Johnson, Municipal Administration, p. 123). The opposing view (expressed by Cagnat, Impôts indirects, p. 71; F. Thibault, Les Douanes chez les Romains, 1888, p. 44ff.; Haywood, ESAR IV, p. 82ff.) is that the quattuor publica denote four separate imposts which were farmed out jointly to the same contractors.

De Laet accepts the latter view (p. 247ff.) He identifies the four publica as the vicesima hereditati, the quinta et vicesima mancipiorum, as well as the portorium (pp. 250-251). He excludes the centesima rerum venalium from this tariff group on the grounds that a special system of collection through the auctionatores, or coactores argentarii, is known to have operated in the case of this revenue (p. 251, citing Rostovtseff, DE art. conductor, p. 582, and Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 93ff., among other scholars, on this question). In a later article, "Documents nouveaux concernant les 'quattuor publica, Africai,", A.C. (1953), pp. 98-102, De Laet finds confirmation of the thesis that the quattuor publica were four different indirect taxes in two inscriptions from Lepcis Magna. The first (AE 1926, n. 164; Reynolds and Ward Perkins, Insc. of Roman Tripolitania 1952, p. 93, n. 302) records a slave of Trajan, Priscillanus, vil(icus) marit(imus) et XX hered. Lepcis/Magn. De Laet, Portorium, p. 252, gives the office of this slave as vilicus marmorum et vigesimae hereditati, as given in AE 1926, n. 164); but in A. C. (1953) he argues that this slave can be shown to be a vilicus maritimus by comparison with: "... lucundus/ Aug. n. ver/na vextigalis (sic)/ IIII p(ublicorum) A(fricae) vil(icus)/ Lepcis Mag(nae)/ terrestris" (Reynolds and Ward Perkins, Inscr. of Roman Tripolitania, p. 96, n. 315a = Fasti Archaeologici IV, 1949, 3985). The writing of the second inscription suggests a second century date (Reynolds and Ward Perkins, loc. cit.); but De Laet dates it from the end of the second century or to the third century on the basis of the formula "Aug. n. verna"; cf. P.R.C. Weaver, C.Q. (1964), p. 139, who regards "Aug(g). n(n). vern." as a form of status indication for imperial slaves which is characteristic of the Severan period.
De Laet (loc. cit.) concludes that the vilicus ter estris and vilicus maritimus were both attached to the administration of the quattuor publica: in his view Lepcis Magna, which was very important commercially, had a double customs office - a statio maritima (sea duties), with the vilicus also collecting the vicesima hereditatium, and a statio terrestris, with the vilicus presumably collecting the other two taxes of the four (the manumission tax and the slave sale tax). The two inscriptions discussed here by De Laet will be mentioned again below (note 69) in connection with the changes probably introduced by Trajan in the collection of the quattuor publica.

De Laet's interpretation of these two inscriptions from Lepcis Magna might, perhaps, be disputed - especially since they appear to date from different periods. But the identification of the quattuor publica as four different imposts seems to receive some support from the fact that in Asia, too, the portorium was sometimes farmed out jointly with other indirect taxes. A promagister duum publicorum, quadragesima portuom Asiae et vicesima libertatis, is recorded in two inscriptions from Ephesus (see De Laet, Portorium, p. 250, n. 2; cf. p. 274), one of which was published in AE (1924), n. 80. A date under Trajan has been suggested on the basis of the Greek text of the other (bi-lingual) inscription; see AE (1924), loc. cit.

22. As with CIL VIII, 1128, 12920 (from Carthage) and 23404 (from Mactaris), which mention the socii IIII publicorum Africam. These inscriptions do not appear to furnish internal evidence of date other than the style of their lettering, which suggests a first century date; cf. De Laet, Portorium, pp. 377-378, n. 4. Similarly, inscriptions recording the socii of the quadragesima Galliarum cannot be dated narrowly, either: namely AE (1916), n. 55 (from Rome); CIL V, 7213 (from the Fines Cotti); XIII. 1819 (from Lugdunum); XII, 724 (from Arelate); and XII, 5362 (from the neighbourhood of Narbo Martius). De Laet thinks that from their general characteristics, such as their lettering, these inscriptions, too, probably date from the first century. On the question of dating the inscriptions of the societates vectigalium De Laet also refers to the conclusions of Rostovtzeff, "Geschichte der Staatspacht in der romanischen Kaiserzeit", Philologus suppl. IX (1904), p. 380. No inscriptions record socii of the publicum portorum Ilyrici, but De Laet, loc. cit., considers that this is probably due to the chance nature of epigraphic discoveries. Earlier, Rostovtzeff, op. cit., p. 393ff., placed the establishment of this tariff region under Hadrian, the date when he thought the companies of publicani farming the portorium had disappeared.

There are, however, other reasons for ascribing the establishment of the tariff region of Illyricum to an earlier period; see following page.
23. De Laet, Portorium, p. 254, n. 1, dates to the first century a certain Ti. Claudius Spuri /ti/ Papiria (tribu) Timonianus, who was a promagister (i.e. annual head) sociorum III Africae, recorded at Thuburbo Maius (AE 1923, n. 22). De Laet argues that this man had probably received his Roman citizenship under Claudius; but in fact Ti. Claudius Timonianus might have been the descendant of someone whose citizenship was granted by Claudius, which leaves the date of the inscription open.


25. See e.g. AE (1913), n. 194: Ti. Iulius Iulianus, who had served in Dalmatia, joins his brothers in making a dedication to their father, Nymphodotus Aug. lib. (tabularius). It is possible, though not certain, that the sons took their names (Ti. Iulii) from their father, who in that case would have been a freedman of Tiberius. On this assumption the inscription might be Julio-Claudian in date.

26. AE (1934), n. 107; AE (1928), n. 153.

27. According to De Laet, Raetia, Noricum, and Moesia were probably added to the district not long after its organization; see Portorium, p. 235.

28. De Laet, Portorium, p. 235, attributes its organization to Tiberius; also see AE (1940), p. 35.

29. These coins include aes struck at Tarraco with the inscription "quadragens. remissae s.c." (Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC I, p. 209, nos. 101, 102, 103); aes struck at Rome with the inscription "Roma s.c. R(emissar) XL" (RIC I, p. 205, n. 56); and a sestertius struck at Lugdunum with the inscription "XXXX Remissa - s.c." (RIC I, p. 214, n. 144). That the quadragesima referred to on this coinage does denote that of the Gauls is suggested by (a) the only other quadragesima known from the first century was that imposed in Asia (mentioned again in this note), and (b) the coinage issued from the mints at Tarraco and Lugdunum. The Gauls were the provinces which would have profited directly by the abolition of the duty, but Spain would also have profited from the measure, since henceforth Spanish merchandise exported overland would have been duty-free; see De Laet, Portorium, pp. 171-173. As the quadragesima Galliarum is definitely attested later, Galba's measure could only have been temporary, however. Possibly the duty was reintroduced by Vespasian, who is reported by Suetonius to have revived the vectigalia abolished under Galba (Vesp. 16, 1).
In addition to those already mentioned, other tariff regions appear to have existed from the first century, also. De Laet, pp. 143-144, argues that the portus Lirensis, which seems to have formed around the customs bureaux located on the Rhine (cf. map of known bureaux, p. 126), must have been established in the period when the Rhine formed the frontier of the Empire: that is between the campaigns of Germanicus under Tiberius (A.D. 16), when the frontier was definitely established at the Rhine, and the extension of this frontier under the Flavians. But since the Romans were collecting a portorium at Cologne at the end of the Julio-Claudian period, De Laet (pp. 235-6) concludes that the portus Lirensis must already have been in existence. Again, the ripa Thraciae may have been established following the annexation of Thrace by Claudius in A.D. 46. De Laet follows Nesselhauf (Epigraphica I, 1939, p. 335; cf. AE 1940, p. 35) in concluding that the expression "τὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸν "Ιστον διχής τέλος", found in an inscription from Histria (AE 1919, n. 10), which mentions a letter of Flavius Sabinus of the year A.D. 49, in fact indicates the portorium of the Ripa Thraciae. De Laet also distinguishes a separate district for the quadragesima Bithyniae, including the provinces of Pontus, Bithynia and Paphlagonia (p. 273). This last district, however, is attested only in inscriptions of the second century, following the unification of all the provinces of Asia Minor into one large customs district (cf. De Laet, pp. 274-277). Similarly, references to the quinquagesima Hispaniorum appear to be lacking before the second century: the socii quinquagen(simae) are attested in an inscription from Baetica (CIL II, 5064), which is dated to the second century on the basis of its lettering (CIL, loc.cit.); cf. De Laet, p. 286ff. On the other hand, a quadragesima was definitely collected in the province of Asia in the Julio-Claudian period. Suetonius (Vesp. 2, 2-3) states that Flavius Sabinus (the father of Vespasian): "publicum quadragesimae in Asia egit". Also, a promagister portuum Siciliae is recorded before A.D. 104 (CIL III, 14195, 7); cf. De Laet, p. 294.

30. De Laet, Portorium, pp. 373-376; Boulvert, EAI, p. 130; also see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 91.

31. CIL VI, 1921: "Nerito divi Claudii [liberto] principi offici imper...viatorvi appa[ruit Augusto]/Juliae Chrysei [di coniugi]/Nerito filio divi [Claudii i. tabul. vect.] /Illyrici/Claudiae Montae [ae filiae? et libertis libertabu] /sque post q. eor(um)".

32. De Laet, Portorium, p. 374, n. 1, points out that the term vectigal appears to have replaced that of publicum portorium Illyrici only from the second half of the second century A.D. (cf. p. 408); again, the restoration of tabularius
in this line is equally conjectural. De Laet, nevertheless, in spite of these uncertainties, thinks it likely that Neritus was in fact employed in a bureau entrusted with the affairs of the publicum portorii Illyrici.

33. CIL VI, 8589: "\[\ldots\] o Aug. lib. Soterich\[\ldots\] proc. IIII publi\[\ldots]c. Afric\[\ldots\]s Quintian\[\ldots\] et sibi et suis li\[\ldots\]bertis libertus\[\ldots\] pos\[\ldots\] terisque eorum\[\ldots\]." Boulvert, EAI, p. 130, n. 254, describes it as a first century inscription, but without explaining his reason for his dating of it. He is perhaps following De Laet, Portorium, p. 373, n. 3, who dates it to the first century, but does not give his reason, either. Hirschfeld, on the other hand, states that the date of this inscription is uncertain (KV3, p. 91, n. 2).

34. CIL VI, 8591: "dis manibu\[\ldots\] Claudiae/ Fortunatae/ coniugi/ sanctissimae de se/ meritae/ lucundus Aug. lib./ actor XXXX Galliarum". De Laet, Portorium, p. 374, n. 1, assumes that this freedman was in fact (Claudius) lucundus.

The function of actor XXXX Galliarum is not clear, either. While actor may be translated as "steward", it can also mean, more narrowly, "a keeper of accounts" (= "actor summarii", as in Suet., Dom. 11); again, "actor" sometimes occurs as a synonym for "exactor", or "collector" (see again De Laet, p. 374, n. 3; cf. ch. 2, note 111, on imperial exactores). Such a meaning might be appropriate to the second century, but not to the first, when the societates vectigalium still collected the portorium.

35. CIL X, 6668 (from Antium): "dis. manib./ luliea/ Demetriae/ Priscus Aug. l(ib.)/ proc. IIII p(ublicorum) Afr(icae) et XXXX Galliar(um)/ coniug. sanctiss." See Weaver, "The Status Nomenclature of the Imperial Freedmen", CQ (1964), p. 276, on the form "Aug. l(ib.)". Once again, the wife is not shown to be an imperial freedwoman, and as with CIL 8591 (above), her name is no indication of the date of the inscription.

36. CIL VI, 8592; c.f. 8593: "dis man./ Pedia Epictesis/ Placidus/ Caesarius/ /ex statione XXXX Galliarum/ fecit et sibi et suis libertis/ libertabuse posterisque eorum. On inscriptions of this category ("Caesarius" followed by the occupation of the slave, with "ser". omitted), see Weaver, CQ (1964), p. 137, and n. 7.

37. De Laet, Portorium, p. 364, argues that as these large tariff regions "englobaient en effet plusieurs provinces, sans qu'il y ait eu une distinction entre les provinces sénatoriales et les provinces impériales", "les
revenues du portorium, aussi bien ceux qui provenaient des bureaux situés dans les provinces du Sénat que ceux que procuraient les stationes sises dans les provinces de l'empereur, alimentaient la même caisse. Cette caisse ne peut être que celle de l'empereur, le fiscus." Roulvern, EAI, p. 129, also agrees that "la mainmise sur les revenues du portorium de certains territoires soumis au Sénat est certainement une des causes de la création des grandes circonscriptions: ainsi la Narbonnaise est englobée dans le district de la quadragesima Galliarum, l'Afrique proconsulaire dans celui des quattuor publica Africae, et certains bureaux d'Italie septentrionale dans le publicum portorii Illyrici".

38. De Laet concludes that the organization of these tariff regions should be attributed to Tiberius, as part of a great financial re-organization of the Empire undertaken by this emperor which included the establishment of the fiscus as a second public treasury (Portorium, pp. 364-365); cf. above, ch. 1, p. 15. As further evidence of such a reform, he points to the appearance of the imperial officials attached to the administration of the large tariff regions: "comme depuis Tiberes les revenues douaniers devaient désormais alimenter le fisc, nous notons depuis le règne de cet empereur un changement assez important dans l'affermage même du portorium aux sociétés vectigaliennes; ces dernières furent en outre soumises à un contrôle sans cesse croissant de la part de l'administration impériale". (Portorium, pp. 372-373). As has just been shown, the evidence of the imperial officials does not support this statement.

39. Boulvert considers that the emergence of the fiscus as a second treasury of state dates from Claudius' reign; see EAI, p. 77, p. 101ff.
Since in his view "le pas décisif dans l'organisation des finances impériales ne remonte qu'au règne de Claude", he places the administrative reform of the portorium under this emperor (EAI, p. 129).

40. Boulvert attempts to support his argument by referring to the fragmentary CIL VI, 1921, the restoration of part of which as tabul(ariu) vect(igalis) Illyrici he accepts (cf. De Laet, Portorium, p. 374, n. 1; see above, note 32). He maintains that while the earliest proof of the existence of an imperial bureau dates only from Néro's reign, "nous pouvons sans trop de risques admettre l'existence d'un tel bureau sous le règne de Claude, qui est, en général, le règne innovateur". See EAI, p. 130, and n. 250.

41. There appear to be no indications, even of a general kind (as in the case of the publicum portorii Illyrici - see above, p. 52) that the quattuor publica Africae already
existed in this period. De Laet, Portorium, p. 254, and n. 1, regards AE (1923), n. 22 as the earliest reference to this tariff group. But as pointed out above (note 23), his dating of this inscription to the mid first century can be regarded only as very tentative. But the quattuor publica Africae certainly existed by Trajan's reign (cf. above, note 21). Moreover, two known officials of this tariff group possibly held their posts before the end of the first century (cf. below, note 63). Therefore, it might be conjectured that the quattuor publica Africae had been organized at some point in the Julio-Claudian period, possibly about the same period as the large customs districts of the quadragesima Galliarum and the publicum portorii Illyrici were formed.

42. See again p. 51, above.

43. Pliny the Elder, H.n. 6, 84: Annius Plocamus, "qui Maris Rubri vectigal a fisco redemerat". De Laet (Portorium, p. 306) considers that this vectigal constituted a customs region which comprised all the ports of the Red Sea, including those on the Arabian as well as the Egyptian coast. Pliny writes that the freedman of Plocamus was caught by the monsoon winds while sailing "circa Arabiam" and blown to India, but De Laet rejects the suggestion that he may have been sailing along the Arabian coast on private business. Instead (p. 307), he points to the statement of the Periplus Maris Erythraei (ch. 19) that a tax collector (παραληπτὴς) was stationed at the Nabataean port of Leuce Come, who was evidently protected by a Roman detachment under a centurion ("καὶ παραληπτὴς χάριν ἐκατοντάρχας μετὰ στρατεύματος ἀποστέλλεται").

Also, an inscription which dates from the earliest years of Roman rule in Egypt records a strategus of Ombitos, Elephantine, and Philae, who was also a παραληπτὴς [τῆς 'Ερ] υψάς Θελάσσης (OGIS I, 202). De Laet believes that he did not collect the customs dues of the Red Sea, as his title would suggest, but gave military protection to the customs bureaux, and supervised the tax farmers who collected the impost (Portorium, p. 306).

44. One Greek and one Latin inscription erected by a certain Lysas, a slave of Publius Annius Plocamus, in the year A.D. 6, were discovered on the road to the ancient seaport of Berenice on the Red Sea coast. D. Meredith JRS (1953), pp. 38-40, considers it would be surprising if Annius Plocamus had held the concession to farm the Red Sea tariff for the whole period between A.D. 6 and Claudius' reign, the period in which Pliny places the voyage of Plocamus' freedman to India (H.n. 6, 84). Nevertheless, Meredith believes we cannot reject this possibility. To support it, he cites the case of a certain Nicanor, who is known to have
held the transport rights between Coptos and the ports of Myos Hormus and Berenice for forty-five years.

45. Tacitus, Ann. 13, 51: "ut ...... Romae praetor, per provincias qui pro praetore aut consule essent iura adversus publicanos extra ordinem redderent". De Laet (Portorium, p. 375, n. 4) remarks that this was not in itself an innovation, since under the Republic competence in cases against the publicani rested with the provincial governor (cf. op.cit., p. 110). But he considers that the introduction of a procedure extra ordinem may have been an innovation.

46. It has been argued that the freedman officials from Rome whose existence is attested in the inscriptions discussed above (p. 52-3) were probably responsible for drawing up accounts of the revenues currently in the hands of the publicani; see De Laet, Portorium, pp. 373-375; Boulvert, EAI, p. 130; Cagnat, impôts indirects, p. 101; Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 91. Since such accounts had been compiled by the slaves and freedmen of the imperial household even under Augustus (see Suetonius, Aug. 101 - the breviarium totius imperii), it is quite possible that the appointment of freedman procurators for the large tariff regions indicates the emergence of a specialised personnel to carry out this function. But there seems to be no evidence for the view that in the first century imperial freedman officials at Rome also took over the function of letting out the contracts to farm the tariff regions; see again Cagnat, op.cit. p. 101; De Laet, Portorium, p. 374; Boulvert, EAI, p. 130.

47. CIL VI, 8451: Epaphra Aug. 1. Atticianus, whose freeborn children were Ti. Claudii.

48. Several inscriptions from Rome (CIL VI, 8450a - a Ti. Claudius Aug. /Lib./; 8450b; 772; 8515; 8450 - a T. Ael(ius) Augg. lib.) record imperial freedmen who were attached to the fiscus libertatis et peculiorum (including two tabularii - CIL VI, 772 and 8450a; a librari(ius) - 8450b; and two procurators - 8515 and 8450). It has been a widely accepted opinion that this chest was created to receive the revenues from the vicesima libertatis (see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 109; Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, p. 127; T. Frank, ESAR V, p. 41; De Laet, Portorium, p. 253, n. 3). But the term XX libertatis is not actually mentioned in the title of the chest; cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 132, who observes here that the occurrence of the word libertatis in the title of the chest does not demonstrate any connection with the tax on manumissions. Since the term peculiorum occurs together with libertatis in the title, it seems far more likely, as Jones argues (Studies, p. 109), that the chest was established to receive the revenues derived from the property, or peculium, of imperial slaves or childless freedmen.
(which was claimed by the fiscus on their death - see Suet., Vesp. 23, 1), plus the sums with which imperial slaves purchased their liberty. Hirschfeld (p. 109, n. 1) considers that the chest was not only for the vic. lib., but was also a fund for the peculia of deceased slaves. But it is most unlikely that two such different categories of revenue - the first a publicum, and the second consisting of "the emperor's profits arising from his familia" (Jones, loc. cit.) - were managed together.

49. This interpretation is suggested by Boulvert, EAI, p. 133. He considers that the revenues collected from the vic. lib. in Rome and Italy continued to go to the aerarium Saturni. On the other hand, he agrees with De Laet (Portorium, p. 253, n. 3) that the revenues of the four publica of Africa (the vic. hered., the vic. lib., the quinta et vicesima mancipiorum, as well as the portorium) came under the control of the fiscus (EAI, p. 128, n. 237; p. 136, n. 293). While De Laet believes that the vic. hered. fed the aerarium militare (loc. cit.), he emphasizes that this treasury was also dependent on the emperor. But once the emperor began to appoint praefecti to the aerarium Saturni (under Nero; see Tacitus, Ann. 13, 28-29), the same might be said of the central public treasury, too (cf. ch. 6, p. 96, below). Moreover, the fact that the revenues of the quattuor publica Africae did not all go to the same chest weakens De Laet's thesis (cf. Portorium, p. 364) that the revenues of a tariff region must have gone to a single treasury.

50. CIL VI, 915, erected in A.D. 43/44, contains a dedication to the emperor Claudius by the publici XX libertatis et XXV venal(ium). Rostovtzeff (DE art. conductor, p. 582, citing Cagnat, Impôts indirects, p. 234) remarks that it was probably convenient to unify two such analogous imposts, rather than create a special administration for the new XXV venal. et mancipiorum. Moreover, Dio (55, 31, 4 and 26, 5) implies that this tax, like the vic. lib., went to the aerarium; it was used partly to defray the cost of maintaining the vigiles, who in Dio's time received their salaries from the public treasury (cf. Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 96). Tacitus records that under Nero: "vectigal quintae et vicesimae venalium mancipiorum remissum" (Ann. 13, 31); but he remarks that its removal was a fiction, since the tax was shifted to the dealers who increased their prices accordingly. Therefore, what resulted from this reform appears to have amounted only to a change in the system of exacting it. In subsequent times, there seems to be no testimony at all concerning this impost; cf. Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 96.

51. Hirschfeld (KV 3, p. 94) cites one imperial freedman whom he associates with the tax: a certain Firmus Narcissianus, a T. Flavius Aug. lib., who is called a relator auctionum (CIL VI, 9035; 9035a). In Suetonius, Gaius 16, 3, the tax (which
had been reduced by half under Tiberius - see Tac., Ann. 2, 42) is termed the ducentesima auctionum. Thus it is possible, though by no means certain, that the freedman in question had some connection with this revenue. Hirschfeld (loc. cit.) suggests that his function was to supervise the collection of the tax; but his post may have been connected only with sales held by the emperor. The appearance of this freedman, then, is hardly a sufficient indication that an imperial administrative organization had been established to supervise the exaction of the centesima rerum venalium. On the system of collection employed for this tax, see again DE art. conductor, p. 582; Hirschfeld, loc. cit.; Cagnat, Impôts indirects, p. 232.

52. Suetonius, Gaius 16, 3: "ducentesimam auctionum Italiae remisit"; cf. Dio, 59, 9, 6 ("καὶ τὸ τέλος τῆς ἑκατοστῆς κατέλυσε"). Also see Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC I, p. 118: coins of A.D. 39-41 bear the inscription "r cc" (i.e. "remissa ducentesima").

53. See again Suetonius, Gaius, 16, 3.

54. CIL VI, 8443.

55. Several scholars would go further than this. They argue that the appearance of this procurator was associated with a more sweeping reform, which they attribute to Claudius: that is, the transfer of the revenues of the vic. hered. from the aerarium militare to the fiscus; see e.g. T. Frank, ESAR V, p. 41; V. Scramuzza, The Emperor Claudius, p. 123.

Rostovtzeff, DE art. conductor, p. 582, believes that in contrast to the other vectigalia the vic. hered. was not strictly a publicum, as there is no record of any socii who farmed it. Rostovtzeff regards Pliny the Younger's statement that publicani farmed the vic. hered. (Pan. 37, 6) as an inexact use of the term "publicani". Rostovtzeff believes that in place of farming the tax to the societates, a system midway between farming out and direct collection had been created, by which contractors were placed under the strict supervision of imperial procurators. In this connection, he cites CIL VI, 8443.

Rostovtzeff's conclusion is criticised by De Laet, who, in his "Note sur l'Organisation et la Nature de la vigesima hereditatium", AC (1947), p. 31, cites an inscription from Falerii in Italy, which mentions a procurator publici XX hereditatum Italiam (CIL XI, 7487). The title proc. XX hereditatium Italiae suggests that the inscription belongs to a period prior to Hadrian, since after his reign Italy was divided

It is very unlikely, also, that the appearance of an imperial procurator of the vic. hered., means that the revenues of this tax had been transferred to the fiscus. If the aerarium militare had been deprived of a significant proportion of its regular income in the first century, it is difficult to understand why it was not abolished then. But, in fact, the aerarium militare is known to have existed as late as Severus Alexander; see RE art. aerarium, col. 673; cf. Dio, 55, 25, 2-3, who states that in his own day the senatorial praefecti of this treasury were chosen by the emperor.

Boulvert (EAI, p. 133) considers that we may conclude from CIL VI, 8443 that the vic. hered. had its own personnel of imperial agents under Claudius, although he believes that the revenues from the tax still went to the aerarium militare. He suggests that the function of this procurator was to assist the praefecti of the military treasury in concluding the contracts with the tax farmers, as well as exercising supervision over the activities of the latter. Since the procuratorship in question was a provincial one, he would presumably have had relations only with the tax farmers who collected the vic. hered. in the territory under his supervision. On the other hand, it seems quite likely that one aspect of his function was to keep the accounts and records relating to the collection of the tax in his area, and he may have forwarded these to the praefecti (and perhaps the emperor’s a rationibus) in Rome.

56. Boulvert, EAI, pp. 133-134, looks at the question of whether the procuratorship of the vic. hered. attested for Achaia in CIL VI, 8443 was exceptional, or whether some areas of the Empire were already divided into special tax districts for the collection of the vic. hered., as was the case later in the second century (cf. below p. 60). Boulvert points to what he defines as a special characteristic of the administration of this tax: namely, the appearance of freedman procurators who did not have the same territorial competence as the equestrian procurators, who in some cases administered areas including several provinces (see e.g. Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1074: the procurators ad vectigal XX hereditatium per Asiam Lyciam Pamphyliam Phrygian Galatiam Insulas Cyclades, of whom the earliest attested held office in the second half of the second century). Therefore, the freedman agents evidently served as subordinates to the equestrian officials, administering sections of these large districts. A bi-lingual inscription from Patara in Lycia (CIL
III, 14180 = IGRP III, 676) attests a freedman of the emperor Antoninus Pius who was attached to the administration of the vic. hered. for the regio Lyciaca. Boulvert (p. 134) would restore his Latin title as subprocurator, rather than vice proc. XX her., as it is given in CIL (also see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 102, n. 1). Boulvert also cites a bi-lingual inscription from Cos recording a freedman of Trajan, who was procurator of the vic. hered. for the region of Caria and the Cyclades; the reference he gives for this inscription is the Nuova Silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos (1925), n. 562.

From these later examples of freedmen officials, of the vic. hered., plus the evidence of CIL VI, 8443, Boulvert (loc. cit.) concludes that under Claudius freedman procurators were already appointed to supervise the collection of the vic. hered. in some provinces, or sections of provinces. Later, he argues, equestrian procurators of large territorial combinations were superimposed on them.

57. It is possible, as Boulvert argues (p. 135) that when equestrian officials of the vic. hered. were appointed in the second century to administer large areas comprising several provinces, they were in fact superimposed on an existing system of administration through imperial freedmen. But the evidence relating to freedman officials of the vic. hered. is generally much later than the Julio-Claudian period. In addition to Saturninus, who is recorded in CIL VI, 8443, Boulvert (p. 136, n. 291) refers, also, to an inscription from Ephesus (CIGr 2980), which records an "[...] ἐπίτροπο[ς] εἰκ[ο]στ[ῆς] καληρονομε[ῶν] (i.e. the vic. hered.) 'Ῥώμης Ἰταλίας'." Boulvert considers that there is nothing in the title of this official to show that he was an equestrian rather than a freedman, while his territorial competence (Rome and Italy) suggests a date prior to the division of Italy into regiones for the collection of the tax, in the second century (cf. above note 55). On the basis of this inscription, Boulvert (pp. 135-136) concludes that from Claudius' reign a single freedman procurator supervised the vic. hered. for all of Italy and Rome. There appears to be no indication in CIGr 2980, however, that the official in question can be dated to the Julio-Claudian period.

58. It is known, for example, that a Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. (Bucolas) held the post of procurator aquarum as late as Domitian's reign (see ILS 1567, note 2).


60. The earliest reference to a conductor of a portorium comes from the customs district of the ripa Thraciae in A.D. 100 (AE 1919, n. 10, line 67). The ripa Thraciae remained a separate customs district under Trajan, but was
probably united with the publicum portorii Illyrici in Hadrian's reign (see again AE 1940, p. 35; cf. AE 1934, n. 107, and AE 1928, n. 153: two inscriptions erected under Antoninus Pius by the conductor T. Julius Saturninus of the p(publicum) portorii Illyrici utriusque et ripae Thraciae).

The term conductor appears to have been used only in connection with the customs districts of Gaul, Illyricum and Africa, whereas the term promagister is attested for Sicily, and the customs district of Asia. The latter term was borrowed from the terminology of the old societates, but in the second century it became synonymous with conductor; see De Laet, Portorium, pp. 387-388. For Sicily, a promagister (Δρυμωνις) portuum provinciae Siciliae is attested before A.D. 104 (CIL III, 6065; 141954, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). He then proceeded to an official equestrian career. De Laet (p. 401-402) argues that it was usual for members of the equestrian order to have a public career, so that it is not surprising to find that equestrian conductores held official posts either before, during, or after their contract to farm the portorium. He denies that the conductores can be regarded as "semi-officials", as they were described by Rostovtzeff ("Staatspacht", Philologus Suppl. IX, p. 397). De Laet (p. 402) emphasizes that the conductores were not officials, as they entered into a real contract with the state to farm the publica, and cites how Fronto (ad M. Caes. 5, 34) writes of Saenius Pompeianus, a conductor of the III p(publica) Afr(icae) (cf. CIL VI, 3588): "in plurumis causis a me defensus, postquam publicum Africam redemit, plurimis causis rem familiarem nostram adiuvat". Also see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 84, on the status of the conductores and promagistri: he seems, however, to favour the viewpoint of Rostovtzeff.

That the conductores were supervised to some extent by imperial officials is also indicated by Fronto, who speaks of Saenius Pompeianus (see above) submitting his accounts to the emperor, that is, presumably to the imperial administration in Africa (ad M. Caes. 5, 34).

61. Cf. above p. 53: two of these freedmen officials should probably both be dated to the first century; but the other officials attested could be later.

62. Also, a freedman of M. Aurelius and L. Verus is attested, who seems to have held the post of commentariensis XXXX Gall(iarum) at Rome (ILS 1560: "../ Aur. Fa[ustino] Augusto/[rum liber] to commentar[i] en/si XXXX Gall(iarum), item urbis albei/ Tiberis ..."; Dessau remarks: "commentariense fuisse Faustinum etiam in urbe Roma in officio curatoris alvei Tiberis videtur indicari"). De Laet (p. 389, n. 2) interprets this inscription as indicating that certain branches of the
imperial administration of the customs districts, concerned with the keeping of accounts and records, were retained in the capital. But possibly this was always the principal function of the bureaux at Rome. The "statio Anto\_nini/ / Aug. n. XXXX G\_alliar.\_ / et Hispaniar\_um\_ hic", attested at Ostia (CIL XIV, 4708; AE 1924, n. 110), may, on the other hand, have served as a collection bureau at which the merchandise coming to Italy by sea from Gaul and Spain was taxed.


De Laet (Portorium, p. 390, with n. 3) dates the inscription to the early second century. He considers that the function of this and similar freedmen officials was to assist the equestrian procurators of the tariff regions, who were appointed in the second century to supervise the conductores. But in view of the fact a C[audia] Aug. 1. is also mentioned in the inscription, a date in the Flavian period (which was earlier favoured by Cagnat, Imp\_ots indirects, p. 90) seems more likely for CIL V, 7209.

Again, CIL VIII, 12656 (from Carthage) records a dedication to a Flavia Aug. lib. by an Aug. ser. IIII p. A., and a T. Flavius Aug. lib. is recorded as a procurator of the quattuor publica Africae (AE 1949, n. 109). These officials, also, may have held their posts before the end of the first century. It is, however, possible that a freedman of the Flavians (who could, after all, have been manumitted at the end of Domitian's reign) held the senior office of procurator under Trajan, to which reign Boulvert (EAI, p. 279, n. 106) dates the freedman procurator of the quattuor publica Africae. CIL VIII, 12655 (from Carthage), which reads: "dis manibus sacrum./ M. M. Coccei Verecundus/ et Verus Pythagorae Aug./ lib. proc. IIII p. A./ bene merenti/ H. s. e."., does not, as De Laet thinks (p. 373, n. 3), record two freedmen of Nerva as dual procurators, but one procurator only: Pythagoras Aug. lib. The Coccei who dedicated the inscription were not freedmen of Nerva, though they were perhaps sons of freedmen; cf. Boulvert, p. 279, n. 107. Therefore, this inscription is probably not earlier than the reign of Hadrian, and is quite possibly later.

64. CIL VI, 8443.

66. He was Ti. Claudius Pollio (CIL VI, 31032): this was the final office recorded in his cursus, and thanks to Pliny the Younger (Ep. 7, 31), we can date the beginning of his career to 81 or 82, since Pliny states that he and Pollio did their military service together, probably already under Domitian (cf. CIL V, 5262, for Pliny's career). But the procuratorship of the XX hered. must have been held prior to 96, as Pliny also mentions an honorific post (as assistant to a senator on Nerva's land commission), which came after Pollio's promotion "ad amplissimas procurationes".

67. Boulvert, EAI, pp. 257-258, dates the establishment of the bureau at Rome under Domitian, also.

68. Pliny, Pan. 37; 39.

69. AE (1926), n. 164; Reynolds and Ward Perkins, Inscriptiones of Roman Tripolitania, p. 93, n. 302; cf. note 21, above: "... imus/ Traiani Aug./ ser. Priscil/lanus vil(icus)/ marit/imus) et XX/ hered. Lepci/is/ Magn. d. d.". On the basis of this reconstruction of the text, therefore, the vilicus (Priscillanus) appears to have collected a sea duty as well as the inheritance tax; see again De Laet, A.C. (1953), pp. 98-102.

70. On the evidence of AE (1926), n. 164, it seems certain that the societates had been eliminated from the collection of the quattuor publica Africae in Trajan's reign. However, conductores are known to have collected the publica towards the middle of the second century and under Antoninus Pius (CIL VIII, 997; PIR II, p. 204, n. 304 - T. Julius Perseus, towards the mid second century; CIL VI, 8588 - Q. Saenius Pompeianus, under Antoninus Pius). Direct collection of the tax through imperial agents seems to have been reintroduced under Marcus Aurelius or Commodus; see again De Laet, A.C. (1953), pp. 98-102, on an inscription of an imperial vilicus Lepcis Mag(nae) terrestris, and slave of the vectigal III p. A. (Reynolds and Ward Perkins, Inscriptiones of Roman Tripolitania 1952, p. 96, n. 315a).

71. See AE (1915), n. 58: M. Aemilius Bassus, proc. Imperatoris Hadriani ad XXXX Galliarum; cf. Pflaum, Carrières, n. 103. On the removal of the conductores in this customs district, see De Laet, Portorium, p. 410ff. Also see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 195, pp. 534-535, on a fragmentary inscription (CIL XIV, 289, c = VI, 31871) which appears to record a /proc. XXXX/ Galliar(um), whose previous post was held in connection with one of the Germanic wars of M. Aurelius. The place of the procuratorship in this official's career would indicate that it carried a higher salary than previous procuratorships of the quadragesima Galliarum, and the increase in salary probably accompanied the introduction
of direct collection of the duty by officials (Pflaum, p. 535, note 13).

In Africa, the equestrian T. Eppius Latinus was procurator of the quattuor publica under Hadrian; see CIL III, 3925: cf. Pflaum, Carrières, n. 115. On the probable date of the permanent change to a system of direct collection through imperial agents in this tariff region see again note 70, above.

72. The collection of the publicum portorii Illyrici (which was probably unified with the ripa Thraciae under Hadrian - cf. note 60, above) was associated with the praefectura vehiculorum under Antoninus Pius; see AE (1940) p. 35. The earliest recorded equestrian procurator vectigalis Illyrici comes from Commodus' reign; see CIL III, 8042.

73. See Boulvert, EAI, p. 281. Later, under the Severans, Bithynia and Asia were unified to form a single customs district, and at the end of Septimius Severus' reign a procurator portuum Asiae et Bithyniae (L. Titinius Clodianus) is attested; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 331 bis; cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 321.

No procurators of the quinquagesima Hispaniarum are recorded. Since all the collection bureaux, with the exception of a statio at Ostia in the mid second century, were located in the province of Baetica (see De Laet, Portorium, pp. 286-291), supervision over the collection of this duty was probably entrusted to the ordinary provincial officials in Baetica; cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 322; De Laet, Portorium, p. 288 and n. 3.

74. An equestrian with the title of pro magistro XX hereditatium is first attested at the beginning of Hadrian's reign (Q. Plotius Maximus Trebellius Pelidianus - CIL IX, 5835); see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 152. He and later pro magistri exercised their function in the capital (see Pflaum, p. 1027; Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 103). The pro magistri XX hereditatium (by contrast with the conductores and promagistri who collected the portoria in the second century - cf. above, note 60) appear to have been imperial functionaries. Pliny the Younger (Pan. 37, 39; Ep. 7, 14) still writes of publicani collecting the vicesima hereditatium; but some steps towards implementing a system of direct collection through officials seem to have been taken under Trajan (see again AE 1926, n.164, discussed by De Laet, A.C., 1953, pp. 98-102; cf. note 70, above). The date of the pro magister Q. Plotius Maximus Trebellius Pelidianus (CIL IX, 5835; Pflaum, n. 152) early in Hadrian's reign, perhaps indicates that this office was introduced prior to Hadrian. In A.C. (1947), p. 32, n. 57,
De Laet argues that the change-over to a system of direct collection for the vice sima hereditatium took place prior to Hadrian's reign (cf., however, Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 100, who places the change-over under Hadrian).

It might be noted that both Nerva and Trajan granted exemptions in certain cases from the vice sima hereditatium (Pliny, Pan. 38-40). Trajan's concern for a more equitable imposition of the tax (for which he is praised by Pliny), perhaps led him to introduce a system of direct collection, partly to ensure that the tax was also exacted less harshly.

75. Cagnat, Impôts indirects, pp. 195-196, thought that there were in fact two bureaux for the vice sima hereditatium at Rome: one for the collection of the tax in Rome (directed by the procurator), and a second (under the magister), which directed the administration of the tax. Then, in the third century, according to Cagnat (p. 196), the two functions were unified (citing CIL XIII, 1807: a proc. in urbe mag. XX her., towards A.D. 224 - see Pflaum, n. 317). But as Boulvert observes (EAI, p. 277), only the one statio appears to be attested at Rome at any stage.

76. CIL VI, 8446: "d. m. M. Ulpio Cadmo Aug. lib./ qui fuit princeps tabularius/ in stacione XX hereditatium". Another freedman of Trajan is recorded at Tarraco (CIL II, 3235) as having held the post of tabularius XX hereditatium, and the posts of tabularius of the provinces of Lugdunensis, Aquitanica and Lusitania - the first post may have been at Rome.

77. CIL VI, 8448: a freedman of Hadrian who was a praepositus tabellarum XX hereditatium; CIL VI, 8445: a freedman of M. Aurelius, who is recorded as praepositus tabellariorum stationis XX hereditatium. The equestrian procurator was also assisted by a freedman procurator: CIL VI, 5554 attests a freedman of Antoninus Pius (T. Aelius Aug. lib. Agathopus) as proc. XX hereditatium.

78. The dispensator, recorded in CIL VI, 8475, makes a dedication to a T. Flavius Apollonius, who was an adiut( or) tabul(arii) XX heredit( atium); CIL VI, 8444, is given as Caes. ser., which is the characteristic form for the
Flavian period to Trajan's reign; see Weaver, CQ (1964), p. 139. But a date under Trajan, or a little later, would be possible for this inscription.

79. The earliest reference to the statio XX hereditatium seems to be CIL VI, 8446 (cf. note 76, above).

80. See again note 55, above.

81. Cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 133, who also considers that the aerarium militare continued to receive the revenues from the vicesima hereditatium, although he concludes that the new procurator appointed by Domitian took over responsibility for the collection of the tax from the senatorial praefecti of the military chest (p. 258).

82. See Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 101, n. 4, for a list of these territorial divisions (also see Boulvert, EAI, p. 287, n. 158). The earliest recorded equestrian procurators of this category are L. Faesellius Sabinianus, between A.D. 138 and 161 (CIL XI, 378; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 153), who was a proc. XX hereditatium regionis Campaniae Apuliae Calabriae; T. Flavius Germanus, towards A.D. 160-161 (CIL XIV, 2922; see Pflaum, n. 183); proc. XX hereditatium Umbriae Tusciae Piceni regionis Campaniae.

83. See Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 102, n. 1 (also Boulvert EAI, p. 287, n. 158); cf. note 56, above. Among the earliest of these equestrian officials attested are: C. Julius Celsus, towards A.D. 125-135 (CIL XIII, 1808; see Pflaum, n. 106 bis), and M. Statius Priscus Licinius Italicus, towards 140 (CIL VI, 1523; see Pflaum, n. 136), who both held the post of proc. XX hereditatium per provincias Narbonensem et Aquitanicam. An equestrian proc. XX her. per Hispaniam citeriorem (P. Cominius Clemens, CIL V, 8659; see Pflaum, n. 184) is attested towards A.D. 169, and a proc. XX her. per Hispanias Baeticam et Lusitaniam (P. Magnus Rufus Magonianus, CIL II, 2029; Pflaum, n. 236) between 180 and 198; again, a proc. XX hereditatium per Gallias Lugdunensem et Belgicam et utramque Germaniam (T. Cl(audius) Candidus, CIL II, 4114; Pflaum, n. 203) is recorded towards 182, and a proc. ad vectigal XX hereditatium per Asiam Lyciam Pamphyliam (C. Valerius Fuscus, CIL VI, 1633; Pflaum, n. 280) towards 181. This last official had previously been proc. XX hereditatium per Syriae towards 172 (see again Pflaum, n. 280), while an official with the title of proc. XX hereditatium provinciae Syriae Palaestinae (T. Flavius Priscus C. Gallonius Fronto Q. Marcius Turbo, AE 1931, n. 35; 1946, 113; see Pflaum, n. 157 bis) is recorded earlier towards 145.
For the second century, the following officials are attested: M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Stephanus, proc. XX her. regionis Kariae et insularum Cycladum (cf. note 56, above; the inscription is quoted by Boulvert from the Nuova epigrafica di Rodi et Cos 1925, n. 562); a freedman of Antoninus Pius, who was subprocurator of the inheritance tax for the region of Lycia (CIL III, 14180 = IGRP III, 676; cf. note 56, above); Hermes, Augustor(um) n(ostrorum) lib., subproc. XX hereditatis, at the earliest under Marcus Aurelius (CIL III, 14199, 5) - since the inscription comes from Cos, this freedman presumably directed that district (see Boulvert, p. 288, n. 165). From Hispания citerior, a freedman under Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta (Aurelius Successus Auggg. lib.) is attested as subproc. XX her. (AE 1928, n. 199, from Tarraco); and the existence of administrative subdivisions for Baetica and Lusitania (see note 83, above) is perhaps indicated by the presence of a freedman subproc. XX (hereditatum), who is recorded at Emerita (CIL II, 487: Hypaticus Augustor(um) - at the earliest under Marcus Aurelius).

In addition, the post of a freedman of L. Verus can perhaps be restored as proc. XX [hereditatium] (CIL III, 4827); his inscription comes from Virunum in Noricum, which would indicate the existence of an administrative division for the tax which had its centre in that town (see Boulvert p. 288, n. 161). Tabularii and a commentarii are also attested in the administrative regions for the vicesima hereditatium: a freedman of Hadrian who was tabul(arius) XX her. Aemiliae Liguriae Transpadanae (CIL XI, 1222, from Placentia); Hilarus, collibertus of an imperial freedman, who was tabul(arius) XX her. provinciae Lusitaniae (CIL II, 4184, from Tarraco); ἁποκρατίων Σεβ(αστού) ἀπαλαζηρός ἀπὸ παραλιῶν κομμ(ενταρσων) εἰκοστῆς κλετονι(ῶν) ἐπαρχεῖον ["Ασίας] ..., recorded at Ephesus (AE 1924, 83). Boulvert considers that the presence of special tabularii of the vicesima hereditatium is also indicated for Egypt, since in a papyrus of A.D. 237 (P. Oxy. 1114) a certain Ivivilinus Aug. lib., a tabularius, intervenes in a professio of succession ab intestat brought before the administration of the vicesima hereditatium; Boulvert also identifies a certain Aelius Epaphroditus, an imperial freedman mentioned in the P. Ross. Georg. II, 26 (dated 160), to whom the task of opening the testaments is entrusted, as a tabularius (EAI, p. 289, n. 168). A freedman of Hadrian is recorded at Tarraco (AE 1932, n. 85) as a comment(arius) XX hereditatium (provinciae) Hispaniae citerioris; and the same post is again recorded at Tarraco (CIL II, 4184), held by a certain Felix Aug. lib. Finally, an inscription recorded at Messana, is dedicated: "dis manibus/ Epitynychani Caes./ n. ser. Candidian./ qui exiebat in officio/ Asiae ark(arius) XX hered". (CIL X, 6977 - Mommsen observes: "mortuus est Epitynychani iter faciens in Asiae, ut ubi munero suo fungeretur"). The appointment of this official points to the existence of a special branch treasury
for the revenues of the tax collected in Asia. In addition to
the officials cited above (note 63) tabularii attached to the
customs districts and the quattuor publica Africai are attested,
also. Judging from the provenance of their inscriptions they
served in the regional centres of these districts. The
following seem to date from the second half of the second
century: Festus Aug. lib., tabularius XXXX Galliarum, from
Lugdunum (CIL XIII, 1814); Festus Aug. nn., tabularius
vectigalis Illyrici, from Poetovio (AE 1938, n. 154). CIL III,
4063, also from Poetovio, is probably no earlier than the middle
of the second century, either, on the basis of the term tabularius
vectigalis Illyrici (Felicianus Aug. lib.); the term vectigalis
Illyrici became current only in the latter part of the second
century (cf. De Laet, Portorium, p. 408). Also, Quinctius
Aug. lib., tabularius XXXX Galliarum, from Lugdunum (CIL
XIII, 1817), has been dated to the second half of the second
century, but only on the dubious criteria that his wife's name
was Aurelia.

85. Cf. note 50, above.

86. Cf. p. 55, with n. 51, above.

87. Cf. again, p. 55, above.

88. See Boulvert, EAI, p. 257, n. 419; cf. Hirschfeld,
KV³, p. 94 (see note 51, above).

89. Only two equestrian procurators of the tax seem
to be recorded: a certain Lollianus (CIL XIV, 5334,) and
P. Vibidius Atticus (CIL XI, 1308). Both these posts were
held at Rome, and both are dated towards the end of the second
century; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 240, and p. 1034. At
least one freedman procurator of the tax is recorded: a
certain Marianus, Aug. lib., p(rae) p(ositus) XX lib. Bithyn(iae)
Ponti Paflag(oniae) (CIL III, 6753). Hirschfeld comments on the
reconstruction of p. p.: "schwerlich pr(ocurator), wie einige
gesehen haben, die Abkürzung wäre irregulär" (KV³, p. 109,
n. 1). CIL III, 4827, which records Buranus, a freedman of
L. Verus, who was a proc. XX /.../ is usually restored as
XX/lib./. Boulvert, EAI, p. 288, n. 161, restores it as
XX/her./, on the grounds that no administrative organization
for the vic. lib. is attested under L. Verus and M. Aurelius.
But Boulvert's alternative reconstruction of the text seems
unnecessary, as Buranus could have held this procuratorship
as late as the end of the second century, when an equestrian
procurator of the tax is already known.

90. Cf. above, pp. 57-58.
91. Cf. note 70, above.

92. Under Antoninus Pius, the conductores of the quattuor publica Africae were obliged to submit their accounts to the imperial administration (Fronto, ad M. Caes. 5, 34).

93. Moreover, as one of the publica of Africa was the vicesima hereditatum, which fed the aerarium militare, it seems probable that the other three, including the portorium, continued to be accountable to the aerarium Saturni, though the disposal of these revenues was now supervised by imperial officials.
CHAPTER 4 - FOOTNOTES

1. Cic., ad Att., 4. 1. 6-7; Plutarch, Pompey, ch. 49; cf. Dio, 39, 9.


3. Cicero, ad Att. 15. 9. 1.


Also, in 28 B.C. (see Dio, 53, 2, 1) and 23 B.C. (see R.G. 151), Augustus made free distributions of grain to supplement the regular public distributions.

5. Dio, 54, 1, 4: "... καὶ ἐπιμεληθὼν τοῦ σίτου, καθάπερ ποτὲ τὸν Πομπήλαν, γενέσθαι".

6. R.G. 5, 2: "curationem annon[a], quam ita admin[ist] rau, ut intra/ [die] s [pauco] s metu et periculo pr[aesen] t μιντατεμ uniuersam liberarem/ impensa et cura mea". (The text of the Res Gestae used throughout this chapter is J. Gage's edition, Paris, 1935). The pressure on Augustus to accept the office of dictator seems to be connected with this food-supply crisis (Dio, 54, 1, 3; R.G. 5, 1).

7. Dio, 54, 1, 4: "καὶ ἔκλεευε δύο ἄνδρας τῶν πρὸ πέντε που ἀεί ἐτῶν ἔστρατηγικῶν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ σίτου διανομὴν κατ’ ἔτος αἰρεῖσθαι".


9. In a s.c. of 11 B.C., which is copied by Frontinus, de Ag. 100-101, these officials are referred to both as the praefecti frumento dando and the curatores frumenti. G.E.F. Chilver, "Princeps and Frumentationes", AJP (1949) p. 12, n. 6, remarks that such variation in the terminology of a legal document is surprising. He agrees, nevertheless, that both titles denote the same group of officials. One official who is recorded with the title of curator frumenti ex s.c. may have been a member of this board: "L. Memmius G. f. Gal., q(uaestor), tr(ibunus) pl(ebis), frumenti curator ex s.c., praef(ectus) leg(ionis) XXVI". (CIL VI, 1460). But Mommsen, Staatsrecht I, p. 672, n. 2, regards L. Memmius' curatorship as an extraordinary office held prior to the establishment of the board of praefecti frumenti dandi in 22 B.C. Also, on the grounds that a legio XXVI did not exist after Actium, Mommsen concludes that this official's posts must have been held shortly after Actium. Cardinali, DE art.
frumentatio, p. 249, takes this point into consideration, but considers it possible, nevertheless, that Memmius was among the new officials appointed from 22 B.C. on (as Van Berchem, op. cit., p. 69, n. 2, seems to conclude, also). Pflaum, "La chronologie de la carrière de L. Caesennius Sospes", Hist. 2 (1954), pp. 431-450 (table), makes Memmius pre-Augustan.

A list of the known praefecti frumenti dandi is furnished by Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 249-253; it is based largely on a list compiled by Cantarelli ("Le distribuzioni de grano in Roma", in the Bulletino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma XXIII, 1895, p. 217). More recently a revised and enlarged list of the praefecti was compiled by H.G. Pflaum, Hist. 2 (1954), pp. 431-450. Cardinali regards only two praefecti as probably Augustan in date (Q. Varius Geminus, recorded in CIL IX, 3306, and ... f. Ser(gia) Cascellius, CIL IX, 3666); Pflaum dates two more to Augustus (CIL VI, 1442 and 1466), whose dates Cardinali regarded as uncertain.

10. See de Aq. 100: "eos qui aquis publicis praessent, cum eius rei causa extra urbem essent, lictores binos et servos publicos ternos, architectos singulos et scribas, librarios, accensos praeconesque totidem habere, quot habent ei per quos frumentum plebei datur ...... utique quibus apparitoribus ex hoc senatus consulto curatoribus aquarum uti liceret, eos diebus decem proximis, quibus senatus consultum ... praetores aerarii mercedem cibaria, quanta praefecti frumento dando dare deferreque solent, annua darent et adtribuerent".

11. Cf. Van Berchem, op. cit., p. 69. It seems significant, also, that many of the inscriptions recording praefecti frumenti dandi have the formula ex s.c. after this title.

12. The appointment of new officials whose responsibility extended to all aspects of the annona (i.e. the importation of supplies, the control of the sale of grain from state-owned granaries, etc.), are not mentioned before A.D. 6 (cf. Dio, 55, 26, 2 - see below, note 18). Dio actually states that the appointment of the aediles cerialis continued into his own day (43, 51, 3). If this statement is correct, the function of these aediles must have become a minor or subsidiary one, once new arrangements for the administration of the annona were introduced later in Augustus' reign.

Mommsen, Staatsrecht II, p. 1041, with n. 3, argued that in 22 B.C. Augustus in fact assumed the cura annonae permanently. But Dio's comparison between the events of that year and the special commission held by Pompey (54, 1, 3), suggests that Augustus' commission was an
extraordinary one, too. Moreover, Augustus himself (R.G. 5) places great emphasis on the special circumstances leading to his acceptance of the commission, and also implies that his administration of it was directed chiefly at saving the city from famine. On this question see Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, p. 241, who rejects Mommsen's interpretation; also see Van Berchem, op.cit., p. 68.


The fact that each of the commissioners then serving was to nominate one ex-praetor of his choice each year, from whom four new commissioners were to be chosen to serve in succession, indicates that the commissioners who made the nominations served longer than a year. For Dio's statement here shows that the final selection of new officials was made from more than four nominees.

14. Dio, 55, 10, 1. A register of the citizens eligible to receive the dole was introduced during the late Republic; see Van Berchem, op.cit., pp. 20-21.

15. Suetonius, Aug. 40, 2: "Populi recensum vicatim egit, ac ne plebs frumentationum causa frequentius ab negotiis avocaretur, ter in annum quaternum mensium tesseras dare destinavit; sed desideranti consuetudinem veterem concessit rursus, ut sui cuiusque mensis acciperet". On the introduction of the monthly free distributions in the Republican period, see Van Berchem, pp. 15-16.

16. This is a point made by Chilver, AJP (1949), p. 18. The emphasis placed by some scholars on the senate's independent control over the free distributions (see Van Berchem, op.cit., p. 70; Boulvert, EAI, p. 53, p. 152) therefore seems unjustified.

17. In addition to the earlier subventions mentioned above (see notes 4 and 6), Augustus records that: "ab eo anno quo Cn. et P. Lentuli consules fuerunt (18 B.C.), cum [c]icerent/ uectigalia, tum centum millibus hominum tu[m p]uribus [mul] to fru/[me] ntarios et nummarios tributus ex horr[eo] et pat[r]i[monio] meo/ [edidi]." (R.G. 18). The passage suggests, then, that whenever the regular income of the state failed to balance its expenditure, Augustus made good the deficit with subsidies of grain from his private granary, and grants of money from his patrimonium.
The above reconstruction and interpretation of R.G. 18 is that of Gagé (Res gestae divi Augusti, pp. 105-106), and is also accepted by Brunt and Moore, in their edition of the text (1967). Rather different reconstructions and interpretations have been proposed, however. In the corresponding Greek text, which is almost complete, the phrase used for Augustus' contributions of grain and money is: "σωτηρίως καὶ ἀρχηγικάς συντάξεις", which seems to denote payment of tribute in kind and money. Mommsen, on the basis of the Greek version, restored the Latin text to read that Augustus sometimes came to the rescue of possessores who could not find the means to pay their tribute in kind or money to the aerarium (see his second edition of the Res Gestae, p. 76). Against this interpretation, there is the fact (emphasized by Gagé) that the R.G. is a record of Augustus' assistance to the Roman people, not the provincials. But the restoration of tributus nevertheless corresponds better to the term "συντάξεις", than that of "nummarias tesseras" which has also been suggested; although (see Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 243-244) this restoration would make R.G. 18 echo Suetonius' statement (Aug. 41, 2): "frumentum quoque in annona difficultatibus saepe levissimo, interdum nullo pretio viritim admensus est, tesserasque nummarias duplicavit". Van Berchem, on the other hand (op. cit., p. 106), argues that because Augustus, in R.G. 18, speaks of subsidies on behalf of "homines", not "cives", he could not be referring here to his generosity towards those already in receipt of the dole, which is already recorded in R.G. 15. Van Berchem concludes, therefore, that Augustus is recording his generosity to the non-citizens of Rome. Yet, in spite of the use of the term "homines", rather than "cives", R.G. 18 does appear to record subventions intended to compensate for the failure of the state to meet its regular commitments owing to a deficit in its income. Moreover, in R.G. 15, 4, the term "homines" appears to be used with reference to the Roman people in receipt of the dole (see note 20, below).


19. See Ann. 15, 18: Tacitus states here that in order to maintain public confidence in the face of an indecisive war with Parthia over Armenia (in A.D. 62): "Nero frumentum plebis vetustate corruptum in Tiberim iecit quo securitatem annonae sustenaret. Cuius pretio nihil additum est, quamvis ducentas ferme navis portu in ipso violentia tempestatis et centum alias Tiberi subvectas fortuitus ignis absumpisset". This passage indicates, therefore, that the frumentum plebis was not stored for free distribution, but for sale at a low rate.
from the public granaries; see the comments of H. Furneaux, The Annals of Tacitus, 2nd ed. (1907), vol. 2, p. 339, on this passage. Also see Ann. 2, 87.

20. See R.G. 15, 4: "consul ter/ tium decimum sexagenos denarios plebei quae frumentum publicum/ accipiebatur dedi; ea millia hominum paullo plura quam ducenta fuerunt". (2 B.C.); cf. Dio, 55, 10, 1: in this year, Augustus fixed the number of citizens to be supplied with grain at 200,000. On the frumentum publicum, also see the discussions of Van Berchem, op. cit., pp. 17-31, pp. 32-34; Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, p. 263; Rostovtzeff, RE art. frumentum, cols 180-181.

21. Dio 55, 26, 1: in consequence of the severe famine the gladiators, and the slaves who were for sale, were banished to a distance of one hundred miles. These expulsions are also mentioned by Suetonius, Aug. 42, 3.

22. Dio, 55, 26, 1: in consequence of the severe famine the gladiators, and the slaves who were for sale, were banished to a distance of one hundred miles. These expulsions are also mentioned by Suetonius, Aug. 42, 3.

23. See Van Berchem, op. cit., p. 68, on these officials. Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 240-241, argues that because of the extraordinary conditions of this period, the frumentationes were reunified (temporarily) with the annona as a whole under the charge of these magistrates. There is no direct evidence, however, that the appointment of the praefecti frumenti dandi was suspended at the time.


25. The date of the first appointment of a praefectus annonae is unknown; see De Ruggiero, DE art. annona, p. 476.

26. Ann. 1, 7; cf. Ann. 11, 31: Gaius Turranus, "rei frumentariae praefectus", is mentioned again, under A.D. 48, as being among the confidants of the emperor Claudius. He therefore held office over a long period, which
is confirmed, also, by Seneca. In an essay written in A.D. 49 to a new incumbent of the office, Pompeius Paulinus, Seneca indicates that Turranius had been retired from office under Gaius, but was later reappointed: "Turranius fuit exactae diligentiae senex, qui post annum nonagesimum, cum vacationem procurationis ab C. Caesare ultro accepisset, componi se in lecto et velut exanimem a circumstante familia plangi iussit.

Lugebat domus otium domini senis nec finivit ante tristitiam, quam labor illi suus restitutus est". (de brev. vitae 20).

The office of praefectus annonae was one of the highest in the equestrian cursus, perhaps originally higher in grade than the prefectship of Egypt: Turranius had been a praefectus Aegypti prior to his appointment as praefectus annonae; see Dessau, PIR III, p. 344, n. 296; DE art. annona, p. 479; Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 240, n. 2. Cf. Tac., Ann. 13, 22 and 14, 51: under Nero, Faenius Rufus was promoted from the office of praefectus annonae to that of praefectus praetorio.

27. Which is the view expressed by Van Berchem, op. cit., p. 70, and Boulvert, EAI p. 53 and p. 152; see note 16, above.

28. Cf. note 26, above. Tacitus mentions a Pompeius Paulinus who was governor of Lower Germany (Ann. 13, 53); under A.D. 62 he records that a Pompeius Paulinus was, with two other ex-consuls, appointed to control public expenditure (Ann. 15, 18). Pliny the Elder also mentions a Pompeius Paulinus who held high posts under Nero, and who was the son of an equestrian from Arelate, in Gaul (H.n. 33, 143). The Pompeius Paulinus who was a prominent figure under Nero was therefore the son of the praefectus annonae to whom Seneca's de brev. vitae is addressed. Seneca implies that Paulinus was fairly advanced in years when he held the praefectura annonae: "maior pars aetatis, certe melior rei publicae data sit" (18, 1). Seneca's wife Paulina (see Ann. 15, 60) was a close relative.

29. de brev. vitae 18, 3: "in officio amorem consequeris, in quo odium vitare difficile est; sed tamen, mihi crede, satius est vitae suae rationem quam frumenti publici nosse".

30. Seneca writes of the prefect's responsibility both for seeing that the required amount of grain safely reached the public granaries, and that this grain was kept in good condition while in storage: "simile tu putas esse,
utrum cures, ut incorruptum et a fraude advehentium et a neglegentia frumentum transfundatur in horrea, ne concepto umore vitetur et concalescat, ut mensuram pondusque respondeat, an ad haec sacra et sublima accedas ...".

31. See again Dio 55, 26, 2. In this case, due to the extreme shortage of grain, the officials in question were appointed to operate a system of rationing on the grain market which would not have been necessary in normal years. Still, the appropriate official to control the allocation of grain for sale would have been the praefectus annonae.

32. Cf. note 4, above: under Augustus Tiberius had gained experience and a good reputation for his handling of a serious grain shortage (in 24 B.C.).


34. Tac., Ann. 2, 87. The "negotiaores" mentioned in this passage were evidently importing grain for sales either on the open market, or to sell to the state granaries; c.f. note 39, below.


36. Suet., Gaius, 31; it is also alleged that in order to promote discord "inter plebeum et equitem" at the theatre, "decimas maturius dabat, ut equestria ab infimo quoque occuparentur". (Suet., Gaius, 26, 4). The term "decimas" seems to refer to the tickets which gained admittance to the frumentationes (cf. Suet., Aug. 41, 2); also see note on Gaius, 26, 4, in the Loeb ed. of Suetonius' Lives.

37. Seneca, de brev. vitae 18, 5.

38. Suet., Claud. 18, 1-2: "Urbis annonaeque curam sollicitissime semper egit ... ... ... artiore autem annona ob assiduas sterilitates detentus quondam medio Foro a turba convicisque et simul fragminibus panis ita infestatus, ut aegre nec nisi postico evadere in Palatium valuerit, nihil non excogitavit ad invehendos etiam tempore hiberno commeatatus".

39. Suet., Claud. 18, 2-19: "nam et negotiatoribus certa lucra proposuit suscepio in se damno, si cui quid per tempestatem accidisset, et naves mercaturae causa fabricantibus magna commoda constituit pro condicione cuiusque: civi vacationem legis Papiae Poppaeae, Latino ius Quiritium, feminis ius IIII liberorum; quae constitueta hodieque servatur". This legislation was afterwards supplemented by Nero, in A.D. 58 (see Tac., Ann. 13, 51).
40. See Suet., Claud. 20, 3. CIL XIV, 85 (A.D. 46) records the cutting of canals from the Tiber to the sea, and at the same time, through the provision of a secondary outlet to the sea, Claudius' efforts to save Rome from flooding: "Ti. Claudius Drusi f. Caesar/ Aug. Germanicus pontif. max./ trib. potest. VI cos. design. IIII imp. XII p. / fossis ductis a Tiberi operis portus[s] / caussa emissisque in mare urbern/ inundationis periculo liberavit". On the rebuilding of the harbour at Ostia, also see R. Meiggs, Roman Ostia (1960), p. 54.

41. See Suet., Claud. 24; cf. Dio, 60, 24, 3 (under A.D. 44): Claudius put the quaestors in charge of the public finances in place of governorships (ἐπὶ τῶν) in Italy outside Rome, for he abolished all the latter positions.

42. The first of these procurators appears to have been Claudius Optatus Aug. lib. (CIL XIV, 163).

43. Meiggs, R. Ostia, p. 55, considers that the procurator portus Ostiensis would have been responsible to the praefectus annonaes.

44. See Van Berchem, op.cit., pp. 73-74; Boulvert, EAI, pp. 151-152; Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 245-246; Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 236; Rostovtseff, RE art. frumentum, col. 177; T. Frank, ESAR V, p. 41. This view assumes, also, that the tribute in kind from all grain-producing provinces, together with the profits from the sales of grain from public granaries, were transferred to the fiscus as compensation for the expenditure now incurred by the emperor; see T. Frank and Van Berchem, loc.cit.; Boulvert, p. 152 (cf. p. 127) concludes that only the tribute in kind from the imperial provinces went to the fiscus under Claudius. In ch. 2, above, it was concluded that there is insufficient evidence to support the view that, in the period between Augustus and Trajan, any part of the provincial tribute became the property of the fiscus.

45. See above, pp. 65-66.

Cardinali, e.g. (DE art. frumentatio, p. 243) deduces from the absence of any reference to the frumentationes in the de brev. vitae of Seneca, that when the essay was written (A.D. 49) responsibility for the dole still remained under the charge of the senatorial cura frumenti dividundi. As Van Berchem (op.cit., p. 73) points out, however, Seneca's reference to Paulinus' supervision of the frumentum publicum denotes the grain intended for the dole; cf. p. 65, above.
46. See above pp. 63-64; also see p. 65, citing Suet., Aug. 42, 3 - after the severe famine of A.D. 6/7 Augustus actually considered abolishing the dole entirely. Claudius' concern for the frumentationes at the beginning of his reign is indicated by his issue of coins depicting a modius (i.e. a measure of grain) on the reverse; see RIC I, p. 130. This issue was presumably connected with his efforts to relieve the extreme shortage of grain in the city at the time of his accession (see again Seneca, de brev. vita 18, 5).

47. This theory was proposed because, on the basis of the known inscriptions recording praefecti frumenti dandi, it has been found difficult to securely date any of these officials after Tiberius, on the one hand, but before Nerva, on the other; see Cardinali, DE art. frumentatii, pp. 250-251. But in Pflaum's more recent table of the praefecti four are dated to Claudius' reign (CIL VI, 1557; III, 6072, IGR I, 431; AE 1925, n. 85); see Hist. (1954), pp. 431-450.

Van Berchem, op.cit., p. 78, claims that the cura was restored by Nerva on the basis of a coin issued under this emperor: i.e. a sestertius with the emperor's portrait on the obverse, and a modius on the reverse accompanied by the inscription "plebei urbane frumento constituto s.c." (RIC II, p. 229, p. 230). Van Berchem concludes that the coin records the senates' testimonial of gratitude for the emperor's restitution to it of a particularly honourable function. The formal issue of a coin by "s.c." does not, however, prove that it was expressing a genuinely senatorial sentiment. Thus also under Nerva we find the issue of sestertii inscribed "Annona Augusti s.c." (RIC II, p. 226). Therefore, contrary to Van Berchem's interpretation of the sestertius described above, it is just as likely that it commemorated a special distribution of grain by the emperor (as concluded by Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, pp. 229-230).

48. In his inscription (AE 1925, n. 85), the text was at first thought to read "pro praeef.": "M. Iul(io) ... f. Vol. Ro(mul)lo proc(os.) extra (sort)em prov(inciae) Macedoni(ae)/ legato (pro) (p)r. provin ... pro praeef(ecto)/ frumen(ti da)ndi ex s. c. (le)gato pro pr. / iterum (p ro) prov(inciae) As(sia)e praetori/ legato (divi C)laudii leg. (X)Apollinar. / adlecto (trib. p)lebis a divo Claudi(o)/ seviro eq(uitu)m Romanor. / equi p(ubl.) / ...... um trib. m(illitum) ... " Pflaum, however, following the reconstruction proposed by Groag and Vitucci, gives instead: "legato / pro p/r(aetore) provin/ciae Cy pro, praeef. frumen/da/ndi ex s. c." See "La chronologie de la carrière de L. Caesennius Sospes", Hist. 2 (1954), pp. 448-9. Chilver, AJP (1949), pp. 8-11, argues that although Claudius is known to have granted the tribuneship to certain equites as early as A.D. 42 (see Dio, 60, 11, 8), it is not certain that the men
created tribunes in 42 became permanent members of the senate: in that case, the more natural date for decisive adlection of an eques is the census year, 48. If Romulus was tribune for 48/9, it is only by holding his subsequent posts without intermission that he could have assumed the cura frumenti dividundi before the death of Claudius. Pflaum, however (Hist. 1954, pp. 449-450) considers that Romulus could have held his prefectship within Claudius' reign, and argues that most, if not all, this official's praetorian offices could have been held under this emperor. But he seems to have no new evidence to put against Vitucci's (and Chilver's) reasons for preferring to date Romulus' prefectship of the grain distributions under Nero.

49. Sospes' cursus is recorded in CIL III, 6818:
"... P(ublii) f. Stel(latina tribu) Sospes/ / ti fetiali, leg(ato) Aug(usti) / pro pr(aetore) provinc(iae) Gal(atae)/ Piscid(iae) Phryg(iae) Luc(aoniae); Isaur(iae)/ Paphlag(oniae) Ponti Galat(ici)/ Ponti Polemoniani/ Arm(eniae) leg(ato) leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae)/ donat(o) don(is) militari(bus)/ expedit(ione) Suebic(a) et Sarm(atica)/ cor(ona) mur(ali) cor(ona) vall(ari) cor(ona)/ aur(ear) hast(is) pur(is) trib(us) ve/xill(is) trib(us), curat(ori) colo/ni(a) et munici/pi(or)um), praef(ecto)/ frum(ent(i) dand(i) ex s.c., praetor(i)/ aed(illi) curul(i), quaestori Cret(ae) et C/yr(enarum)/ trib(unos) leg(ionis) XXII(1) Primigen(iae); III vir(o) a(uro) a(rgento) a(ere) f(lando) f(eriundo)/ Thiasus lib(ertus)".

A major difficulty in dating his career is that, on the one hand, the post of curator coloniarum et municipiorum was thought to have been instituted no earlier than Trajan, while, on the other hand, it has been argued that a major campaign against both the Sarmatae and the Suebi could only have been conducted by a legate of the XIII Gemina when that legion was stationed in Pannonia. After the conquest of Dacia this legion was withdrawn from Pannonia and became the permanent garrison of the new province (see Ritterling, RE XII, (col. 1717). Therefore, it has been concluded that Sospes took part in one of Domitian's campaigns on this front - either that of A.D. 92/3, or the fighting which coincided with the end of the Dacian wars in 88/9 (cf. ILS 2719: "bello Suebico item Sarmatico"; CIL XI, 5992: "bellum Germanicum et Sarmaticum"); see Chilver, AJP (1949), pp. 11-12. On this hypothesis Sospes' tenure of the prefectship of the grain distributions can also be dated under Domitian. The dating of Sospes' inscription, and the establishment of the office of curator coloniarum et municipiorum, in his reign was proposed earlier by St. Gsell, Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Domitien (1894), p. 145, p. 370. More recently, J.H. Oliver also placed Sospes' career under Domitian; see "The Ruling Power", Trans. Am. Philos. Soc., n.s. 43, pt. 4 (1953), p. 974, where he quotes other scholars, especially D. Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor (1950), n. 13, for pp. 1454-46.
50. Pflaum, Hist. (1954), p. 433, takes the year A.D. 97 as a terminus a quo for Sospes' inscription, as he considers that Van Berchem (op. cit., pp. 77-78) is correct in attributing the restoration of the cura frumenti dividendi to Nerva. Pflaum (p. 432) also accepts the conclusion of R.K. Sherk, The Legates of Galatia (The John Hopkins University Studies in Hist. and Polit. Sciences, LXIX, no. 2) (1953), pp. 87-90, that the mention of a praetorian legate of the province of Galatia and its adjacent territories must be dated before A.D. 72 or after 114, since during that period Galatia was being governed with Cappadocia as part of a single territorial complex. Therefore, Pflaum maintains that a new date must be found for the expeditio Suebica et Sarmatica in which Sospes commanded the legio XIII Gemina: the new date should not only be later than A.D. 97, but also A.D. 114, as Cappadocia is omitted from Sospes' title as governor of Galatia.

Galatia's separation from Cappadocia in 114 is shown by the governorship of L. Catilius Severus Julianus Claudius Reginus, leg. Aug. pro pr. prov. Cappadociae et Armeniae maioris et minoris (CIL X, 8291 = ILS 1041 add.). Pflaum admits to one difficulty in the way of his proposed new dating of Sospes' career: the fact that the territory of Armenia Minor (which is included in Sospes' title) seems to have been combined with Cappadocia, also in A.D. 114 (see again CIL X, 8291; Sherk, op. cit., pp. 63-64). But Pflaum thinks this problem is minimal, on the grounds that Trajan's administrative arrangements may not have survived under his successor. Pflaum then proceeds to identify Sospes' military campaign against the Suebi and Sarmatae with a war of this kind under Hadrian (citing HA, v. Hadr. 5, 2; 6, 7-8), during which the provinces of Pannonia and Dacia appear to have been placed temporarily under the command of the equestrian Marcius Turbo. Pflaum concludes, then, that if his hypothesis is correct, "il en résulte que Sospes a participé à cette guerre en qualité de légat de la legio XIII Gemina, corps de troups qui faisait partie de la garnison de la Dacie" (pp. 435-436).

51. Pflaum concedes that the previous dating of Sospes to Domitian's reign was supported by the omission of the emperor's name in the inscriptions of two officers known to have been decorated by Domitian, after the campaigns against the Sarmatians and Suebians which took place in his reign (p. 439). While this omission can be explained on the grounds that Domitian's memory was damned, it is difficult to explain the omission of Hadrian's name from the record of Sospes' military decorations. Pflaum argues, however, that against this difficulty with his own hypothesis, there are four difficulties to consider in dating Sospes under Domitian: the omission of Cappadocia in his title, the question of the existence of the praefecti frumenti dandi before 97, the mention of a
curatorship of the colonia and municipia prior to Trajan, and finally the disgrace of Sospes. This last factor, he believes, emerges not only from Sospes' family connections (p. 444), and evidence of imperial favour in the fact that his initial post consisted of membership of the vigintiviri (ordinarily reserved for the young members of patrician families, which Sospes was not), but also from his tenure of the prefectship of the grain distributions. Pflaum (with the help of his table of the known officials) is able to demonstrate that it was not normally an office held by members of the patrician families, who could look forward to more brilliant posts (p. 441). But if Pflaum is correct in suggesting that the emperors would not favour the candidature of members of the patriciate, because patrician families might use the office to build up their own clientele, this would imply that the prefecture of the grain distributions was a sensitive (if not prestigious) post. Therefore, it would seem unlikely that Nerva or Trajan would favour the candidature for the office of a senator whose Flavian connections gave rise to suspicion. The weakness of Pflaum's thesis in this respect removes one of the difficulties against the earlier date for Sospes. Another of the difficulties assumed by Pflaum is also negligible: as pointed out above (note 49) the evidence in favour of the restoration of the cura frumenti dividundi under Nerva is far from definite. Moreover, Pflaum is unable to find any praefecti who certainly held office under Nerva, or even early in Trajan's reign (see his table, no. 17: L. Acilius Rufus, CIL X, 7344, who would have held the office prior to his consulate in A.D. 107, is placed next after M. Iulius Romulus). Finally, the omission of Cappadocia in Sospes' title as legate of Galatia is balanced by Pflaum's difficulty due to the inclusion of Armenia.

52. Dio states that Nero abolished the free distributions in A.D. 64 (62, 18, 5 = Xiph. 166, 17-169: "καὶ τῶν Ἀμαζών ἄτοσαν τὸ σιτηρεύον παρεπάσατο "). Moreover if Pflaum (Hist. 1954, see table) is right in placing four praefecti under Claudius (which compares well with the five he dates to Tiberius' reign, and to Trajan's), it seems even more unlikely that Claudius was the emperor responsible for the suppression of the office.

53. See again Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 250-254; also Pflaum, Hist. (1954), pp. 431-450 (he identifies 23 praefecti whom he considers held office between Trajan and the end of Commodus' reign).

54. Hirschfeld, for example (KV³, p. 237) argues that the praefecti frumenti dandi in the second and third centuries only presided over extraordinary grain distributions. But there seems to be no evidence which would indicate that their function was not the same as earlier; cf. Van Berchem, op. cit., p. 77.
Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 248-249, argues that the continued existence of the praefecti indicates a "parallelismo diarchico del senato e del principe". A combination of imperial and senatorial control does not, however, point to the existence of a "dyarchy" (which implies dual, but separate control), but indicates the overlapping of "senatorial" and "imperial" spheres in the public administration (cf. ch. 2, above, esp. pp. 29-30). Similar examples of "dual" control in the other urban curae will be discussed in the following chapter.

55. See De Ruggiero, DE II, art. curator, p. 1326; Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 238.

56. CIL VI, 10223: "Ti. Claudius Aug. lib./Ianuarius curator/de Minucia die XIII/ostio XLII et/Avonia Tyche uxor eius/pituaniani solaria de sua/impesa (sic)///fecerunt".

57. In rejecting this view, Van Berchem (op. cit., p. 38) observes, firstly, that if this freedman had been a curator the conditions of his appointment - i.e. to carry out the functions of curator on the fourteenth day of each month at the forty-second arcade - were extraordinary (as Hirschfeld, p. 238, also observed, indeed). Secondly, the fact there were thirty days in each month, and that the porticus is known to have possessed forty-five arcades, would mean - if the older interpretation of CIL VI, 10223 is retained - that one thousand three hundred and fifty curators were employed to assist in the grain distributions. This would also seem an extraordinary situation. Thirdly, in all other cases, the term curator is followed by the genitive with respect to the cura held; or, exceptionally, by the use of the preposition a with the ablative (see DE art. curator, p. 1324). The reading curator de Minucia is therefore unsatisfactory. In his own reading of the text, Van Berchem links the word curator with the final formula of the inscription, instead of the line which follows it. He concludes that the author of the inscription wished to emphasize Ianuarius' citizenship by recording the day of the month on which he was registered to receive the dole at the porticus Minucia; cf. e.g. CIL VI, 10224: "frumentum accepit die X ostio XXXIX" (see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 238, n. 3). As a freedman, Ianuarius would not be able to indicate his Roman citizenship by reference to membership of a tribe. For the appointment of an imperial procurator at the porticus later under Trajan, see below p. 74

The estimated cost of the dole in the late Julio-Claudian period is based partly on the information of Pliny the Elder (H.n. 18, 89 and 90) that the average price of a modius of flour was 40 asses, which was equivalent to 2 modii of grain. If prices were the same as in the early Flavian period, the price of grain under Nero would therefore have amounted to 5 sestertii per modius. Following Augustus' reduction of the number of citizens in receipt of the dole to about 200, 000 in 2 B.C. (cf. Dio, 55, 10, 1 and R.G. 15, 4), the number of people eligible may have been reduced again. For it appears that Augustus' legacies to the Roman people (i.e. the "plebs frumentaria") reached only about 150, 000. This figure is reached on the basis of the information that 40 million sesterces was the sum left by Augustus to the people (cf. Suet., Aug. 101, 2 and Tac., Ann. 1, 8), and that from this legacy 65 denarii were distributed per head (see Dio, 57, 14, 2). If Nero's annual subsidy of 60, 000, 000 sesterces to the state was intended to cover the cost of the dole, this would imply that the number of citizens admitted to the frumentationes had again risen to 200, 000: that is, 5 modii of grain distributed monthly per head at a cost of 5 sestertces per modius = a cost of 300 sestertces per head per annum; 300 sestertces per head per annum x 200, 000 = 60, 000, 000 sestertces per annum.

Van Berchem (op. cit., p. 30) considers that after Augustus the number of recipients of the dole probably oscillated between 150, 000 and 200, 000; also see pp. 28-31 and pp. 85-88, for a discussion of the organization of the monthly distributions of 5 modii of grain, and estimates of the number of recipients of the dole in the first century and later; cf. J. Marquardt, L'Organisation financière chez les Romains (translated by A. Vigie, 1888), p. 140, pp. 147-149; Cardinali, DE art frumentatio, p. 138.

As Van Berchem also observes on this passage (op. cit., p. 74); he considers that this sum would have been paid into the fiscus (which in his definition of the term is equated with the public funds held by the emperor, in contrast to the funds drawn from his patrimonium). But it seems more straightforward to regard the term "res publica" used in this passage as denoting the treasury of the senate and Roman people, namely the aerarium Saturni. In contrast to Van Berchem, Cardinali (DE art. frumentatio, p. 249, pp. 245-246) sees the passage as indicating that, from Claudius' reign, the grain and money needed to maintain the frumentationes were remitted by the fiscus to the senate. In Van Berchem's view
on the other hand, Nero's subsidy points to a change in imperial policy, in so far as under Claudius (in his opinion) the plebs received their grain at the expense of the public funds held by the emperor, while Nero reduced the Roman populace to the status of clients by making them dependent on his largess.

61. It is true that in the first section of the passage (Ann. 15, 18, 1) Tacitus discusses Nero's policy with respect to the urban grain supply; but the reference to his annual subsidy comes in the context of senatorial affairs, and the appointment of a senatorial commission to investigate public spending ("vectigalibus publicis") in general. Boulvert (EAI, p. 156, n. 149) likewise concludes that there is no connection between Nero's subsidy and the expenditure of the frumentationes.

62. Tac., Ann. 15, 18, 1; cf. 2, 87. Tacitus' account points up the personal initiative of each emperor: Tiberius "statuit" what the price would be, and made it possible by the promise of a subsidy to dealers. In the later passage, Nero appears to be the initiator of all the financial action reported.


64. Tac., Ann. 15, 39, 2-3: here too Nero is represented as the initiator of all relief action. 3½ sestertii per modius was the regular price of grain in Cicero's time (see Verr. 3, 75, 174).

65. Dio, 62, 18, 5 (= Xiph. 166, 17-169).

66. Van Berchem, op.cit., p. 75, comments that Nero's action in suspending the free distributions is at first sight surprising in view of his reported popularity with the Roman populace. To reconcile this apparent contradiction, Van Berchem points to the complexity of the population of the capital, and argues that Nero's partisans were drawn from the lowest strata of the populace. Therefore, in 64, when there was threat of famine in the chaos which followed the fire, Nero strove to assist the whole of the population by lowering the price of grain, and by throwing on the market all the available reserves (see again Ann. 15, 39): the grain set aside for the dole was also utilised, and the citizens ceased to receive their free monthly ration. Van Berchem (p. 76) believes that it was only after Galba's accession that the frumentationes were restored. In this connection he cites a denarius of Galba, on the reverse of which appears the
inscription "Libertas p(opuli) R(omani)"; and the image of this goddess flanked by two spears of wheat (RIC I, p. 200). This coin appears to be the only issue on which this attribute is associated with Libertas, and so it may have commemorated the restoration of the citizens' right to receive the frumentatio.

Because of the slight evidence for the date of the re-establishment of the free distributions, it might be held instead that they were restored by Nero himself, once the emergency following the fire was over. Yet there is perhaps some grounds for accepting a distinction between Nero's popularity with the Roman masses, on the one hand, and the hostile attitude shown towards him by the plebs after his death, on the other; see Suet., Nero 57, 1; cf. Otho, 7 (here Otho is said to have been hailed as Nero "ab infima plebe").

67. It might be noted, too, that just as the populace looked to Augustus to rescue them from famine in 22 B.C. (Dio, 54, 1, 3-4), and, conversely, blamed Claudius when supplies were scarce (Suet., Claud. 18, 2), the people looked to Nero to guarantee their supplies. In 64 (just prior to the fire), the emperor had been considering embarking on his projected tour of the eastern provinces, but declared that he would yield to the people's appeals and remain in the capital. Tacitus comments on this: "haec atque talia plebei volentia fuere, voluptatem cupidine et, quae praecipua cura est, rei frumentariae angustias, si abesset, metuenti". (Ann. 15, 36).

68. See below, note 78, for the probable dates of his tenure of this office.

69. Statius, Silvae 3, 3 (= the Consolation addressed by Statius to Claudio Etruscus on his father's decease), line 100.

70. As concluded by Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, p. 245; Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 236; Van Berchem, op. cit., 72; Boulvert, EAI, p. 151.

The mention of the tribes was presumably a convenient way for the poet to indicate the citizen body of Rome. This allusion comes in the context of a list of other regular public expenditures (the armies, the aqueducts, the roads and other public works), which suggests that it was in fact a reference to the cost of the regular frumentationes, rather than expenditure on irregular imperial distributions of grain and money (congiaria) to the tribes.

71. Silv. 3, 3, lines 86-88.
72. Silv. 3, 3, lines 90-91.

73. As P.A. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 90, argues, it is too restrictive an interpretation to exclude the stipendium of Africa, and regard Statius' reference to the produce of the "African harvests" as indicating only the grain paid as rent by the tenants of imperial estates; this also applies to Statius' allusion to "all that is threshed on the floors of the sultry Nile". Cf. Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 237 with note 2; Mommsen, Staatsrecht² II, p. 1006.

74. At the end of Nero's reign, Egypt was capable of supplying enough grain to feed Rome for four months of the year, and Africa for eight months; see Josephus, B.1. 2, 383.

75. See again Seneca, de brev. vitae 19. Imperial granary officials are attested for the Julio-Claudian period: Calamus Ti. Claudii Caesaris Augusti Germanici Pamphilianus, who is recorded as a vilicus ex horreis Lollianis (CIL VI, 4226; 4226a); Philadelphus Neronis Caesar(is), who was employed ex horreis Petronian(is) (CIL VI, 3971). On the history of these horrea, see P. Romanelli, DE art. horrea, pp. 986-988. Imperial slaves described as horrearii, who were probably the lowest grade of imperial slaves attached to the granaries: Stephanus Caesar(is) hor(rearius) belongs to the Julio-Claudian period (CIL VI, 4240, from the Monumentum Liviae), and similar officials are found later at the horrei Galbani and horrei Nervae (CIL VI, 30855 - on which see Dessau's comments, ILS 1621; CIL VI, 8681). Also see Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 240, n. 1, on these granary officials.

76. See again Tac., Ann. 6, 13.

77. Suet., Aug. 101, 4 ("... tertio breviarium totius imperii, quantum militum sub signis ubique esset, quantum pecuniae in aerario et fiscis et vectigaliorum residuis. adiecit et libertorum servorumque nomina, a quibus ratio exigi posset").

78. It has been assumed (see Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, p. 245; Van Berchem, op. cit., p. 72) that the father of Claudius Etruscus had already been appointed under Nero, following the retirement of Pallas (Tac., Ann. 13, 14). But from P.R.C. Weaver's reconstruction of his career, it seems more likely that he was appointed a rationibus only after the accession of Vespasian; see "The Father of Claudius Etruscus: Statius, Silvae, 3, 3", CQ (1965), pp. 148-149. For a fuller discussion of this question, and Weaver's conclusions, see below, ch. 7, p. 112-114.

79. See Weaver, CQ (1965), p. 149.
80. See again note 75, above.

81. **CIL VI, 8470:** "Carpus Aug. lib. Pallantianus, adiutor Athenodori praefecti annonae"; **cf. VI, 143:** "Carpus Aug. lib. Pallantianus, sanctis draconibus d. d." Carpus and the prefect Claudius Athenodorus have been dated to Nero's reign on the basis of the dedication "sanctis draconibus" in VI, 143; according to Tacitus (Ann. 11, 11) a fable grew up that Nero had been watched over by serpents in his infancy.

82. **CIL XIV, 2833:** "dis manibus/ M. Antoni Pallantis l./Nobilis/Abascantus Aug. disp./ a frument(o) de suo fecit." (from the ager Praenestinus in Latium); **cf. VI, 8472 = XIV, 2834, also from Praeneste):"d. m./ Lauri/ Abascantus Caes. n./ ser. vern. disp. annonae/ pater et/ Carpime mater/ fil. dulcissimo". The Abascantus of these two inscriptions is unlikely to be one and the same person, however, since the slave status indication ("Caes. n. ser. vern.") indicates a date in the second century for the second inscription (see Weaver, CQ 1964, p. 137, p. 139).

But it is quite likely that the imperial bureau a frumento and that of the annona denote the same branch of administration (see Boulvert, EAI, p. 154). That there was some fluidity in the terminology used to refer to this sphere of administration is indicated by other inscriptions, too, (see below note 97, e.g.). Moreover, Tacitus calls Gaius Turranius praefectus annonae in Ann. 1, 11, but speaks of him as "rei frumentariae praefectus" in Ann. 11, 30.

83. **CIL VI, 8473:** the tabellarius, Festus Caes. n., makes the dedication to his wife, Flavia Cominia. But there is no evidence that the wife is an imperial freedwoman; hence a Flavian date cannot be definitely claimed.

84. **CIL XIV, 49.** Such a junior clerical post would presumably have been held soon after manumission.

85. Cf. notes 42 and 43 above; also see Meiggs, R. Ostia, p. 298ff.

86. **CIL XIV, 4482; portus Aug(usti) refers to Claudius' new harbour at Ostia (cf. Suet., Claud. 24).**

87. **CIL XIV, 4483 (from Porto, in Latium):**

88. **CIL VI, 8850, dedicated to Nitor, Domitiaes Aug(ustae), actor a frumento (VIX. ann. XXXV), by Lampyris. Domitiae Aug. lib.: this inscription most probably dates fromDomitian's reign, but could be later as Domitia lived on into Hadrian's reign (cf. above, ch.2, note 127).
89. CIL VI, 8852: [... Aug., a frumento, "sibi et Ulpiae et libertis"; VI, 8851: a P. Aelius (not stated to be a freedman), a frumento; VI, 33778: [ ... ] Augg. nn., a frumento.

In other inscriptions the existence of a department a frumento for the emperor's household staff is clearly indicated in the titles of the officials: see e.g. CIL VI, 8771, dedicated to P. Aelius Aug. lib., a frumento cubicul(ario rum); VI, 8872, dedicated to M. Ulpius Aug. lib., a frumento cubiculariorum; VI, 8924, dedicated to his wife Claudia by Chrysason Caes. n. ser., a frumento ministratorum (probably second century, also, on the basis of the slave status indication "Caes. n. ser." - see Weaver, CQ 1964, p. 139). On the officials a frumento see Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, pp. 262-263; also see Boulvert, EAI, pp. 154-155.

90. Sex. Attius Suburanus Aemilianus (AE 1939, n. 60); see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 56. A second adiutor praefecti annonae is recorded under Domitian (Pflaum, n. 52), and another towards A.D. 167 (Pflaum, n. 185).

91. The fact that the prefect's name is given in the adiutor's title indicates that the latter was the personal assistant of the former; cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 257.

92. M. Vettius Latro, whose title was proc. annona( )e Ostiae et in portu, between A.D. 103 and 117 (see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 104); C. Camurius Clemens, proc. ad Miniciam(sic), towards A.D. 110 (CIL XI, 5669; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 87). Both this post and the procuratorship of the annona at Ostia belonged to the lowest grade of the officia sexagenaria. Their low grade suggests that both were subordinated to the praefectus annonae.

A special imperial bureau of the annona was established at Ostia: CIL VI, 8450, a freedman of Antoninus Pius who was a tabul(arius) Ostis ad annona(m). A freedman of Trajan is recorded at Puteoli as a prox(imus) comm(antariarum) ann(onae) (CIL X, 1729). Officials attached to the administration of the finance department of the grain supply are also recorded at Ostia (see below, note 96). The administration of the port of Ostia continued into the second century, too: AE (1948), n. 103 - a freedman of Hadrian who was a tabulario portus utriusque (i.e., he was attached to the administration both of the Claudian harbour, and the new harbour built by Trajan). Boulvert, EAI, pp. 267-269, believes that the port administration was subordinated to a new freedman procurator at Ostia from Trajan's reign, but a proc. portus utriusque (imperial freedman) is not attested until the time of Caracalla, definitely.

93. See above, p. 70.
94. CIL VI, 8475; the abbreviation f. f. for the fiscus frumentarius used in this inscription is also found in CIL XIV, 2045 (see below, note 96).

95. CIL VI, 8474.


A branch of the fiscus was established at Ostia, as indicated by an inscription dedicated to a freedman of Hadrian, who was a procurator annonae Ostiensis, and had formerly been "praepositus mensae nummul(ariae) fisci frumentarii Ost(iensis) (CIL XIV, 2045); literally, mensa nummul(aria) means the 'money-changing counter'. Meiggs (R. Ostia, p. 301) suggests that the chest at Ostia met payments to shipmasters, and for labour at the docks and in the warehouses of the port.

A tabularius fisci frumentarii, Genialis Aug. lib. (CIL VI, 8477), has been identified with an imperial slave of the same name, who served as a dispens(ator) ad frumentum in Bithynia (ILS 1539 and 1543). The second inscription is dedicated to a Flavia Sophena; but as it is not stated that she was an imperial freedwoman, this criterion is too indefinite to serve as an indication to the date of CIL VI, 8477, even assuming the Genialis of this inscription is the same man. The function of Genialis in Bithynia was presumably associated with the acquisition of grain for the annona; the same function can be attributed to Lysimachus Aug., who was a disp. frument(i) mancip(alis) (CIL VI, 8853)- the inscription was dedicated by a Flavia Corinthias; but, once again, this is too vague a criterion on which to date the inscription to the first century. Also see CIL III, 6065, which records C. Vibius Salvianus, who early in Trajan's reign was a promag(iste) portuum pr ovinc(iae) Siciliae, item promag. frumenti mancipalis; presumably he collected the grain rent from the tenants of ager publicus. On the frumentum mancipalis see e.g. Cardinali, DE art. frumentatio, p. 247; Boulvert, EAI, p. 155, with note 413.

97. CIL VI, 9626 (no indication of date) mentions the fiscus stationis annonae. It is very probable that this was the chest elsewhere recorded as the fiscus frumentarius; cf. note 96, above; also see De Ruggiero, DE art. annona, p. 476.

98. Pliny the Younger, Pan. 25, 26, 27, 28.

99. Pan. 29, 3-5.
The mention of purchases of grain by the fiscus could not refer to the grain tribute which supplied the bulk of the annona. An inscription from Trajan's reign appears to record the appointment of a special commissioner by the emperor for the purchase of supplies: it is dedicated to an imperial procurator (T. Flavius Macer), who held the post of curator frumenti comparandi in annona(m) urbis facto a divo Nerva Traiano; see De Ruggiero, DE art. annona, p. 484.

100. Cf. above note 53.
CHAPTER 5 - FOOTNOTES

1. See Frontinus, de Aq. 96.

2. de Aq. 9, 10, 98; Suet., Aug. 42, 1.

3. Frontinus was himself a curator aquarum under Nerva, when this commentary was written (see de Aq. 1).

4. de Aq. 98.

5. Agrippa (see de Aq. 98), on the basis of the amount of water available, had determined "quid aquarum publicis operibus, quid lacibus, quid privatis dare tur". Then after Agrippa (see de Aq. 99), "Q. Aelio Tuberone Paulo Fabio Maximo cos. (11 B.C.) cum res usque in id tempus quasi potestate acta certo iure eguisset, senatus consulta facta sunt ac lex promulgata". Also see de Aq. 106: it was laid down, for example, that private persons could only use pipes of a standard size to bring water into their own residences.

6. de Aq. 99: "... et rei continendae exercendaeque curatorem fecit Messalam Corvinum, cui adiutores dati Postumius Sulpicius praetorius et Lucius Cominius pedarius". Messala had been consul in 31 B.C., and that the senior member of the board was an ex-consul is indicated by inscriptions of the first century A.D. - CIL XI, 571; cf. III, 4013 and X, 2456 (see DE art. aqua, p. 549). The two adiutores also bore the title of curator, as indicated by de Aq. 100, 104, and by the placing of terminal cippi by the board recorded in CIL VI, 1248 ("cippi positi iussu A. Didi Galli, T. Rubri Nepotis, M. Corneli Firmi curator(um) aquarum" - Didius Gallus was curator between A.D. 38 and 49, see de Aq. 102). In giving a list of his predecessors (de Aq. 102) Frontinus, however, gives the names only of the consular heads of the board ("qui officio praefuerint").

7. de Aq. 104; cf. 100: "qui curatores aquarum publicarum ex consensu senatus a Caesare Augusto nominati essent".

8. de Aq. 100: "utique quibus apparitoribus ex hoc senatus consulta curatoribus aquarum uti liceret, eos diebus decem [pr]oximis ... ad aerarium deferrent; quique ita delati essent iis praetores aerarii mercede/[m] cibaria, quanta praefecti frumenti dando dare deferre solent, annua darent et adtribuerent". Frontinus adds that the attendants and assistants of the curator were still supported by the aerarium in his own day (101).

9. de Aq. 99.
10. de Ag. 106: "... ne cui privato aquam ducere ex rivis publicis liceret, utique omnes ei quibus aquae ducendae ius esset datum ex castellis ducerent".

11. See again de Ag. 99; cf. 110-111 (where Frontinus is quoting from imperial mandata relating to the distribution of water to privati, including the use of "aqua caducae", as the overflow from reservoirs or leakage from pipes was termed): "Caducam neminem volo ducere nisi qui meo beneficio aut priorum principum habent". The procedure for procuring imperial authorization to draw off public water was that: "Qui aquam in usus privatos deducere volit, impetrare eam debuit et a principe epistulam ad curatorem adferre". (de Ag. 105).

12. de Ag. 119 explains how it was the responsibility of the curator to see that the necessary repairs were carried out, and also how he was provided with skilled technicians, such as architecti, who were attached to his statio.

The generic term for the various categories of labourers employed in the service of the aqueducts (for which see de Ag. 117) was aquarius. This is the term Frontinus uses whenever he speaks of the various frauds the labourers might practice (see chs. 9, 31, 75, 114, 115 e.g.).

13. de Ag. 116-117.

14. de Ag. 116; cf. 98: "habuit et familiam propriam aquarum, quae tueretur ductus atque castella et lacus. hanc Augustus hereditate ab eo sibi reliquit publicavit".

15. de Ag. 118: "Commoda publicae familiae ex aerario dantur, quod impedimentum exoneratur vectigalium reeditu ad ius aquarum pertinentium".


17. de Ag. 105: "procuratorem autem primus Ti. Claudius videtur admovisse, postquam Anionem Novum et Claudium induxit".
18. It seems reasonable to assume that the competence attributed to the procurator by Frontinus (de Aq. 105) was much the same in the period prior to Nerva's reign. But there seems to be no reason to assume, as Boulvert does (EAl, p. 148; cf. p. 263), that it was Nerva who was responsible for subordinating the procurator and his functions to the authority of the curator. The connection indicated by Frontinus between Claudius introducing a procurator, and the completion of the new aqueducts, suggests that the emperor took this step because the amount of administrative work increased due to the now greater volume of the public water supply. Frontinus writes (de Aq. 105) that after the privatus had secured the necessary authorization from the emperor, "curator deinde beneficio Caesaris praestare maturitatem et procuratorem eiusdem officii libertum Caesaris protinus scribere".

Boulvert (p. 143) suggests that the passage should be translated as: "et écrira aussitôt à l'affranchi impérial procurateur de ce bureau". This seems to express the sense of the passage better than: "the commissioner must ... appoint one of Caesar's freedmen as his deputy for this service", as given in the Loeb ed. and trans. of the text (M. B. McElwain, 1925).

19. de Aq. 106. It should be noted that the decrees quoted by Frontinus were those which were still relevant to his own time (cf. de Aq. 103).

20. de Aq. 105: "procurator calicem eius moduli, qui fuerit impetratus, adhibitis libratoribus (= "the levellers") signari cogitet, diligenter intendat mensurarum quas supra diximus modum et positionis notitiam habeat, ne sit in arbitrio libratorum, interdum maioris luminis, interdum minoris pro gratia personarum calicem probare". The procurator therefore had competence over the whole aqueduct system of Rome; but it appears that this was technically only in his capacity as the curator's assistant in carrying out this function (see DE art. aqua, p. 552; Hirschfeld, KV^3, p. 277).

The names of these procurators are known both from the stamps on ancient water pipes (cf. note 24, below), and from the inscriptions of imperial freedmen; see DE art. aqua, pp. 551-553. CIL XI, 3612, e.g., records Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. Bucolas, who held several posts including that of proc. aquarum; he is known, also, from a pipe inscribed: "Imp. Domitianii Caesaris Aug. Ger. sub cura Bucolae proc." (see Dessau, ILS 1567).

22. See DE art. aqua, p. 552.

23. He was C. Pomponius Hyllus (CIL XV, 7299; 7300), whom Pflaum (Carrières, p. 1032) dates between A.D. 102 and 114.

24. See CIL XV, 7295, 7296, 7297, 7298; cf. Boulvert, EAI, pp. 263-264. The freedmen recorded in these inscriptions do not, however, have the full title procurator aquarum. The inscriptions cited here are from the water-pipes of the Roman aqueduct system, which were under the charge of these procurators.

25. de Aq. 116: "Superest tutela ductuum, de qua priusquam dicere incipiam, paucia de familia quae huius rei causa parata est explicanda sunt (at which point there is a gap of about twenty letters in C. - see Loeb edition of text). Familiae sunt duae, altera publica, altera Caesaris. Publica est antiquior, quam ab Agrippa relictam Augusto et ab eo publicatam diximus; habet homines circiter ducentos quadraginta. Caesaris familiae numerus est quadingentorium sexaginta, quam Claudius cum aquas in urbem perduceret constituit".

26. de Aq. 117: "Utraque autem familia in aliquot ministeriorum species didicitur, vilicos, castellarios, circitores, silicarios, tectores aliosque opifices. Ex his aliquos extra urbem esse oportet ad ea quae non sunt magnae molitionis, maturum tamen auxilium videntur exigere". Thus the slaves of both familiae, who were designated by the general term aquarii, were divided up according to various functions which are also attested in inscriptions of both the imperial and public slaves: CIL VI, 8495: Sabbius Caes(aris) n(o stri) s(ervus), vilic(us) Aquae Claudiae, and Sporus Caes. n.s., vilic. Aquae Claudiae; VI, 33733: Euporus servus, vilicus Caes. aquarius; VI, 8492: Naucelliu(s), castellarius; VI, 8494: Cleme(n)s Caesarum (sic) n( ostrorum) servus, castellarius Aquae Claudiae; VI, 8749: Peregrinus Aug. ser., ex circitoribus; X, 711 (from Surrentum): Lalemus Aug., circitor; cf. VI, 2343: a publicus Aquae Annesis; VI, 2345: a publicus p(opuli) R(omani), aquarius Aquae Annionis veteris castelli viae Latinae, "contra dracones"; VI, 8493: a servos publicus, castellar( ius) Aquae Annionis veteris.

27. de Aq. 118: "Commoda publicae familiae ex aerario dantur"; "Caesaris familia ex fisco accipit commoda". Also see Statius, Silvae III, 3, 100-101: among the expenditures the a rationibus had to calculate, Statius mentions "quid alii undarum cursus ... poscant". (i.e. how much had to be spent on the aqueducts).
28. de Aq. 118: "... unde (i.e. "ex fisco") et omne plumbum et omnes impensae ad ductus et castella et lacus pertinentes erogantur".

29. See again de Aq. 125: "...uti cum ei rivi, specus, fornices, quos Augustus Caesar se referetur impensa sua pollicitus senatui est, refricerentur .......".

30. The reason why imperial funds were utilized on an increasing scale for this purpose must lie in the fact, reported by Frontinus, that the income furnished by the receipt of rentals from water-rights, which amounted to nearly 250,000 sestertii, had been dissipated through bad management. Even in Frontinus' own day, this income sufficed only to pay the wages of the familia publica (de Aq. 118). Inefficient administration of this money possibly explains why Domitian had decided to assume control of it ("proximis vero temporibus in Domitian loculos conversum"); but his action had evidently aroused protest, so Nerva "iustitia ... populo restituit". Frontinus adds (loc. cit.): "nostra sedulitas ad certam regulam rededit, ut constaret quae essent ad hoc vectigal pertinentia loca".

31. See again de Aq. 100; 104.

32. See again de Aq. 106.

33. See again de Aq. 99 ("Augustus quoque edicto complexus est, quo iure uterentur qui ex commentariis Agrippae aquas haberent, tota re in sua beneficia translata."); 109; 111 (imperial regulations regarding the utilization of "lapsed" water).

34. As argued by Boulvert, p. 148, who considers that "ces dépenses, publiques par leur nature, seront logiquement financées par les fonds publics dont le prince dispose, ce qui ne constitue pas une liberalité de la part de celui-ci".

35. de Aq. 117: "tam amplum numerum utriusque familiae solitum ambitione aut neglegentia praepositorum in privata opera diduci revocare ad aliquam disciplinam et publica ministeria ita instituimus, ut pridie quid esset actura dictaremus et quid quoque die actis comprehenderetur". Since practical supervision over both gangs devolved, evidently, on the senatorial curator, it is difficult to accept the conclusion that the introduction of the imperial work force meant the establishment of a separate branch of administration under the management of the procurator (as concluded by Boulvert, EAI, pp. 143-144); cf. DE art. aqua, p. 552.

36. de Aq. 116. In view of Frontinus' terminology in this passage, it is especially difficult to accept Boulvert's conclusion (see e.g. EAI, p. 148) that this familia Caesare was virtually a public institution, too.
37. de Ag. 116: "... quam Claudius cum aquas in urbem perduceret constituit". On the construction of both the Aqua Claudia and the Anio Novus see de Ag. 12.

38. See CIL VI, 1256: "Ti. Claudius Drusi f. Caisar Augustus Germanicus pontif. maxim./ tribunicia potestate XII cos. V imperator XXVII pater patriae (A.D. 52)/ aquas Claudiam ex fontibus qui vocabantur Caeruleus et Curtius a millario XXXXV/ item Anienam novam a millario LXII sua impensa in urbem perducendas curavit".

39. Cf. de Ag. 98.

40. CIL VI, 1257 and 1258 record repairs of the Claudian aqueducts undertaken by Vespasian and Titus respectively, "sua impensa"; CIL VI, 1260 records the completion of the Aqua Traiana, which Trajan paid for "pecunia sua". It should also be noted that inscriptions of imperial aquarii show that, in general, they were attached to the aqueducts completed under Claudius, while the aquarii of the familia publica were attached to the older aqueducts, such as the Anio Vetus; cf. above, note 26.

41. See again de Ag. 118 ("Caesaris familia ex fisco accipit commoda, unde et omne plumbum et omnes impensae ad ductus et castella et lacus pertinentes erogantur."). A freedman of the Flavian emperors is recorded as a tab(ularius) rationis aquarior(um) (CIL VI, 1743, from Puteoli; also see VI, 33731: T. Siverus Aug. lib., tab(ularius) rat(ionis) aquariorum. It is probable that this imperial bureau came into existence as a special department for the management of the aquarii attached to the familia Caesaris. Presumably this department was chiefly concerned with the payment of the slaves' salaries, for which purpose funds were allocated by the fiscus; cf. DE art. aqua, p. 553. Other imperial freedman clerks are attested whose title suggests, however, that they were concerned in the administration of the aqueduct system as a whole: Moschus Aug. lib., a commentari(i)s aquarum, who makes a dedication to "Flaviae Helpidi coniugi" (CIL VI, 8487) - the inscription is only very doubtfully of Flavian date, however, since there is no indication that the wife of Moschus was an imperial freedwoman; Salvius Aug. lib., a tabul(arius) aquarum (CIL VI, 8488) - no indication of date given; a M. Ulpius Aug. lib., a ... aquarum (CIL VI, 8490), who may have held office under Trajan, but possibly later. Frontinus mentions how the commentarii (records) of the holders of water licences had to be kept up to date, so that vacant water rights might be granted (by the emperor) to new applicants (de Ag. 109). The imperial clerks were no doubt employed on this task, for example.
42. Boulvert, EAI, p. 148, sees a contrast between the situation under Claudius, and Agrippa's use of his private slaves for servicing the aqueducts. He argues that if Claudius had followed the example of Agrippa his familia would have been maintained at the expense of patrimonial funds. It has been concluded here, however, that this is just what Frontinus does say. In Boulvert's view, Frontinus could not have meant this, because "cet auteur est trop courant des termes techniques pour employer maladroitement le terme fiscus pour patrimonium". But, as argued elsewhere in this thesis (cf. above, ch. 1, p. 27), Boulvert assumes erroneously that by the latter part of the first century the term fiscus, when contrasted or compared with the aerarium, must denote a second treasury of state.

43. See e.g. CIL VI, 31542 (7-6 B.C.): boundaries fixed by Augustus on the right bank of the Tiber, all with the formula: "Imp(erator) Caesar Divi f(ilius)/ Augustus/ pontifex maximus/ tribunica potest(ate) xvii/ ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) terminavit". In the preceding year (8 B.C.) boundaries had been fixed by the consuls; see CIL VI, 31541: "G(aius) Asinius G(ai) f(ilius) Gallus/ G(aius) Marcius L(ucius) f(ilius) L(ucius) n(apos)/ Censorinus/ co(n)s(ules) ex s. c. termin(averunt)."

On the fixing of the river boundaries under Augustus, see J. Le Gall, Le Tibre Fleuve de Rome dans l'Antiquité (1953), p. 155.

44. It appears that Suetonius (Aug. 37) was mistaken in attributing the establishment of this cura to Augustus. Suetonius' statement cannot be reconciled with a passage from Dio (57, 14, 8), in which it is recorded (under A.D. 15) that after a serious flood the emperor decided that five senators chosen by lot should constitute a permanent board to look after the Tiber and see that it maintained an even flow.

Tacitus does not mention the establishment of a board of five senators: instead, he records that Gaius Ateius Capito (who was a curator aquarum between A.D. 13 and 24 - see de Ag. 102, 97), and Lucius Arruntius were instructed to control the flow of the Tiber (Ann. 1, 76). From Tacitus' account it appears that this appointment was made after Tiberius had rejected the proposal of Gaius Asinius Gallus (who as consul had carried out the fixing of the river boundaries with his colleague in 8 B.C. - see note 43, above) that the Sibylline Books should be consulted with regard to the recent flooding of the Tiber. The senators Arruntius and Ateius are mentioned again by Tacitus (Ann. 1, 79) as leading the subsequent debate in the senate over measures to reduce the volume of the Tiber's flow. Plans to alter the course of the river's tributaries were, however, set aside after various Italian municipalities and colonies expressed their opposition to the project in the senate.
Le Gall, op. cit., p. 136, argues convincingly that Tacitus' failure to record the setting up of a permanent cura of five senators in A.D. 15 does not destroy the credibility of Dio: "car si Tibère a fait remplacer la consultation traditionnelle des Livres Sibyllins par une enquête technique, c'est qu'il estimait possible d'entreprendre une lutte efficace, et s'il a fait écartier des projects irréalisables - et nuisables - il a dû cependant vouloir faire quelque chose, et créer l'administration nécessaire. Tacite et Dion ne s'opposent pas, ils se complètent: l'un n'a retenu que les solutions grandioses des ingénieurs, qui ne furent pas réalisées, l'autre que la création administrative qui avait duré jusqu'à son époque et devait lui survivre longtemps encore".

45. See CIL VI, 1235e (also see CIL VI², 31540 1; 31541 g, h, o, s, u; 31542 s; 31557 d): "(C. Asinius Gallus)/ C. Marcius L. f. Censorinus/ cos. ex s. c. termin. r(ecta) r(egione) proximus c(ippus) ped(es) XIIXS/ curatores riparum qui primi terminaverer/ ex s. c. restituerunt". (A.D. 15+; the name of Asinius Gallus was erased and afterwards restored). In contrast to subsequent inscriptions of the commission, the names of the curatores are not given; nor does their title refer to their function of controlling the channel of the Tiber (see again Dio, 57, 14, 8; cf. Suet., Aug. 37). Le Gall, op. cit., p. 147, considers that their title was simply abbreviated here, and also suggests that the omission of their names from the boundary stones indicates that the first curatores, in re-establishing the boundaries fixed earlier, were content to mention only the primacy of which they were proud (cf. Le Gall, p. 137, p. 155).

46. The next board in chronological order seems to have been that headed by L. Caninius Gallus, who had been consul suff. in 2 B.C.; see Le Gall, op. cit., pp. 137-138. His four colleagues were L. Volusenus Catulus, C. Caedicius Agrippa, M. Acilius Memmius Glabrio, and Q. Fabius Balbus (see CIL VI, 31543 - L. Volusenus Catulus is also recorded as member of the board of curatores locorum publicorum iudicandorum, in VI, 31573; cf.: note 92, below). The date of Caninius' consulship leads Le Gall to date this board earlier than that headed by C. Vibius Rufus and his four colleagues (CIL VI, 31544): "G(aius) Vibius G(aii) f. Rufus/ Sex(tus)
Sotidius Sex(ti) f. Strabo/ Libuscisid(us?)/ G(aius) Calpetanus G(aii) f. Statius Rufus/ M(arcus) Claudiaus M(arci) f. Marcellus/ L(ucius) Visellius G(aii) f. Varro/ curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis/ ex s. c. termin(averunt)". Gaius Vibius Rufus was consul suff. in A.D. 16, and L. Visellius Varro was consul ord. in A.D. 24, which dates the board between these limits (see Le Gall, p. 138).
Three boundary stones placed by C. Antistius Vetus and his four colleagues were discovered at Ostia (see CIL XIV, 4704). C. Antistius Vetus was consul in A.D. 23, which means that this board of curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis held office after that year (see Le Gall, p. 138). As these boundary stones from Ostia indicate, the authority of the board extended to the mouth of the Tiber (see Le Gall, pp. 175-176).

47. CIL X, 797, from Pompeii: the date of the inscription is fixed by the occurrence of the Claudian letters (praefectus); see Le Gall, op. cit., p. 182, on Turranius' career.

48. Cf. CIL XIV, 2045: "P. Aelio Aug. lib. Liberali procuratori annonae Ostiensis ... patrono Laurentium vici Augustanor(um)"; XIV, 154: "Q. Acilio c. f. Pap. Fusco v(iro) e(gregio) procur(atori) ann(onae) Aug(ustorum) n(ostrorum duorum) ... sacerd(oti) Laurent(ium) Lavinat(ium)". See Le Gall, op. cit., p. 183, and Meiggs, R. Ostia, p. 304, on this question. Le Gall concludes that since "nous n'avons aucune raison de croire que Turranius, dont la statue a été dressée à Pompeii sur un terrain donné par les decurions de cette ville, ait eu des rapports personnels avec Ostie, il semble difficile de douter qu c'est sa préfecture de la procuratelle du Tibre qu l'oblige à s'y établir momentanément". Moreover, it is most probably Turranius who is recorded in a fragmentary inscription from Ostia, which is cited below (note 50).

49. Cf. note 46, above: inscriptions recording delimitations of the Tiber banks by the board at Ostia show that the curators were active in the area under Tiberius. This may explain why they found it necessary to have a representative resident in the town.

50. CIL XIV, 4176: "Augustus 
\[
f.[t]i[f.] / f.[A]ugusti pontif]
\[

51. This procurator is known from a Greek inscription (CIGr.3991 = ILS 8848) from Iconium in Galatia, in which he is recorded as: έπ[ι][τρο]πο[ν] Καίσαρος προς δ[χ]θας Τ[ι]βέρεως, έπ[ι][τρο]πο[ν] Τ[ι]βερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ καὶ Νέρωνος \([K]\) Καύσιου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ [Γ]αλα[τ]ης ε[π]αρχειας τον Ε[αυ]τού\(\underline{ε}περγήτη\) και [κ]ατίστην
Pflaum, Carrières, n. 24, pp. 58-59, points out that it is striking that the emperor's name is omitted from Praesens' title as procurator of the Tiber banks, whereas in the case of his later post in Galatia it is expressly stated that Praesens was a procurator of Claudius and Nero successively. He considers it likely that Praesens was already procurator of the Tiber banks under Gaius, or even Tiberius, and that his career was then interrupted, arguing that this interpretation "s'accorde également avec l'absence, dans la titulature du poste, des noms des princes damnati memoriae". Pflaum therefore rejects the opinion of Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 263, who favours a Claudian date for the procuratorship of the Tiber banks, and explains the omission of the emperor's name from this title on the grounds that the people and council of the Claudiconians, who erected the inscription to Praesens, were concerned only with his post in Galatia, which was of direct interest to them. Moreover, Hirschfeld makes the strong point that the earlier part of Praesens' career is also given in abbreviated form - even to the extent of omitting the distinguishing numeral and proper name of the legion in which he had served ("... [ξ]παρχον ἵππεων ἅλητος Πελευτεννως ").

52. Le Gall, op. cit., p. 261ff., thinks it very unlikely that the procuratorship in question was associated with the function of the senatorial Tiber Commission. But Pflaum (Carrières, n. 24, p. 60) rejects Le Gall's conclusion, as well as Hirschfeld's view (KV³, p. 263) that Praesens' post was connected with works undertaken by Claudius along the Tiber banks at the time of his excavations for the new port at Ostia. Pflaum considers that "Quand l'empereur nomma le collège entier, il n'eut plus besoin de désigner un homme de confiance pour en surveiller les membres, précédemment tires au sort". (p. 59). Pflaum also thinks that the post would only have been filled when circumstances required it, and that Praesens was probably appointed after the flooding of the Tiber in A.D. 26 (see Dio, 58, 26, 5).

53. An equestrian (Rufus) is recorded as a proc. Caes(aris) Hadriani ad ripam (CIL X, 7587). But Pflaum concludes that in this case the procuratorship was probably a patrimonial one, connected with the oversight of imperial property located on the Tiber; see Carrières, n. 101.

54. Boulvert (EAI, p. 74, n. 410) also views the procuratorship in question as a temporary office concerned with the management of works carried out by the emperor with his private funds.
Suetonius, for example, records that Augustus "ad coercendas inundationes alveum Tiberis laxavit ac repurgavit completum olim ruderibus et aedificiorum prolationibus coartatum". (Aug. 30, 1); and Claudius records that "fossis ductis a Tiberi operis portu/s7 caussa emissisque in mare Urbem/ inundationis periculo liberavit". (CIL XIV, 85, erected in A.D. 46; on Claudius' works in connection with the construction of the new port at Ostia, see Le Gall, pp. 131-133).

55. CIL VI, 31545: Paullus Fabius Persicus and his four colleagues: the inscription is dated by Le Gall (op. cit., p. 138) between the accession of Claudius in A.D. 41 and A.D. 44, about which date Fabius Persicus became proconsul of Asia. The formula ex auctoritate Imp. Caesaris... e.g. replaces that of a s.c. in subsequent delimitations of the Tiber banks, also.

56. If the curatores were not nominated directly by the emperor from Claudius' time, it is difficult to explain why they should act formally by the authority of the emperor rather than the senate, as had been the case under Tiberius; cf. Le Gall, p. 147.

57. See above, pp. 82-83.

58. See above, notes 52 and 54: Praesens may have been a procurator of imperial works in progress along the Tiber, rather than an imperial agent associated with the functions of the Tiber Commission.

59. Cf. below, p. 85.

60. CIL VI, 31456a: "ex auctoritate/ Imp. Caesaris Vespasiani/ Aug. p. m. tr. p. IIII (A.D. 72-3) imp. X p. p./ cos. IIII desig. V censor(is)/ Gaius Calpetanus Rantis Quirinalis/ Valerius Festus curator riparum/ et alvei Tiberis terminavit r. r. prox. cipp. p. LII S."; two boundary stones erected by this curator are known (Le Gall, op. cit., p. 157). A single cippus, poorly preserved, records a delimitation by C. (? ) Dillius Aponianus (end of A.D. 73), which conforms to the boundaries marked by Calpetanus (CIL VI, 31547); see Le Gall, p. 158. He was succeeded by C. Caecina Paetus (A.D. 74), of whom three boundary stones have survived (CIL VI, 31548 a, b, c). Caecina was followed by Sex. Sentius Caecilianus (CIL IX, 4194 - towards A.D. 75), but then there is a gap in the record until the reign of Trajan. From his reign two series of delimitations by the curator Ti. Julius Ferox are known, the first of which was made between December A.D. 100 and December 101, and the second between January 1 and December 10, A.D. 103 (CIL VI, 31549 a-m; 31550 a-d); see Le Gall, op. cit., pp. 140-141, p. 149.
The formula employed for the delimitations undertaken by Ferox is "Ex auctoritate/ Imp(eratoris) Caesaris Divi/ Nervae f. Nervae/ Traiani Aug(usti) Germanici pont. max. trib. pot. V cos. III p. p./ Ti. Iulius Ferox curator/ alvei/ et riparum Tiberis et cloacar(um)/ urbis terminavit ripam/ r. r. ad pro(ximum) cipp. p. LXXXVI". (CIL VI, 31549f); the boundary stones set up by Ferox demonstrate, therefore, that the authority of the curator now extended over the sewers of Rome (cloacae). Ferox may have been succeeded by Pliny the Younger, whose curatorship should be placed between A.D. 100, when Pliny was consul, and his governorship of Pontus and Bithynia, which he appears to have taken up in A.D. 111 (CIL V, 5262, 5268, 5267); see Le Gall, p. 141.

61. See e.g. the career of Pliny the Younger, CIL V, 5262; also CIL IX, 4194 (Sex. Sentius Caecilianus); CIL V, 531 (Calpetanus Rantius Quirinalis - curator immediately after his consulship); also see Le Gall, p. 147, on the place of this curatorship in the senatorial cursus.

62. See Le Gall, pp. 146-147, who, while he rejects this explanation of the change in the formula, raises the possibility that eponymy may have become the privilege of the head of the cura (cf. op.cit. p. 181).

63. He was L. Vibius Apronianus (AE 1952, n.156). Pflaum, Carrières, n. 160 bis (pp. 387-388) dates his career between A.D. 96 and 161. Apronianus had the title adiutor albei (sic) Tiberis et cloacarum which means that he cannot have held this post prior to A.D. 101, by which date the authority of the Tiber Commission extended to the cura cloacarum (= "sewers"); cf. CIL VI, 31549 f (see note 60, above). On the other hand, the post of tr(ibunus) mil(itum), also recorded in Apronianus' inscription, always follows that of praefectus cohortis after the reign of Antoninus Pius. This furnishes a terminus ante quem for Apronianus' career (see Pflaum, p. 388). The title of Q. Petronius Melior, the next known adiutor, shows that he had been personally chosen for the post by the consular head of the cura (see CIL XIV, 172; ILS 1429; cf. Pflaum, n. 201). Pflaum concludes from this (cf. n. 160 bis, p. 387) that imperial intervention in the appointment of these adiutores alvei Tiberis et cloacarum amounted only to ratification of the consular's choice.

The function of the earlier praefectus curatorium was evidently to supervise the activities of the Tiber Commission in and around Ostia (cf. p. 83, above). Two inscriptions dedicated in A.D. 184 to Q. Petronius Melior at Ostia by the Corpus Mensorum Frumentariorum and by the Collegium Fabrum Tignuariorum of the town (CIL XIV, 172 and 5345) indicate that
this later official was also stationed in Ostia. Inscriptions of the curator Ti. Julius Ferox under Trajan give some indication of the activities of the cura in this region: "\textit{N}umini domus Aug. \textit{cor}pus \textit{mn}em\textit{cl}ariorum \textit{traiectus} Luculli pecunia sua f\textit{irmiori} et cultiori \textit{opere} f\textit{ecerunt} (per\textit{missu} Ti. Iuli Ferocis \textit{curatoris} al\textit{vei} Tiberis et riparum". (CIL XIV, 5320); this inscription must date from the beginning of Ferox's curatorship, before the cura was extended to include the charge of the cloacaem, which it is already in the first series of delimitations undertaken by Ferox between December A.D. 100 and December 101 (cf. CIL VI, 31549; see note 60, above). The Tiber Commission evidently controlled the use of the Tiber banks, if not the activities of the river guilds in general (cf. Meiggs, \textit{R. Ostia}, pp. 303-304; Le Gall, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 180-181).

64. See Hirschfeld, \textit{KV} 3, pp. 358-59; also see De Ruggiero, \textit{DE} art. \textit{curator}, p. 1325.

65. Suet., \textit{Aug.} 30, 1.

66. \textit{R.G.} 20, 5; also see CIL XI, 365 (27 B.C.).


Then follows Dio's well-known statement that he himself was unable to distinguish between the imperial and public funds (οὐ γὰρ ὅμας διακόνησα τοῦ ἡσαυρός αὐτῶν)-no matter how much Augustus attempted to make it appear that all the expenditures which he claimed to be making were from his own means (ἐς νόμισμα κατέκοψε τοῦ δὴ καὶ ὅκουσεν πάντως διὰ γε καὶ ἔλεγε δαπανῶν δοκεῖν).

68. See above, p. 78.

69. Dio 54, 8, 4-5. Dio adds that the acts recorded in this passage were all done in pursuance of a decree (ἐκ ψηφίσματος, ὥσπερ ποιοῖ καὶ τὰλλα, ἔγένετο). Mommsen, \textit{Staatsrecht} II 3, p. 1077), considers that three curatores viarum, whom he dates to Augustus, were not members of a regular board of magistrates but held extraordinary magistracies, instituted for the highways in the vicinity of Rome. One of these curatores viarum was P. Paequius Scaeva, who (following a praetorship of the aerrarium and governorship of Cyprus) was \textit{viar(um) cur(ator)} \textit{extra ur(rem)} ex s.c. \textit{in} quinquennium, prior to being proconsul for the second time, "extra sortem auctoritate Aug. Caesaris" (CIL IX, 2845). Scaeva's appointment "in quinquennium" does suggest that he held a special commission rather than an
ordinary magistracy; but in the two other inscriptions which record curatores of the highways in general tenure of the office for a specific period is not stated, and neither is the designation "extra urbem" found in their titles: "C. Propertius Q. f. T. n. Fab(ia) Postumus/ IIIvir cap(italis)
et insequenti anno pro/ IIIvir q(uestor) pr(aetor) desig(natus)
ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) viar(um) cur(ator) pr(aetor)/ ex s. c.
pro acd(ilibus) cur(ulibus) ius dixit procos. ..." (CIL VI,
1501); "T. Mussidio Polliano/ cos. pr. procos. provinc./
Gall. Narbon. tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) q(uestor)/ XVir. stl(itibus)
judic(andis) cur(ator) viarum/ praef(ecto) frumenti dandi
ex s. c." (CIL VI, 1466 - in this inscription the curatorship
of the highways and appointment as praefectus frumenti dandi
are given separately from the other offices held by Mussidius
Pollianus, and without reference to their order in his
 cursus). The first of these two inscriptions was dated by Mommsen to
the reign of Augustus on the grounds (a) that Propertius
served twice as a triumvir, perhaps because senatorial
candidates were lacking, which sometimes occurred under
Augustus (see Dio, 54, 26, 3-6); and (b) that under Augustus,
also, the judicial functions belonging to the office of aedile
were often entrusted to praetors: Dio states that so many
senators had become impoverished that none were willing to
hold the aedileship because of the expense this office involved
(53, 2, 2). In the case of Mussidius Pollianus, however, there
is no internal evidence for an Augustan date, although Mommsen
(p. 669, n. 5) links his curatorship with the appointments
attested in CIL VI, 1501 and IX, 2845, and would place him
under Augustus, too.

Mommsen (p. 669, p. 1077, n. 3) believes
that before the end of Augustus' reign, curatores were already
appointed to take charge of individual highways (though
senatorial posts of this kind are not attested in inscriptions
earlier than Nero's reign - see below, p. 87). Hirschfeld
however, argues that the establishment of a regular board of
commissioners with competence over the highways in general,
preceded this development (KV 3, pp. 206-207). It is true
that an equestrian curateur of the viae Labicana and Latina
is attested as early as Tiberius' reign (see below, p. 86;
cf. Hirschfeld, p. 207 and Mommsen, p. 1077, n. 4); but
Hirschfeld's conclusions regarding the nature of the cura viarum
under Augustus seem to be supported by an extract from a
s. c. of 11 B.C., quoted by Frontinus, de Ag. 101, in which a
board of viarum curatores is coupled with the board of curatores
frumenti: "itemque cum viarum curatores frumentique parte
quarta anni publico fungantur ministerio, ut curatores aquirum
iudiciis vacent privatis publicisque". Hirschfeld (p. 206, n. 2)
would reconstruct the text of the original decree as: "itemque
cum viarum curatores que frumenti qu[a]/parte
anni publico fungantur ministerio, ea e/t curatores aquirum
iudiciis vacent privatis publicisque".
70. See again Dio, 53, 22, 2-3.

71. Mattingly and Sydenham, Roman Imperial Coinage I, nos. 79-84: the reverse of this coin bears the inscription "S.P.Q.R. Imp. Cae. quod v(iae) m(unitae) s(unt) ex ea p(ecunia) q(uam) is ad a(eratorium) de(tulit)".

72. CIL X, 5393 (=ILS, 6286; Jones and Ehrenberg, Documents, no. 229): "Q(uinto) Decio Q(uinti) f. M. N. Saturnino/ pontif. minori Romae tubicini/ sacror. publ. p. R. Quiritium/ praef. fabrum cos. /ter (?) curatores viarum Labic. / et Latinae trib. mil. praef. fabr. i. d. et sortiend. / iudicibus in Asia/ Ilvir. i. d. Veroneae/ q. bis Ilvir. i. d. Ilvir. iter. quinq. praef. / quinq. Ti. Caesaris Augusti/ iter. / Drusi Caesaris Ti. f. tertio Neronis/ Caesaris Germanici f. pontif. flamin./ Romae et divi August. perpetuo ex auctore./ Ti. Caesaris et permessu e/ius/cooptato coloniae patrono/ publice d. d."; see Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 207, with n. 4, who regards this official as exercising a temporary function only, since senatorial curatores (of praetorian rank) are attested later for the viae Labicana et Latina (see e.g. CIL III, 6154 - Hadrian). Mommsen, Staatsrecht 3 II, p. 1077, considers that, in general, equestrian curatores were appointed to the minor, not the major, road-systems.

73. CIL III, 7271: "Q(uinto) Fab107 Q(uinti) f. /... (tribu) Ca7/s pe/k. ..., / pro c(uratores) A/u7 g(usti) prov / inciae/ Achaia prae f(ecto) eq(uitum) trib. milit. leg. X /... curatores viae No/m(entanae)'..."; the spelling of Achaea, which is peculiarly Claudian, defines the date of the inscription.

74. See e.g. CIL XIV, 3955: "Cn. Munatius M. f. Pal(atina) Aurelius Bassus proc. Aug., praef. fabrum, praef. coh(ortis) III Sagittariorum, praef. coh. iterum II Asturum, censitor civium Romanorum coloniae Victricensis, quae est in Brittonia Camaloduni, curator viae Nomentanae, patronus eiusdem municipi, flamen perpetuus, duumvirali potestate, aedilis, dictator III."; an indication of the date of this inscription is that the cohors II Asturum was stationed in Britain in A.D. 105 (CIL XVI, 51 - A.D. 105; 69 - A.D. 122; 70 - A.D. 124) - see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 83, pp. 180-181. Pflaum considers that Aurelius Bassus, as a prominent member of the town of Nomentum, was most likely acting in the capacity of a procurator of road works undertaken by the emperor.

75. Dio, 59, 15, 3-5, writes that "there was a senator, Gnaeus Domitius Corbulo, who had noticed that the roads during the reign of Tiberius were in a bad condition, and was always nagging the highway commissioners about it, and furthermore kept making a nuisance of himself to the senate on the subject. Gaius now took him as an accomplice, and through him attacked all those, alive or dead, who had ever been highway commissioners
and had received money for repairing the roads; and he fined both them and the men who had secured contracts from them, on the pretence that they had spent nothing. For his assistance in this matter Corbulo was at the time made consul, but later, in the reign of Claudius, he was accused and punished; for Claudius not only failed to demand any sums still owed, but, on the contrary, took what had been paid in, partly from the public treasury and partly from Corbulo himself, and returned it to those who had been fined". Tacitus, Ann. 3, 31, also reports: "Idem Corbulo, plurima per Italiam itinera fraudem mancipum et incuria magistratum interrupta et imperuvia clamitando, executionem eius negotii libens suscepit".

76. See above p. 86, with note 69.

77. See Hirschfeld, KV³, pp. 206-207.

78. Apoc. 1: "Appiae viae curator est qua scis et divum Augustum et Tiberium Caesarem ad deosisse". On this passage see Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 207.

79. He was L. Funisulanus Vettonianus, and he appears to be the earliest senatorial curator of a particular highway who is attested epigraphically (see Hirschfeld, KV³, pp. 206-207). His cursus is recorded in CIL III, 4013; XI, 571. Prior to his curatorship of the via Aemilia Vettonianus had commanded the legio III Scythica, and he is mentioned by Tacitus, Ann. 15, 7 (under A.D. 62), as commander of this legion. He was afterwards praefectus aerarii and then curator viae Aemiliae. As late as A.D. 84-85 he was consular legate in Pannonia, and went on to become a curator aquarum (CIL III, 4013; see Hirschfeld, p. 207, n. 1, on his career.

80. The selection of Pulcher for this post is perhaps explained by this senator's close association with the Julio-Claudian family, which also emerges from his inscription (CIL XIV, 3607): "... q./Ti. Caesaris Aug. V consularis (A.D. 31)/tr. pl. pr. ad aerar. comes Drusi fili/ Germanici avonculus Drusi/Ti. Claudi Caesaris Augusti fili/ et ab eo consore inter patricios lectus".

81. See Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 208, note 1. Special road commissioners appointed by the emperor - presumably to supervise works carried out with imperial funds - are attested later: see CIL IX, 2655 (Hadrian and Antoninus Pius) and XI, 5697 (Antoninus Pius). Also see again note 69, above: a curator viarum extra urbem s. c. is attested for Augustus' reign, who was probably an extraordinary magistrate, too.

82. For a list of these curatores see e.g. DE art. curator, pp. 1332-34. For a curator viae Aemiliae who may have held this post not long after Funisulanus Vettonianus (on whom see above, note 79) see CIL XIV, 2925: C. Iulius P. f.
Horatia ... Cornutus Tertullus, who had been "aridus inter praetorios a divis Vespasian et Tito". The curatorship of the highways was later combined sometimes with supervision of the alimenta in the regions of Italy corresponding with the major road systems (see again DE art. curator, loc.cit.; DE art. alimenta, pp. 405-407): L. Minicius Natalis, cura\tor viae Flaminiae praefectus alimentorum, who was consul in A.D. 127 (PIR II, p. 379, n. 440; cf. Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 216, nn. 4 and 5). It is not certain, however, that the two posts were held simultaneously. In later inscriptions the usual title for the combined administration of the highways and alimenta seems to be (e.g.): curat. viae Salar. et alimentorum (CIL VI, 1509: consul in A.D. 186); cf. T. Caesernius Statius Quinctianus, who was consul early in the reign of Antoninus Pius, and who is recorded as a curat. viae Appiae et alimentorum in one inscription (published in Fasti Archaeologici 1956, n. 4602), and curat. viae Appiae praef. alimentorum in another (CIL V, 865; see E. M. Smallwood, Documents, no. 195).

83. See CIL X, 7587: a subcurator viae Aemiliae ( ... im...u... Rufus), whom Pflaum dates towards A.D. 110 (see Carrières, n. 101); CIL VI, 3536 (A. Seius Zosimus), between A.D. 138 and 161 (Pflaum, p. 1039). CIL VII, 1054 attests an unknown subcurator viae Flaminiae et alimentorum, whose dates could range between A.D. 117 and 192 (Pflaum, p. 1038).

84. See above, note 63.

85. See AE (1913), n. 143; Pflaum, Carrières, no. 66. Celer was consul suff. between A.D. 77 and 79. Pflaum would date Lentulus' post towards A.D. 80, on the grounds that probably only a consular had the right to designate an adiutor (p. 157).

86. CIL IX, 3305c: "Quinto Vario Q. f. Gemino leg. divi Aug. II, procos., pr., tr. pl., q., quaesit. iudic., praef. frum. dandi. Xvir. stl. iudic., curatori aedium sacr. monumentorum. que public. tuendorum, is primus omnium Paelign(orum) senator factus est et eos honores gessit".

Since the office of praefectus frumenti dandi was normally a praetorian post, as was also so, subsequently, for the curatorship of public buildings etc. (see e.g. DE art. curator, pp. 1326-27), it seems that the cursus of this senator, in which the junior senatorial post of decemviri stl. iudic. is inserted between his two curatorships, is not recorded in strict chronological order. Possibly, these three posts were grouped together because they were all regarded as honorific offices: membership of the vigintiviri was generally reserved for the young men from patrician families (see Pflaum, Hist. 1954,
p. 445ff.), so the selection of Geminus, a "novus homo", for one of these posts may have been a mark of imperial favour. Mommsen, Staatsrecht III, p. 1051, n. 2, places Geminus' curatorship of the public buildings and temples under Tiberius; but (cf. DE art. frumentatio, p. 250), assuming that his curatorships were actually held prior to his appointments as proconsul and legate, the whole of his career would have fallen in Augustus' reign.


88. See DE art. curator, for a list of the titular formulae associated with the cura in inscriptions; also see A.E. Gordon, "Quintus Veranius, Consul A.D. 49", University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology (1952), Appendix 1.

89. Under Augustus, the construction of works on a large scale in Rome was paid for by the emperor, or by notable personages. On this point, see Tacitus, Ann. 3, 72: he records that Marcus Aemilius Lepidus asked permission of the senate to strengthen and beautify at his own expense the basilica which was the family monument of the Aemilii. Tacitus adds that public munificence was still fashionable then, and Augustus had allowed exuviae (booty), or great resources, to be devoted to the adornment of Rome, by Titus Statilius Taurus, Lucius Marcus Philippus, and Lucius Cornelius Baibus. For the construction of major new works at their own expense, the emperors often appointed special representatives who were not necessarily senators (see e.g. Tac., Hist. 4, 53, with reference to Vespasian: "Curam restituenti Capitolii in Lucium Vestinum confert ...".)


91. See above, p. 82.

92. See CIL VI, 1266: "T. Quinctius Crispinus/ Valerianus (consul suff. in A.D. 2)/ C. Calpetanus Statius Rufus/ C. Pontius P/a/eligius/ C. Petronius Umbrinus/ M. Crassus Frugi (consul A.D. 27)/ curatores/ locor(um) publicor(um) iudicand(orum) ex s.c. causa cognita/ ex privato in public. restituer."; VI, 31573: "L. Asprenas (consul suff. in A.D. 6)/ P. Virasius Naso tr. pl. (proconsul of Crete
between A.D. 31-37)/ M. Caecilius Cornutus (Tac., Ann. 4, 28: mentioned as an ex-praetor who committed suicide in A.D. 24)/ L. Volusenus Catulus/ P. Licinius Stolo/ curatores locorum publicorum/ iudicandorum ex s.c. ex privato/ in publicum restituerunt"; VI, 31574: "L. Asprenas/ M. Caecilius Cornutrus/ L. Volusenus Catulus/ P. Licinius Stolo/ C. Pontius Paelignus/ curatores locorum publicorum/ iudicandorum ex s.c. ex privato/ in publicum redegerunt". (= Dessau, ILS 5939; 5940; 5941). The known members of this commission, therefore, all held the office under Tiberius.

93. See DE art. curator, p. 1327.


95. Suet., Vit. 5: "Trium itaque principum (i.e: Gaius, Claudius and Nero) indulgentia non solum honoribus verum et sacerdotiiis amplissimis auctus, proconsulatum Africai post haec curamque operum publicorum administravit et voluntate dispari et existimatione. In provincia singularem innocentiam praestitit biennio continuato, cum succedenti fratri legatus substitisset; at in urbano officio dona atque ornamenta templorum subripuisse et commutasse quaedam ferebatur proque auro et argento stagnum et aurichalcum supposuisse". Although Suetonius gives him the title only of curator operum publicorum, the anecdote related about his corruption in administering the cura shows that his competence extended over the temples also.

96. CIL VI, 814.

97. See again CIL VI, 814. Domition is alleged to have put Flavius Sabinus to death, because at the consular elections the herald inadvertently announced him as "imperator" instead of "consul" (Suet., Dom. 10, 4).

In CIL VI, 814, Flavius Sabinus is given the title only of curator operum publicorum. But the full title of curator aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum is sometimes given in the cursus of senators who held the office; see McCrum and Woodhead, Documents, n. 286; also see ILS 8971, which records a consul of A.D. 92 (Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaenus), and in which the title cur(ator) aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum populi Romani is given.
98. See above, note 85.

99. The curators acted both singly and jointly in authorizing the use of public ground, and the allocations are dated by the current consuls; see e.g. CIL VI, 855 - A.D. 150; VI, 360 - A.D. 160.

100. These officials can be equated with the board known as the quattuorviri viis in urbe purgandis, who together with the duoviri viis extra propiusve urbem Romam passus M purgandis are first recorded under 45 B.C. (RE art. quattuorviri cols. 849-850). Dio, 54, 26, 6 states that the duoviri (i.e. the two who were once entrusted with the roads outside the walls) had been abolished; but the quattuorviri continue to be attested into the third century (see Dessau, ILS Index III, 409; RE loc. cit.; Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 258). They were under-officials on the staff of the aedile, who had responsibility for the urban streets (see Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 258). Suetonius relates that when the future emperor Vespasian was aedile under Gaius, the latter, "succensens curam verrendis viis non adhibitam, luto iussisset oppleri congesto per milites in praetextae sinum . . ." (Vesp. 5, 3). These boards of junior senators (including also the tresviri capitales, the decem stilibus iudicandis, and the tresviri auro argento aere flando feriundo) made up the vigintiviri (see again Dio, 26, 5-6). Responsibility for keeping the streets paved devolved on the urban quaestors up till Claudius' reign (see Suet., Claud. 24, 2).

101. Dio, 55, 8, 6-7.

102. Suet., Aug. 30, 1; cf. Tib. 76: Tiberius bequeathed separate legacies to the magistri vicorum.

103. Dio, 55, 8, 7.

104. Dio, 55, 8, 7; Suet., Aug. 30, 1.

105. Dio, 55, 26, 4-5; Suet., Aug. 30, 1.

106. Dio, 55, 26, 5. In the following year the tax of two percent on the sale of slaves was introduced, partly to help defray the cost of maintaining the new corps (Dio, 55, 31, 4; cf. above ch. 3, p. 48).

107. Dio, 55, 8, 7 (he adds that this was the arrangement in his own time); cf. Suet., Aug. 30, 1: "spatium urbis in regiones vicosque divisit instituitque, ut illas annui magistralus sortito tuarentur, hos magistri e plebe cuiusque viciniae lecti".
108. CIL VI, 3958: "[H[eurem]/ Aug(usti) a re/[g(ionibus) urb(is)]/"; VI, 4017: "Ti. Cl[audio Aug. 1,7/ Blasto procurat.] a regionibus urb(is)/"; VI, 4018b: "Ti. Claudio/ Aug. 1. Meropi/ procurator/ a regionibus urb(is)/"; VI, 4019: "Actio/ Aug(ustae)/ a reg(ionibus) urb(is)/ imm(un)i hon(orato)"; and "Plaetoriae/ Priscae/ Acti(i) dec(urioni)"; VI, 4021: "Ti. Claudio/ Aug. 1. - Meropi/ procurat. / Ta region(ibus urb(is)"; VI, 4019: "Actio/ Aug(ustae)/ a reg(ionibus) urb(is)/ imm(uni) hon(orato)", and "Plaetoriae/ Priscae/ Acti(i) dec(urioni)"; VI, 4022 a, b: "Livia Secunda/ Aciri soror." and "Felix Caeser, ingen(Firstname) urba(rit)"; VI, 4023: "Philodamo/ Caesaris/ a reg. urb. / dec."; VI, 4024: "Pontico/ Caesaris/ a region. / dec."; cf. VI, 8685: "dis manibus/ Ti. Claudius/ Aug. 1. Eupaes/ a reg(ionibus) (sic) / et Claudiae Vitali/ libertae suae et/ posteri(a)erum (sic)". The freedmen, some of whom were procurators "a regionibus" are all Ti. Claudii, while the imperial slave decuriones, on the other hand, date from Augustus.

109. See CIL XIV, 2992, which records T. Flavius Germanus, who held the post of proc. reg(ionum) urb(is) / diuncto sibi officio viarum / sterd/nendarum urbis partibus duabus towards A.D. 162; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 183; also see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 262, on the functions of this official. Another pro(regionum sacrae urbis is attested towards A.D. 202 (CIL VIII, 18909); see Pflaum, n. 274.

110. See Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 260, n. 2. These curatores regionum, who were generally private freedmen, are recorded in CIL VI, 975, dedicated in A.D. 136. The inscription is divided up according to the regiones, and subdivided according to the vici, with the curator recorded at the head of each regio. Some imperial freedmen are listed among them, however (e.g. P. Aelius Aug. 1. Onesimus, of regio X). Another inscription dedicated earlier (in A.D. 80) appears to have for its executors the praefectus annonae, a magister (vici?), and a freedman curator (regionis?) - CIL VI, 2059: "loca asignata in amphiteatro/ L(uicio) Aelio Plauto Lamia Q(uinto) Pactumeio Fr/ontone co(n)s(ulibus)/ acceptum ab Laberio Maximo procuratore praef(ecto) annonae L(uicio) Vennuleio Apron/ano mag(isto) curatore Thyrso l(iberto)".

111. See again, note 110. Hirschfeld, KV3, pp. 260-261, n. 2, suggests that the imperial slaves and freedmen attested for the Julio-Claudian period (see again note 108, above) exercised supervision over imperial distributions carried out in the vici (citing Suet., Tib. 76). Bouvert, EAII, pp. 54-55, thinks that Augustus employed his slaves to exercise supervision over the new urban divisions he had introduced. Bouvert suggests that this may have been done in virtue of Augustus' consular imperium, which allowed him to take measures for the public security; and, as for any other magistracy he assumed, he could employ his own slaves as assistants.
Frontinus' account of the administration of the aqueducts shows that the aerarium continued to support both the familia publica (de Ag. 118) and also the cost of providing the curatores with apparitores and ministeria: Frontinus comments, however: "apparitores et ministeria, quamvis perseveret adhuc aerarium in eos erogare, tamen esse curatorum videntur desisse inertia ac segnitia non agentium officium". (de Ag. 101).

113. See above note 38: new aqueducts; also see ILS 5856: 9496: Trajan's construction of the via Traiana.

114. See above note 40 (repairs on the Claudian aqueducts undertaken by Vespasian and Titus). Again, Trajan records that in the case of the via Flaminia: "viam prolapsam nova substruct(ione) rest(ituit)". - (inscription quoted in DE art. Flaminia via, p. 151); also see ILS 280: Trajan completed repairs begun by Nerva on the via Appia.

115. Suet., Claud. 24, 2.

116. Hirschfeld (KV³, p. 261) assumes that after this time the cost must have been assumed, at least partly, by the fiscus.

117. CIL VI, 931: "Imp. Caesari/ Vespasiano Aug./ pont. max. tr. pot. III/ imp. IIX p. p. cos. III des. IIII (A.D. 71) s.c./ quod vias urbis/ negligentia/ superior. tempor./ corruptas in(sic)pena sua restituit".

118. The earliest such official appears to be an imperial freedman (L. Aurelius L. Caesaris 1. Nicomedes), who was appointed proc(urator) ad silic(es), by the emperor Antoninus Pius (CIL VI, 1598); cf. CIL XIV, 2992: T. Flavius Germanus, a proc. reg. urbis adiuncto sibi officio viarum sternendarum urbis partibus duabus, towards A.D. 162 (see Pflaum, no. 183); cf. note 45, above.


120. See CIL VI, 8479: M. Ulpius Aug. 1. Abascantus, tabularius oper(um) public(orum); also see VI, 8481: T. Flavius Aug. 1. Eutactus, an exactor operum; XI, 3860: M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Thaumastus, a commentariis operum publicorum et rationis patrimonii; VI, 8478: a disi (sic) = dispenser operum publicorum. See Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 269, on these categories of officials; also Boulvert, EAI, pp. 232-33.
121. Trajan, for example, seems to have had his own body of technical assistants for the public works he constructed: when Pliny the Younger requested the emperor to send out a surveyor (mensur) from Rome to assist him in Bithynia, Trajan replied that he was unable to do so because he had scarcely enough surveyors for the works in progress in and around Rome (Ep. 10-18).

122. See again discussion of the financing of the cura aquarum, above, p. 80.

123. The evidence for Nerva's initiation of the scheme consists mainly of a coin issued in A.D. 97, which represents the emperor seated on the sella curulis extending his right hand towards a boy and girl accompanied by a woman, and which has the inscription "tutela Italiae" (Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, p. 220). The authenticity of this coin has been questioned, however (e.g. by Mattingly, in BMC III, p. 21).

The theme of private liberality by the emperor in establishing the alimenta is underlined in several of the records commemorating their institution by Trajan. A stone from Auximum, for example, is dedicated: "[Imp. Caes. Di]vi Nervae f. Nervae [Traiano Aug. Germ. Dacic]o ... quod per munificentiam suam ..." (CIL IX, 5825). The senators Cornelius Gallianus and T. Pomponius Bassus were appointed to set up the alimentary funds in Italy; they are recorded (without any official title) in the tabula Veleiatium, one of the chief documents relating to the institution of the alimenta (CIL XI, 1147). Also, a municipal decree from Ferentinum, in which Bassus is named patronus, records his mandate as follows: "Quod universa v(erba) f(ecerunt) T. Pomponius Bassus clarissinum virum demandatam sibi curam indulgentissimo Imp(eratore) Caesare Nerva Traiano Augusto Germanico (A.D. 101) qua aeternitati Italiae suae prospexit secundum liberalitatem eius ita ordinare ut ..." (CIL VI, 1492).

124. See Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1029; also see n. 94, on Q. Marcius Turbo, pp. 212-213: Turbo was made the head of a new central bureau, created by Trajan, for the vehiculatio.


126. See again de Aq. 99, 100; see p. 78, above.

127. See again de Aq. 103, 106; cf. 99, 110-111.

128. See again de Aq. 103 and 99. Cf. de Aq. 101 - Frontinus speaks of how he was invested with the insignia of a magistrature by s.c., but preferred himself to dispense with these trappings: "fides nostra et auctoritas a principe data pro lictoribus erit".

129. See above p. 84.
CHAPTER 6 - FOOTNOTES


2. Cf. Dio, 53, 2, 1 - Augustus: "καὶ ἐπειδὴ χορημάτων τῷ ἐνοχῷ ἔδέχετο, ἐδανείστα τινα καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν διοίκησιν ὅπως δῶ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἔστρατηγικότατον αἱρεῖσθαι ἐκέλευσε";
Suetonius, Aug. 36: "Auctor et aliarum rerum fuit, in quis ... ut cura aerarii a quaestoribus urbanis ad praetorios praetoresve transiret" (28 B.C.).

3. Cf. Dio, 53, 32, 2: "Ταύτα τε οὕτως ἃ Άθηνας ἐποίησε, καὶ στρατηγοὺς δέκα, ὡς οὐδὲν ἐπὶ πλείονα δεδομένος, ἀπέδεξεν καὶ τούτῳ καὶ ἐπὶ πλείω ἔτη ἔγνετο. ἐμεῖλλον δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι τὰ αὐτὰ ἀπέρ καὶ πρόσθεν πολυτέλει, δύο δὲ ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησιν δοθα ἔτη γενήσεσθαι".


5. Dio, 60, 24, 3.

6. CIL VI, 1403. Also see De Ruggiero, DE I, art. aerarium, p. 304.

7. Ann. 13, 28: the quarrel arose from Helvidius' accusation that Sabinus had been over hasty in selling up the property of state debtors. On this function of the aerarium officials, see below, p. 99.

8. Ann. 13, 28: "Dein princeps curam tabularum publicarum a quaestoribus ad praefectos transtulit" - the cura tabularum publicarum involved one aspect of the work of the aerarium officials, see below, p. 97; cf. Ann. 13, 29: "igitur Nero praetura perfunctos et experientia probatos delegit". On these changes in the aerarium management in the early Principate, also see Mommsen, Staatsrecht II, pp. 1012-1013.

9. Hist. 4, 9: "praetores aerarii (nam tum a praetoribus tractabatur aerarium) publicam paupertatem questi modum impensis postulaverant". On this occasion, the praetores presented their report on the financial situation to the senate; but despite the senator Helvidius Priscus' insistence that the senate should act independently on the question of the finances, "Vulcavius Tertullinus tribunus plebis intercessit ne quid super tanta re principe absente statueretur".
10. For a list of recorded praefecti aerarii Saturni, see DE art. aerarium, pp. 302-303.

11. See DE art. aerarium, p. 302 (see e.g. CIL VI, 1517; 1545; III, 4013).

12. Pliny was consul in A.D. 100 (Pan. 92), and before that praefectus aerarii since 98 (Pan. 91; Ep. 10, 3); also see DE art. aerarium, p. 302.

13. See DE art. aerarium, pp. 305-306; they are recorded with the title scriba librarius quaestorius in CIL II, 3596; VI, 1802, 1804, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1811, 1815, 1821, 1822a, 1824, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1833a, 1833b, 1833c, 1834; X, 4737; XIV, 3949; for the III(trium) decuriarum see CIL II, 3596; VI, 1802, 1804, 1807, 1808, 1811, 1815, 1816, 1819, 1824, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1833a, b, c; X, 4727; for the sexprimi: CIL VI, 1810, 1820, 1822, 1825, 1827, 2165; XIV, 3645, 3674.

14. See Cicero, in Verr. 3, 79, 184; 3, 60, 137; cf. 66, 154; Horace, Sat. 1, 5, 35; Pliny, H.n. 26, 1, 3. Some scribae are known to have proceeded to an equestrian career, see e.g. CIL VI, 1802 - "a militis"; VI, 1832 - "equo publico exornatus ab imperatore"; VI, 1817 - "praefectus fabrum"; VI, 1822 - "praefectus cohortis"; VI, 1806, 1822 - "tribunus militum". Also see A.H.M. Jones, "The Roman Civil Service (Clerical and Sub-Clerical Grades)", JRS (1949), p. 38 (= Studies in Roman Government and Law, p. 151). Some freedmen, however, are recorded as scribae (CIL VI, 1815, 1819, 1829), including two imperial freedmen: "Tit. Claudius Augustus ... scriba librarius" (CIL VI, 1859); and M. Ulpianus Augustus Callistus, scriba librarius quaestorius (CIL VI, 1809). On the basis of these two inscriptions it is difficult to judge whether the emperor may have regularly nominated his own freedmen to this post. Boulvert argues that the emperor "peut avoir un intérêt à introduire ses affranchis dans ce corps", on the grounds that through the intermediary of these officials he could control the management of the public funds dependent on the aerarium (EAI, p. 44, n. 199). It is more probable that the emperor exerted his influence directly on the management of the aerarium, rather than try to control it indirectly through the minor officials attached to it. But possibly the emperor found it convenient to have his own freedmen among the scribae, perhaps to provide copies of the records held in the treasury building, or to enter accounts on his own behalf (see p. 97 below).

15. See Livy, 40, 25, 10; Cicero, pro Cluent. 45, 126.

16. See DE art. aerarium, p. 305.
17. See Cicero, de domo 28, 74; also in Verr. 3, 79, 183, in which he speaks of "eorum hominum fidei tabulae publicae periculaque magistratum committuntur".

18. See Cicero, de leg. 3, 20, 46; Plutarch, Cato min. 61. The effect of a s.c. could be annulled if the process of delatio ad aerarium could be halted in time; see Suet., Aug. 94, 3; Jul. 28, 3. In A.D. 21, after the hurried execution of Clutorius Priscus by the decision of the senate, Tiberius had rebuked the senators for their haste in carrying out the sentence, and "factum senatus consultum ne decreta patrum ante diem decimum ad aerarium deferrentur idque vitae spatium damnatis prorogaretur"; Ann. 3, 51.

There is some conflict of evidence as to which senatorial officials had charge of the treasury records in the early Principate. Dio (54, 36, 1) records under 11 B.C. that the quaestors were instructed to preserve the decrees passed at various times, because the tribunes and aediles, who had previously been entrusted with this duty, had been performing it through their assistants with the result that some mistakes and confusion had occurred. Then, early in Tiberius' reign, a commission of three senators was appointed to restore the public records; see Dio, 57, 16, 2. Curatores tabularum publicarum are also attested under Claudius: the senator C. Ummidius Durmius Quadratus was a quaestor of Divus Augustus and of Tiberius (A.D. 14), aedile, praetor, and (perhaps concurrently with his praetorship), curatores tabularum publicarum (CIL X, 5182), while L. Coedius Candidus was a quaestor of Claudius, quaestor aerarii Saturni, and (perhaps at the same time) curatores tabularum publicarum (CIL XI, 6163). Also, an inscription from Rome records the dedication of a building (in A.D. 46) "ex s.c. per7" C. Calpetanus Rantius Sedatus Metronius, M. Petronius Lurco, T. Satrius Decianus, curatores tabulariorum publicorum (CIL VI, 916 = 31201). These officials may have been members of a new board created by Claudius (Dio, 60, 10, 4; see note 33, below), as their title differs from that of the officials recorded in the two preceding inscriptions; cf. DE art. curator, p. 1329.

But in recording Nero's decision to transfer the management of the aerarium from the quaestors to praefecti, Tacitus calls the office the cura tabularum publicarum (Ann. 13, 28); also, from Pliny the Younger's description of his duties as praefectus aerarii, it appears that oversight of the public records was among them: "conficio tabulas ..." (Ep. 1, 10, 9-10). Yet in the Julio-Claudian period the functions of the oversight of the public records and the financial management of the public treasury were evidently kept separate for a time, although Ann. 13, 28 obscures this division between the two functions.
19. Pliny the Younger, Ep. 4, 12, discusses a recent case involving a provincial quaestor whose scriba had died. The quaestor had not known what should be done with the deceased scriba's salary, and had brought the matter to Trajan's attention. Next, "Caesare auctore", the quaestor brought the question before the senate, and a law-suit followed between the heirs of the scriba and the praefecti aerarii, which was won by the advocate (Caecilius Strabo) for the latter.

20. See Cicero, in Verr. 3, 78, 79, 183; in Pis. 25, 61. Cf. Fam. 5, 20, 2; ad Att. 6, 7, 2: Cicero reported from his province (Cilicia) that in accordance with a lex of Julius Caesar, he had deposited copies of his rationes at two cities in the province, and had sent a third copy to the aerarium.

21. Cf. Jones, Studies, p. 105, who argues that since the emperors (after Augustus) held their provincia for life, they were under no obligation to render an account of their provincial administration.

22. Suet., Gaius 16, says that this practice was followed by both Augustus and Tiberius (until the latter's retirement to Capri), and was resumed by Gaius.

23. FIRA\(^2\)I, 13, lines 46-9.

24. That is, presumably sales of property foreclosed on by the praetores with respect to privati unable to realize their obligations to the aerarium (see note 26, below).

25. Dio, 60, 10, 3: "ἐπεὶ τε τινες τῶν στρατηγῶν τῶν τὴν διοίκησιν ἐγκεχειρημένων αὐτίκα ἔλαβαν, οὐκ ἐπεξερήθει μὲν ὁφεῖ, πιπράσκουσι δὲ τινὰ καὶ μεθοθουσι ἐπιφοιτήσας πάνθε' ὡσα ἐνόμικε μὴ καλὰς γέγενεσαι διάρκεια".

26. In the Republic the censors on leaving office would deposit at the aerarium a list of public debtors (e.g. Livy, 29, 37, 12); an example of censorial action is that of Camillus and Postumius, who (403 B.C.) laid a fine on all those who had attained old age in celibacy and reported their names to the aerarium (Val. Max., 2, 9, 1); see F. Millar, "The Aerarium and its officials under the Empire", JRS (1964), pp. 35-36.

27. This was presumably the priesthood inaugurated by the emperor Gaius for the cult of his own divinity; Suetonius (Gaius 22, 3) states: "magisteria sacerdotii ditissimus quisque et ambitione et licitatione maxima vicibus comparabant".

28. Suet., Claud. 9, 2.
29. F. Millar, JRS (1964), p. 36, views the issuing of an edict by the praetores aerarii as indicating that they possessed jurisdiction in such cases; cf. below, p. 99, where the scope of the jurisdiction exercised by the aerarium officials in the first century is discussed.

30. Dio, 53, 2, 3-4: "καὶ τὰς ἄγγας τὰς πρὸς τὸ δημοσίουν πρὸς τῆς πρὸς τῷ Ἀκτίμῳ μάχης γενεμένας, πλὴν τῶν περὶ τὰ οἷκονταματα, ἀπῆλλαξε, τὰ τὲ παλαιὰ συμβόλαια τῶν τῷ κοινῷ τὶ φερόλοντων ἐκαυσε";

 cf. Suet., Aug. 32, 2:
"tabulas veterum aerarii debitorum, vel praecipuam calumniandi materiam, exussit".

31. Dio, 66, 10, 2a = Zon. 11, 17: "καὶ τὰ συμβόλαια τὰ παλαιὰ τὸ δημοσίου προσήκοντα προσδιέφειρε".

32. For Hadrian, see Dio, 69, 8, 1 = Xiph. 246:
"Ελέαδον γὰρ ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀφῆκε τὰ φερόλομένα τῷ τε βασιλείῳ καὶ τῷ δημοσίῳ τῶν Ῥωμαίων, ἔκκαιδεκατῇ δρόσῳ χρόνον ἐφ' ὅδε τὲ καὶ μέχρις ὑπὸ τηρήθησαν τούτ' ἔμελλεν";

 cf. HA (v. Hadr. 7, 6), in which it is stated that Hadrian remitted to private debtors in Rome and in Italy immense sums of money owed to the fiscus, and that in the provinces "ex reliquis ingentes summas remisit". Also, in a Roman inscription dedicated in A.D. 118, the senate and Roman people officially thank Hadrian as the first and only princeps who in remitting 900,000,000 HS due to the fisci had by this act rendered secure not only the living citizens but their posterity (CIL VI, 967). The term fiscus in this inscription may refer to the provincial chests, or, alternatively, the inscription may commemorate Hadrian's remission of sums due to the public treasury; see F. Millar, JRS (1963), p. 32; cf. above, ch. 1, note 71.

For Marcus Aurelius' remission of debts, see Dio 71, 32. 2 = Xiph. 265.

33. Dio, 60, 10, 4: "τούτῳ τε σὺν περὶ τὴν διοίκησιν ἔπαξε, καὶ τρεῖς ἀνέδρας τῶν ἐστρατηγικῶν πράκτορας τῶν τῷ δημοσίῳ φερόλομένων κατέστησε, καὶ μαραθούχος καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ὑπηρεσίαν αὐτοῖς δοῦα".

34. See above, pp. 95-6.

35. Ann. 13, 28; cf. again Suet., Claud. 9, 2.


37. Ann. 13, 28; Tacitus begins his account of this senatorial activity by stating: "Manebat nihil minus quaedam imago rei publicae" - apparently he felt that what he was about to relate demonstrated that the senate still enjoyed some freedom of action.
38. Cf. below, ch. 8, note 80 - other passages relating to events under Nero indicate that the senate hesitated to act on its own initiative on matters affecting the emperor and officials responsible to him, particularly the imperial legati.


41. Pallas, the a rationibus of Claudius, had been dismissed from this office by Nero in the same year (cf. Ann. 13, 14), while Afranius Burrus still held the post of prefect of the Praetorian Guard (cf. Ann. 13, 20). The charge originated by Paetus was that these two men had conspired to give the empire to Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix, because of his illustrious name and marriage link with Claudius, whose daughter Claudia Antonia was his wife. According to Tacitus, Burrus "quamvis reus inter iudices sententiam dixit". (Ann. 13, 23).

42. Ann. 13, 23.

43. Suet. Dom. 9, 2 ("reos, qui ante quinquennium proximum apud aerarium pendissent, universos discrimine liberavit nec repeti nisi intra annum eaque condicione permisit, ut accusatori qui causam non teneret exsilium poena esset.")

44. Dio, 60, 4, 4; Millar JRS (1964), p. 36, suggests quite plausibly that the exercise of judicial functions by the officials in charge of the aerarium possibly began in the period (A.D. 23 - A.D. 44) when the post was held by praetors.

45. Cf. p. 98, above (on Dio, 60, 10, 3).

46. See again Dio, 60, 4, 4.

47. Nero 17, 2: "utque rerum actu ab aerario causae ad Forum ac recipitores transferrentur et ut omnes appellationes a iudicibus ad senatum fierent".

48. Pan. 36, 1-2: "Quam iuvat cernere aerarium silens et quietum, et quale ante delatores erat! nunc templum illud nunc vere dei (sedes), non spoliarium civium cruentarumque praedarum saevum receptaculum, ac toto in orbe terrarum adhuc locus unus in quo optimo princepe boni malis impares essent". (Pliny then goes on to hint at new restrictions placed on the activities of informers by Trajan: "manet tamen honor legum, nihilque ex publica utilitute convulsum, nec poena cuiquam remissa, sed addita est ultio, solumque mutatum, quod iam non delatores sed leges timentur."

50. Ep. 1, 10, 9-10; this is confirmed by the words which Euphrates used to console Pliny for his labours, and which are quoted in the same letter: "agere negotium publicum, cognoscere, iudicare, promere et exercere iustitiam".

51. A case recorded by Tacitus possibly indicates the existence of such a tribunal under Tiberius. The case in question (which is reported under A.D. 15) concerned a junior senator, Aurelius Pius, who protested that his house had been undermined by the construction of a road and aqueduct, and appealed to the senate: "resistentibus aerarii praetoribus subvenit Caesar pretiumque aedium Aurelio tribuit, erogandae per honesta pecuniae cupiens, quam virtutem diu retinuit, cum ceteras exuerat" (Ann. 1, 75). Tiberius apparently did not attempt to reverse the judgement of the praetores aerarii on Aurelius Pius' case.

52. The lex Papia, which Tacitus states had been sanctioned by Augustus in his later years, was introduced to supplement the lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus: "Relatum dein de moderanda Papia Poppea, quam senior Augustus post Iulias rogationes incitandis caelibus poenis et augendo aerario sanxerat." - Ann. 3, 25; cf. Dio, 56, 10 (under A.D. 9) - Augustus increased the rewards to those who had children and in the case of the others he made a distinction between the married men and the unmarried by imposing different penalties; contrary to the Voconian law, according to which no woman could inherit property to the value of more than one hundred thousand sesterces, he permitted some women to inherit larger amounts; then later the Papian Poppean law was framed by Marcus Papius Mutilus and by Quintus Poppeus Secundus who were consuls at the time.

53. See Ann. 3, 25: "nec ideo coniugia et educationes liberum frequentabantur praevalida orbitate: ceterum multitudo periclitantium gliscebat..."

    Cf. Ann. 3, 28: "acriora ex eo vincla, inditi custodes et leges Papia Poppea praemiis inducunt, si a privilegiis parentum cessaretur, velut pares omnium populus vacantis teneret. sed altius penetrabant urbeaque et Italian et quod usquam civium corripuerant, multorumque excisi status".


55. Suet., Nero 10, 1 ("praemia delatorum Papiae legis ad quartas redegit").
Apart from inheritances forfeited because of failure to comply with the provisions of the lex Papia Poppaea, which were intended to benefit the aerarium (see again Tac., Ann. 3, 25), certain passages of Ulpian relating to the provisions of the Augustan marriage laws also show that the Roman people (and hence the aerarium) was intended as the beneficiary of property forfeited under them: that is, in cases where there were no validly instituted testamentary heirs (or none who would accept the inheritance), and no persons who were entitled to intestate succession or to bonorum possessio under praetorian rules (or none who would accept the estate), the bona were vacantia and "populo bona deferuntur ex lege Iulia caducaria"; see Ulpian, 28, 7; Gaius 2, 150; cf. 3, 62 (by the lex Iulia "bona caduca fiunt et ad populum deferri iubentur ..."). See P.A. Brunt, JRS (1966), pp. 79-80, for a discussion of these and other relevant passages.

Tac., Ann. 2, 48 ("bona Aemiliae Musae, locupletis intestatae, petita in fiscum, Aemilio Lepido, cuius e domo videbatur, ... tradidit").

After relating (Ann. 2, 47) how Tiberius assisted the cities of Asia damaged by earthquake in that year (A.D. 17), Tacitus goes on to state, with reference to the case of Aemilia Musa's estate, "Magnificam in publicum largitionem auxit Caesar haud minus grata liberalitate" (Ann. 2, 48).

In fact it can only be conjectured on what legal basis the emperors began to claim bona vacantia and caduca, as well as bona damnatorum (i.e. the property of condemned persons). P.A. Brunt, e.g., considers that the emperor's seizure of these categories of income, of which formerly the aerarium was the sole beneficiary, is explicable only if the fiscus was already in some sense a public institution, that is, "a kind of department of the aerarium of which the emperor was the administrator" (JRS 1966, p. 82). On the other hand, F. Millar (who views the fiscus in the early Principate as being nothing more than a private fund of the emperor) points to Ptolemaic precedents, preserved in Roman Egypt, to explain the emperor's claims; but he admits that it is difficult to see how the fiscus' rights to caduca and bona damnatorum could have entered Roman legal practice outside Egypt (JRS 1963, p. 35, p. 36). Moreover, as Millar's arguments concerning the relevance of Ptolemaic precedents rests on his definition of φίλοκος in the context of the Gnomon of the Idios Logos as being the emperor's chest, his case is not convincing: as pointed out elsewhere (cf. above, ch.1, p.23, and below, ch.9, p.145), the term fiscus (or φίλοκος) used in a provincial context probably denotes the provincial chest. Yet Brunt's thesis is not convincing either, since (as will emerge from discussion of particular cases) in Tiberius' reign it was the patrimonium which benefited. G. Boulvert (RHD 1970, p. 436) argues that even if the bona did go to the patrimonium under Tiberius, when
Tacitus employs the term fiscus with respect to such imperial appropriations he means something different, because in Tacitus' time the fiscus was "une caisse publique" (cf. op.cit., p. 434) and could thus claim public revenues concurrently with the aerarium. Since, however, imperial claims to bona damnatorum do go back to Tiberius' time, the status of the fiscus in a considerably later period does not furnish any clue to the grounds on which Tiberius made his claims. In the case of Aemilia Musa's estate, A.H.M. Jones suggests that as the rest of the passage (Ann. 2, 48) deals with property left by will to Tiberius, it may be presumed that Tiberius claimed as next of kin (see Studies, p. 108). Though Tacitus' description of how Tiberius revoked his own claim in favour of a distant connection of Aemilia Musa perhaps supports Jones' explanation, there are unfortunately no other grounds for his assumption (as observed by Boulvert, RDH 1970, p. 434, n. 25).

See Tac., Ann. 4, 19; and Tacitus adds (Ann. 4, 20): "ea prima Tiberio erga pecuniam alienam diligentia fuit".

It seems impossible to deny the straightforward implications of Tacitus' statement, although Brunt (JRS 1966, pp. 81-82) considers that the senate would have been required to make a new law to the effect that the emperor might recover gifts from one who could be held to have shown him ingratitude. Brunt also points out (loc.cit., note 38) that the rules of private law under which a donor, but not his heir, could recover gifts on grounds of ingratitude are inapplicable here; for he emphasizes (p. 81) that there is no indication in legal texts that a private donor was entitled to recover gifts from a person convicted on a criminal charge. But Pliny the Younger states (Pan. 43, 5) that the recovery of former imperial gifts from someone's estate had been a common pretext for confiscation, even of the whole estate. Therefore, even if there are no certain legal grounds on which an emperor could reclaim former imperial benefactions, it is apparent that Tiberius' pretext in Silius' case later became customary grounds, at any rate.


Dio, 53, 23, 7 (under 26 B.C.).
65.  Ann. 6, 2; the passage gives a list of senatorial decisions made at the beginning of A.D. 32, all of which are mentioned by Tacitus as examples of extreme sycophancy on the senate's part. In Brunt's opinion (JRS 1966, p. 82), even if the senate had framed a new law declaring that the emperor might reclaim former imperial benefactions, that could not constitute a justification in law for the emperor annexing the whole property of the man concerned. This is no doubt so, since Pliny the Younger (Pan. 43, 5) clearly regards confiscation of entire estates on these grounds as an abuse. Yet the fact remains that the senate evidently sanctioned the transferral of Seianus' estate from the aerarium to Tiberius, and very probably similar proposals were framed under later emperors. Tacitus' comment on the senate's action over Seianus' estate ("tamquam referret") is perhaps a comment on the impotence of the senate to really control the disposal of bona damnatorum.

66.  Tac., Ann. 6, 18-19.

67.  It is not entirely clear from Tacitus' account whether the mines ceased to be public property as the result of the emperor's seizure of them.

Brunt (JRS 1966, p. 82) observes that Tacitus, in stating that Tiberius set aside these mines for himself, uses a verb he employs in connection with Augustus' administration of the province of Egypt (Ann. 2, 59; cf. Hist. 1, 11: "seposuit Aegyptum"). On the basis of this parallel use of terms, Brunt argues that as Egypt was in some sense "public" we are not obliged to hold that the mines taken by Tiberius ceased to be in public ownership, only that the emperor simply decided to manage and exploit them through his own agents. To interpret Ann. 6, 19 in this way, however, surely ignores the force of Tacitus' statement, in which the phrase "quamquam publicaretur" is contrasted with "sibimet Tiberius seposuit".

Outright acquisition of landed property by the emperors is commonly described in the sources as an aspect of the tyranny of unpopular emperors; see again Pliny, Pan. 45. Thus the successors of these emperors reportedly restored such "illegally" confiscated properties to their rightful owners; see Dio, 60, 6, 3 (Claudius is said to have returned the moneys that had been confiscated under Tiberius and Gaius); Tac., Hist. 1, 90 (Galba's policy for recompensing those exiled under Nero); Dio, 68, 2, 1 (Nerva is said to have paid compensation to those unjustly deprived of their estates by Domitian).

68.  See Dio, 58, 4, 8.
69. Brunt, e.g., suggests with reference to the case of Cornelius Gallus under Augustus (see again, Dio, 53, 23) that in the earliest period of the Principate, senatus consultae provided precedents for a practice which became in course of time general, and was adopted without express sanction in each particular case (JRS 1966, p. 81).

70. Pan. 42, 1. Pliny's reference to the lex lulia is perhaps shorthand for both the lex lulia and lex Papia Poppeae, which was introduced to supplement it; cf. Millar, JRS (1964), p. 35.

71. See above, pp. 101-102.

72. This emerges from Dig. 49. 14, 13 (from Paulus, liber primus ad legem Iuliam et Papiam) on two edicts of Trajan, and further second century regulations. Dig. 49. 14, 13 pr. deals with fideicommissa - a device by which caelibes and orbi were at first able to evade the restrictions on their right to inherit under wills. Trajan and Hadrian enacted that a beneficiary might, under such provisions, take one half of the property that would have accrued to him, provided that he denounced himself "ad aerarium" before any other delation had taken place. A s.c. of Hadrian's reign enacted that it was for the aerarium in these circumstances to sequester the property and hand over a half to the self-delator (Dig. 49. 14, 15, 3). Also see Brunt (JRS 1966, p. 80) on this legislation.

73. The assumption that the praefecti aerarii had jurisdiction over the claims of the fiscus to bona caduca rests on two reports of a case decided by Marcus Aurelius (Dig. 28. 4, 3; 34. 9, 12). This case involved the will of a man who had erased the names of his heirs, and it is shown that advocati fisci were present at the hearing, as well as the advocate of one of the legatees (Dig. 28. 4, 3). The presence of advocati fisci (first appointed by the emperor Hadrian to represent the fiscus in cases where its interests were involved - see HA v. Hadr. 20, 3) indicates that the fiscus had a possible claim to the estate as caducum. But it also emerges from the reports of this case that the advocati fisci had to make good their claims before other judges, and that these judges were the praefecti aerarii. Papinian (Dig. 34. 9, 12) refers to "the judgment of the Divine Marcus in the case of the man whose name the testator had erased after completing his will" and adds that the emperor "sent the case to the praefecti aerarii, though the legacies bequeathed remained valid".

74. Brunt deduces, from the case mentioned in the preceding note, that the appearance of advocati fisci before the administrators of the public treasury shows that the fiscus,
in one of its aspects, should be regarded as a department of the aerarium (JRS 1966, p. 81). This does not seem to be a very satisfactory conclusion, however. If the fiscus claimed bona caduca in virtue of being "a department of the aerarium," it seems strange that the fiscus would be obliged to plead its case before the praefecti. Rather, the case in question indicates that in theory the claims of the aerarium to bona caduca were still paramount over possible claims the fiscus might urge. It might be noted, also, that the emperor Hadrian had evidently felt that the claims of the fiscus to bona damnatorum were illegal, for "damnatorum bona in fiscum privatum redigi vetuit, omni summa in aerario publico recepta" (HA v. Hadr. 7, 7) - even if (as Millar comments, JRS 1963, p. 37) his lead was not followed under his successors.

75. Pliny the Younger, Pan. 36, 3-5: "At fortasse non eadem severitate fiscum qua aerarium cohibes: immo tanto maiore quanto plus tibi licere de tuo quam de publico credis. dicitur actori atque etiam procuratori tuo: 'in ius veni, sequere ad tribunal'. nam tribunal quoque excogitatum principatui est par ceteris, nisi illud litigatoris amplitudine metiariis. sors et urna fisco iudicem adsignat; licet exclamare: 'hunc nolo, timidus est et bona saeculi parum intellegit; illum volo, qui Caesarem fortiter amat'. eodem foro utuntur principatus et libertas; quae praecipua tua gloria est, saepius vincitur fiscus, cuius mala causa nunquam est nisi sub bono principe. ingens hoc meritum; maius illud quod eos procuratores habes, ut plerumque cives tui non alios iudices malint. liberum est autem discrimini suo locum eligere (=emendation; see Loeb and O.C.T.: M. has "discriminis volo cum"). neque enim ullam necessitatem muneribus tuis addis, ut qui scias hanc esse beneficiorum principalium summam, si illis et non uti licet". The tribunal mentioned by Pliny in this passage may be identified with the special praetor's court created by Nerva, to which Pomponius refers: "adiecit divus Nerva (praetorem) qui inter fiscum et privatos ius diceret" (Dig. 1. 2, 2, 32). On this court see Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 81; Latomus (1966), p. 480; cf. Millar, JRS (1963), p. 33; Hist. (1965), p. 364. Nothing more is heard of the jurisprudence of this fiscal praetor in legal texts relating to the claims of the fiscus under Trajan, Hadrian, or the Antonines.

76. Pliny's meaning in this passage (Pan. loc. cit.) seems to be that, in the first place, the claims of the fiscus were pressed by an imperial procurator, and that formerly (i.e. under Domitian) a privatus had no legal recourse for contesting the claim further than the procurator's ruling. But at the time Pliny is writing, a privatus could bring the procurator into court - specifically before the special tribunal for the hearing of cases in which the interests of the fiscus were involved. Pliny continues that this tribunal was no different
from other courts except in the eminence of its litigator. The fiscus was assigned its judge by lot (whom the privatus could reject if he wished), and the fiscus frequently lost its case. But in the final section of the passage (36. 5) Pliny indicates that under Trajan most people desired no other judges besides the procurators for their cases. Nevertheless, people were free to choose the place (i.e. court : "locum eligere") they preferred, and Pliny concludes by emphasizing that Trajan did not oblige anyone to use the facilities (= "muneribus") provided by him. In view of the above alternatives available to a privatus against whom the fiscus had pressed a claim, it thus appears that when Pliny speaks of the "munera" provided by Trajan he is referring to a kind of procuratorial court; cf. Brunt, Latomus (1966), p. 481, and Millar, Hist. (1965), p. 364. Millar argues that Pliny's passage does not mean that procurators acted as judices in cases between the fiscus and privati; but as Brunt points out, if Pliny means only that under a good emperor privati would accept the demands of an imperial procurator as just and not contest them, then it is difficult to understand the point of the phrase "locum eligere". Brunt concedes that this is a phrase which rests on conjectural emendation (see preceding note); but he also observes that the last sentence is extraordinarily banal if it means only that persons faced with a fiscal claim need not take it to the courts at all.

77. The exercise of such procuratorial jurisdiction perhaps represents an extension of the sort of powers that the emperor Claudius reportedly secured for his patrimonial agents in A.D. 53. In a much discussed passage (Ann. 12, 60) Tacitus records: "Eodem anno saepius audita vox principis, parem vim rerum habendam a procuratoribus suis iudicatarum ac si ipse statuisset". Tacitus adds that in order that this opinion should not be taken as a chance indiscretion, provision - more extensive and fuller than previously - was made to that effect by a senatus consultum as well ("ac ne fortuito prolapsus videretur, senatus quoque consulto cautum pleniun quam antea et uberius"). Tacitus continues (loc.cit.): "nam divus Augustus apud equestris qui Aegypto praesidenter lege agi decretaque eorum proinde haberí usserat ac si magistratus constituissent; mox alias per provincias et in urbe pleraque concessa sunt quae olim a praetoribus noscebatur". Then, after a brief account of the powers granted to equestrians from the time of the Republic, Tacitus concludes with the comment: "Matios posthac et Vedios et cetera equitum Romanorum praevalida nomina referre nihil attinuerit, cum Claudius libertos quos rei familiari praefecerat sibique et legibus adaequaverit".

The nature and extent of the powers granted to procurators by the s.c. of A.D. 53 are not really clarified by Tacitus, though his actual words with reference to the content of this decree imply that decisions handed down by imperial agents were to be regarded as legally binding. Also, according to Suetonius,
Claudius asked the senate for ratification of the judicial acts of his agents (Claud. 12, 1: "ut sibi in curiam praefectum praetoris tribunosque militum secum inducere liceret utque rata essent quae procuratores sui in iudicando statuerent, precario exegit"). Brunt (Latomus 1966, p. 477) suggests that Tacitus may actually have misconceived the purport of what Claudius really said, in writing "parem vim rerum habendam a procuratoribus iudicatarum, ac si ipse statuisset". Brunt considers that this is reminiscent of Ulpian's statement: "quae acta gestaque sunt a procuratore Caesaris, sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Caesare gesta sunt". (Dig. 1. 19, 1, pr.), a statement which Ulpian then modifies by pointing out the limitations in the procurator's right to alienate property belonging to Caesar. On the basis of a comparison of Tacitus and Ulpian, Brunt asks "May it be that Claudius, while certainly granting new juridical rights to his procurators, at the same time promised to be bound by their executive decisions as if he had made them himself?" This appears to be a helpful interpretation of a problematic passage; cf. Millar, however, who denies that Claudius' measure gave procurators the jurisdiction between the fiscus and privati (Hist. 1964, p. 185).

Moreover, this development seems to present a contrast with the situation in the earliest period of the Principate when, according to Tacitus, the emperor's suits with privati were decided in the ordinary courts; see Ann. 4, 6 ("ac si quando privatis disceptaret, forum et ius").

Cf. above, note 75 (Dig. 1, 2, 2, 32 - Pomponius: "adiecit divus Nerva (praetorem) qui inter fiscum et privatios ius diceret").

It is not made clear what sorts of cases were decided in the procurator's court and in the fiscal praetor's tribunal. But it is possible that the procurator and fiscal praetor were concerned with suits connected with the administration of property by the fiscus (as Brunt suggests, JRS 1966, p. 81), and in particular suits arising from the fiscus' claims to inheritances under private wills. Abuses arising from the emperor's claims to estates on the grounds that he was the heir were allegedly rife under Domitian (see Suet., Dom. 12, 2). Nerva may have tried to conciliate public opinion by providing legal recourse for privati whose inheritance had been swallowed up by imperial claims made on the estate. Brunt (Latomus 1966, p. 480) suggests that the procurators mentioned by Pliny (Pan. 36) may have been the officials known under the title of procurator patrimonii or procurator hereditatum (on which see below, ch. 7, pp. 114-5). Since cases coming under the laws regarding inheritances continued to come before the
aerarium in the second century (see above, notes 72 and 73), it is unlikely that the fiscus, at least in Italy, had already acquired an independent jurisdiction in such cases. Moreover, Brunt notes that Hadrian wrote to the provincial governors on the subject of the fiscus' claims to bona vacantia and caduca; thus it would appear that in his reign the provincial governors remained competent in such cases (Latomus 1966, p. 475, citing Dig. 49. 14, 2, 1).

See again pp. 101-102.

82. See again Pliny, Ep. 4, 12, 3-5: the salary of a provincial quaestor's scriba was successfully reclaimed by the praefecti aerarii following the death of the scriba in question. Cf. above, note 19.

Under the Republic it had been the practice for the senate to vote each governor a sum of money to be drawn on the aerarium, for his expenses (see Cicero, ad Att. 3, 24, 1; cf. Q.fr. 2, 3, 1; in Pis. 2, 5; Suet., Div. Iul. 18). Under Augustus, the provincial governors began for the first time to receive a fixed salary (see e.g. Dio, 53, 15, 5), and the emperor also ordered that "proconsulibus ad mulos et tabernacula, quae publice locari solebant, certa pecunia constitueretur" (Suetonius, Aug. 36). Tacitus (Agric. 42) shows, however, that in Domitian's reign, the granting of a salary to a proconsul was at the emperor's discretion: "salarium tamen proconsulare solitum offerri et quibusdam a se ipso concessum Agricolae non dedit".

Thus Brunt (JRS 1966, p. 91) comments that "no means could be devised of bringing to account an autocrat who held power for life".

Pan. 20, 5-6. The use of the word "tamquam" in this passage suggests that the emperor was not under any formal obligation to render an account of his expenditure, but should behave as if he were. The theme of the whole passage is Trajan's return to Rome as emperor, in the spring of A.D. 99. Pliny mentions Trajan's modest use of the public post on his journey, whereas Domitian's passage along a similar route (on returning from the Suebian-Sarmatic war in December 92) is described as a plundering foray. According to Pliny, Trajan had published an expense account of his journey from the German frontier to Rome, comparing his moderate outlay of funds with Domitian's alleged reckless extravagance ("persuadendum provinciis erat illud iter Domitiani fuisse, non principis. Itaque non tam pro tua gloria quam pro utilitate communi edicto subiecisti, quid in utrumque vestrum esset impensum"). Obviously Trajan's publication of the two expense sheets was for purposes of propaganda.
86. Polybius (6, 13) shows that under the Republic the aerarium officials could issue funds only on the authority of the senate, or the consuls. Also see Millar, JRS (1964), p. 39, on this question.

87. Frontinus, de Aq. 100: "ex hoc senatus consulto ... ... quique ita delati essent, eis praetores aerarii mercedem cibaria, quanta praefecti frumento dando dare deferreque solent, annua darent et adtribuerent; eisque eas pecunias sine fraude sua capere liceret".

88. As in A.D. 69, when the officials then in charge of the aerarium reported a deficit to the senate - although the senate decided to leave the matter until Vespasian had arrived in Rome (Ann. 4, 9).

89. See again, Pan. 92, 1.

90. See again, Pan. 36, 3.


93. Pliny, Pan. 36, 3.
1. Suetonius, discussing Augustus' treatment of his slaves and freedmen, cites how: "Thallo a manu (his secretary), quod pro epistula prodita denarios quingentos accepisset, crura ei fregit" (Aug. 67, 2). Also, Suetonius records that Augustus appended to the account of the Empire's finances which he left at his death: "et libertorum servorumque nomin, a quibus ratio exigis posset" (Aug. 101, 4).

2. The importance Augustus attached to the possession of this financial data is implied in Suetonius' account of how on two occasions Augustus considered restoring the Republic: "primum post oppressum statim Antonium ...... ac rursus taedio diuturnae vallitudinis, cum etiam magistratibus ac senatu domum accitis rationarium imperii tradidit". (Aug. 28, 1).

3. See Suet., Gaius 16: "rationes imperii ab Augusto proponi solitas sed a Tiberio intermissas publicavit".


8. Ann. 4, 6 (under A.D. 23): "rari per Italiam Caesaris agri ... intra paucos libertos domus".

9. CIL VI, 8409c: "Antemus Ti. Caes. Aug. 1. a rationibus accenso delat(o) ab Aug". Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 89, considers that the term "delatus" used in this inscription signifies that Antemus was in receipt of a salary from the aerarium in his capacity as a rationibus. In fact, the term should be linked with Antemus' function as an accensus of the emperor. A magistrate of consular or praetorian rank was entitled to receive lictors and apparitores: the accensus occupied a special place among these attendants, being chosen personally by the magistrate in question (see Boulvert, EAI, p. 47). The apparitores of a magistrate were supported at the expense of the public treasury, and the term delatus refers to this (see Frontinus, de Ag. 100: "quibus apparitoribus ex hoc senatus consulto ... eos diebus decem proximis, quibus senatus consultum factum esset, ad aerarium deferrent"); cf. CIL VI, 1962: "Eutactus Aug. lib. proc. accensus delat(us) a divo Vespasiano".
10. At this stage in the Principate, the title "a rationibus" was not, however, regarded as exclusive to the accounting staff of the emperor - cf. CIL VI, 33736: "a rationibus divae lul/[ ... ]", in which "diva lul/[ia]" no doubt refers to Livia (see Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 27, n. 1).

11. CIL VI, 4014: "Felix Ti. Caesaris ad possess (iones)".

12. As Boulvert, EAI, p. 34, emphasizes. The domus Tiberiana had its own vicus: "lucundus vilic. (domus) Tib(erianae)" (CIL VI, 8655), and also an a supelecile (in charge of the furnishings), an aquarius (CIL VI, 8654, 8653), and special dispensator a toris (responsible for the dining couches - see CIL VI, 8653a = XIV, 4120. 3 = XV, 7142). Indications of increasing specialization in the emperor's domestic services are found in the branch responsible for the imperial clothing (the a veste): Anteros Ti. Caesaris, cistarius a veste foren.si (CIL VI, 5193); Ti. Iulius Aug. et Augustae 1. Nereus paternus, vesta castrensis (VI, 5248 - the term castrensis in this context denotes the emperor's residence; cf. below, p. 117); Ti. Iulius Serapio, deaetarches (VI, 5187).

13. Cf. above ch. 4, pp. 66-7 (subsidization of grain prices in Rome) and ch. 5, pp. 92-3 (subsidization of public building in Rome). According to Tacitus, Ann. 6, 17, one of the causes of the monetary crisis in A.D. 33 was so much cash being withdrawn from circulation, having been deposited in the aerarium and fiscus. Tacitus' use of the term fiscus in this context possibly refers only in a general sense to the place where the emperor's cash reserves were located (cf. below, p. 120). Indeed, as will emerge later in this discussion, there is no record of the existence of a central imperial treasury as such, to parallel the aerarium Saturni, but only individual fisci.

14. Namely Polybius, a libellis and a studis (see Seneca, Consolatio ad Polybium 6. 5; Suet., Claud. 28); Callistus, who probably succeeded Polybius (on whom see Tac., Ann. 11, 29); Narcissus, ab epistulis (see CIL XV, 7500, and on whom see again Tac., Ann. 11, 29; Suet., Claud. 28).


16. P.R.C. Weaver, "Slave and Freedman 'cursus' in the Imperial Administration", Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. (1964), p. 75, comments that Pallas and the other top freedmen mentioned in the literary sources are untypical of the ordinary freedman personnel in the imperial administration, both in their influence and affluence. On Pallas' influence over palace affairs under Claudius, see S. 1. Oost, "The career of M. Antonius Pallas",
AJP (1958), pp. 113-139.

17. Tac., Ann. 15, 35; cf. 16, 8: Lucius, Torquatus' nephew, was attacked in A.D. 65 on the same grounds:- "tamquam disponeret iam imperii curas, praeficeretque rationibus et libellis et epistulis libertos".


19. Boulvert, EAI, p. 103, argues that under Claudius the a rationibus "n'est plus un comptable qui, entre autres tâches, réalise la comptabilité de l'empereur relativement à ses différents fisci. Il est le chef des finances publiques impériales, les finances privées relevant de l'administration spéciale du patrimonia". (The emergence of a special bureau for the patrimonium is discussed below, p114 ff.)

20. The decree in question is quoted by Pliny the Younger, Ep. 8, 6, 7, and 13. Tac., Ann. 12, 52-53 (under A.D. 52) records that it was proposed following the passing (on Claudius' initiative) of a decree to the effect that free-born women marrying slaves were to be penalized by reduction to servile status if the woman married the slave without his master's permission, and reduction to the legal status of freedwoman if she married with the master's knowledge. Claudius revealed to the senate that the proposal was due to Pallas, whereupon the senate (with the consul-designate Marius Borea Soranus proposing the motion) decided to vote Pallas the sum of fifteen million sesterces and an honorary praetorship.

One effect of the s.c. Claudianum was to reduce all freeborn wives of imperial slaves to the legal status of Caes. servi, and all children of such wives to the status of Caes. vernae. The decree thus protected the interest of the imperial treasury in the inheritances accruing from the wives and children of imperial slaves, which it would lose if both the wives and children were freeborn, see Weaver, "Irregular nomina of Imperial Freedmen", CQ (1965), p. 325; cf. below, pp.116-17. This may explain the interest of Pallas as "custos principalium opum" in the passing of the s.c. On the claims of the fiscus to the property of imperial freedmen see also the anecdote related by Suetonius, Vesp. 23, 1.

21. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 89, accepts this interpretation of the s.c. honouring Pallas, and remarks that Pallas was distinguished from his predecessors (as indeed from his successors) only by the magnitude of his political influence and by the scale of his venality and wealth. Boulvert, EAI, p. 103, n. 64bis, objects to this interpretation on the grounds that "les biens publics composant ce qui s'appellera le fiscus
devant s'attacher à une personne, le Prince, et étant considérés tout naturellement comme appartenant au prince dans le language courant". But this is not a convincing explanation: not only does Pliny the Younger contrast "de tuo" and "de publico" in speaking of the emperor's fiscus on the one hand, and the aerarium on the other (Pan. 36, 3), but in Ep. 8, 6 he quotes the phrase "principalium opum" from the s.c praising Pallas' stewardship of this wealth, and later, with reference to the senate wishing to vote Pallas the sum of fifteen million sestertes, says "This, then, was the will of the senate, the chief pleasure of the people, the highly gratifying occasion of liberality - to add to Pallas' fortune by squandering public funds (="publicarum opum")". In Pliny's mind, therefore, the terms "principalium opum" and "publicarum opum" evidently denoted two different categories of funds.

22. See again Suet., Aug. 101, 4; also see Statius, Silvae 3, 3, 89ff.: these lines show that the Flavian a rationibus was responsible for estimating public income and expenditure.

23. Cf. above, ch. 4, p. 70ff.


26. See Oost, AJP (1958), p. 134; cf. Jones, Studies, p. 109. Boulvert, however, argues that if Nero dispensed Pallas from rendering any account, it was because he knew very well that it was not necessary for him himself to present any account to the aerarium. This, Boulvert thinks, indicates that the traditional order of things had changed: that is, the public funds administered by the emperor were now held quite apart from the funds accountable to the public treasury. (EAI, p. 102).

27. Oost, loc. cit.; Boulvert, loc. cit.

28. Oost, loc. cit.

29. See Weaver, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. (1964), p. 89. These freedmen are Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Abascantus, a rationibus (CIL VI, 8411); Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Actiacus, a rationibus (VI, 8412); Ti. Claudii Eros and Felix Aug. 1., a rationibus (VI, 8413); two unnamed Claudii (XI.4360); also Crescens Aug. 1., a rationibus; Diadumenus Aug. lib., a rationibus (VI 8415; cf. X, 3347; ILS 1474; CIL VI, 33903); and Philotimus Aug. 1., a rationibus (VI, 8416). Cf. Abascantus Aug. a rat(ionibus) Attic(ianus) (CIL VI, 8408); Sivirus Aug., a rat(ionibus) (VI, 33724); Apolaustus Caesaris, a rationibus (VI, 33467) - slaves. The last two give no precise indication of date (although the status indication "Caesaris" is the chief form in the Julio-Claudian period), but
Abascantus Attic(ianus), like the tabular. a rationibus of CIL VI, 8410, was no doubt a former slave of Atticus Aug. lib. a rationibus, to whom CIL VI, 8410 is dedicated in Domitian's reign (by "Fructus Imp. Caesars/ Domitiarii Aug./ Germanici Atticianus", etc.). Of the three freedmen (Crescens, Diadumenus and Philotimus) whose inscriptions do not indicate the manumitting emperor, Crescens (VI, 8414) can be dated within a generation of the Flavian dynasty as his sister was a Flavia Aug. liberta, while Diadumenus (VI, 8415) may be identified with the procurator cited under A.D. 65 in ILS 5798; there is no indication of the dates of Philotimus. Another inscription (from an amphora - CIL III, 14112, 2) records a Phaon. Aug. lib. a rationibus. The rarity of this cognomen (cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 97, n. 37) makes it extremely likely that he can be identified with the Phaon, a freedman of Nero, who is mentioned by Dio (epit. 63, 27, 3) and Suetonius (Nero 48) as being with the emperor during his last hours.

Only one certain freedman of the Flavians (T. Flavius Epaphroditus Ephebianus Aug. libertus) is recorded with the general title /a/ rationibus (CIL VI, 33468); and no Ulpius (cf. Weaver, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. 1964, p. 89).

30. See Weaver, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. (1964), p. 91. He points out, however, that the practice of labelling such subordinates simply with the name of the department applied to the growing central bureau of finance only in the Claudian and perhaps early Flavian period; thereafter the title was reserved for seniors. But some differentiation of functions was already the practice in the first century: two Ti. Claudii are recorded as tabularii a rationibus (CIL VI, 8426; VIII, 21008). For the Flavian period there is Fructus Atticianus (recorded in CIL VI, 8410; cf. preceding note - under Domitian); possibly Martialis A Aug. lib. / tabularius/s a rat. (VI, 8315; cf. below, p. 117 , with note on this official), and T. Flavius Heracleo tabularius a rationibus (VI, 8428). Also see CIL VI, 8431: T. Flavius Aug. 1. Agathopus, custos tabulari a rationibus.

31. See e.g. Rostovtzeff, DE art. fiscus, p. 133; Charlesworth, CAH XI, p. 30, n. 2.

32. See Statius, Silvae 3, 3, 146ff.

33. His name would therefore have been "Ti. Iulius Aug. 1. ..." He is usually entered as "Claudius", on the basis of the son's name. But Weaver emphasises ("The Father of Claudius Etruscus: Statius, Silvae 3, 3", CQ (1965), p. 146, n. 2; cf. Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. 1964, p. 86ff) that in the familia Caesaris the nomen of a freedman father cannot be inferred from that of a son; also see CQ (1965), p. 151.
34. Jos., A.I. 18, 182.

35. Statius, Silvae 3, 3, 71 ("huic et in Arctoas tendis comes usque pruinas").

36. Silvae 3, 3, 76-78.

37. Weaver, CQ (1965), pp. 147-148. Weaver observes that the epithet "longo" is a curious usage; he considers that the sense is temporal, and that its emphatic predicative position is best explained if it is taken in sense with "habere": "longo" = "longum" would then refer to the particular situation of Etruscus' father. That Nero is not named directly would not be surprising, nor the brevity of the reference, if his reign did not mark any change in the career of Etruscus' father (loc. cit. note 3).


40. CQ (1965), p. 148. Weaver also remarks that otherwise (surprisingly) the poem would contain no mention of the period of the Civil War.

41. CIL III, 14112, 2.

42. Dio, 63, 27, 3; Suet., Nero 48. Phaon was evidently wealthy, as Suetonius records that the freedman offered to hide Nero in his own villa (which was located in the suburbs between the via Nomentana and the via Salaria near the fourth milestone).

43. Weaver, CQ (1965), p. 149.

44. Silvae 3, 3, 146 gives his age at the time he was exiled; see below. On his appointment see Silvae 3, 3, 85-87.


46. Weaver, CQ (1965), p. 150.

47. Silvae 3, 3, 143ff. - his sons had reached the rank of equites before him, presumably during service in the Civil or Jewish Wars; see Weaver, CQ (1965), p. 150.


49. See again CIL VI, 8410; cf. X, 6640: he was a rationibus by A.D. 85.

50. CIL VI, 8408; VI, 8410 (cf. note 29, above).
51. Two equestrians are attested for Trajan's reign: L. Vibius Lentulus, towards A.D. 112 (AE 1913, n. 143 a and b; 1924, n. 81; cf. Pflaum, Carrières, n. 66); Cn. Pompeius Homullus, between A.D. 103 and 114 (CIL VI, 1626; cf. Pflaum, n. 89). The inscriptions recording Lentulus' career are Greek, and in these the office of a rationibus is termed "ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων ".

One freedman with the title procurator a rationibus is known after Hadrian: see CIL XIV, 2104: T. Aurelius Aug. lib. Aphrodisius proc. Aug. a rationibus, who was manumitted by Antoninus Pius before the latter's adoption by Hadrian. The title "proc. Aug." is exceptional for a freedman; see Weaver, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. (1964), p. 82, n. 2; cf. p. 91. Two other freedmen who were possibly heads of the bureau after Hadrian are Cosmus Aug. lib., a rationibus under M. Aurelius and L. Verus (CIL IX, 2438; VI, 455, dated A.D. 168), and T. Aelius Aug. lib. Proculus, a rationibus) (CIL XIV, 5309. 23, 28). The career of Cosmus is discussed by Weaver, op. cit. pp. 81-83, who concludes that Cosmus is in fact likely to have been the senior freedman in the central finance department, but the subordinate of an equestrian head (cf., note 30, above).

Subordinate freedman officials of the bureau of the a rationibus dating from the second century are: Evander Aug. lib. tabul(arius) a rationibus) (CIL VI, 8427 - his friends are Ulpii); T. Aelius Augg. lib. Saturninus ... tabul(arius a rationibus) (VI, 8450 - a freedman of Antoninus Pius); T. Aelius Felix Aug. lib. adiutor a rationibus) (VI, 8430; cf. VI, 8429).

52. An inscription (CIL VI, 3962) from the columbarium of Livia, and therefore Julio-Claudian in date, records a certain Bromius custos ration(is) patrimonii.


A T. Flavius, Paederos Aug. lib. Alcimianus, is recorded as "superpositus medicorum ex ratione patrimoni" (CIL VI, 8504). This freedman was probably not attached to the bureau, but was head of the physicians maintained at the expense of the patrimonium (see Boulvert EAI, p. 105, n. 77; cf. Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 41, n. 3). Two freedmen of Trajan are recorded as a comm(Entariis) rat(ionis) patrim(onii) (CIL VI, 8502; XI, 3860; cf. VI, 8503: "Marullus Aug. lib. / subseques (sic)/ a comm. rati(on)/ patrim", - no indication of date).
From a later period are recorded Soter Augg. lib. proximus tabular(ii) rationis patrim(on) (CIL VI, 8508 - at the earliest Marcus Aurelius), and Urbanus Aug. vern(a) adiutor tabulari rationis patrimoni (AE 1945, n. 134 = 1949, 70, from Rome - cf. Weaver, CQ May 1964, p. 139: "Aug(g). vern." is characteristic of the period from M. Aurelius to Commodus). Also, Au_r(elius) In7 achus Aug. lib. is recorded as "optio tabellariorum ct(=st) (ationis) patrimonii" (CIL VI, 8505).

54. CIL XI, 5028: ILS 1447; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 37. Cf. Tac., Hist. 1, 58: "ministeria principatus per libertos agi solita in equites Romanos disponit". Propertianus played an important role in the Civil War as a supporter of Vitellius, no doubt, so it is likely that he was soon removed from these offices after Vitellius' fall (see Pflaum, p. 90).

55. An equestrian a libellis is not attested again until Hadrian (see Pflaum, n. 95, p. 218).

56. CIL VI, 798; ILS 1448; see Pflaum, Carrières n. 60. Capito was a friend of Pliny the Younger (see Ep. 1, 17, 3; 8, 12, 4).


A date in Domitian's reign for Domitius Lemnus has been shown to be false by Weaver, "ILS 1489, 1490 and Domitius Lemnus", Hist. (1965), pp. 509-512. Weaver demonstrates that this official was manumitted by Nero after the latter's adoption by Claudius, but before he became emperor in A.D. 54.

Ti. Claudius Marcellinus (CIL VI, 8501 a) has often been identified as the earliest freedman procurator of the bureau of the patrimonium (see DE art. fiscus, p. 104). But Pflaum, Carrières, p. 1025, identifies him as an equestrian, and dates him towards A.D. 215 (cf. Boulvert, EAI, p. 105, n. 70). A freedman of the Flavians (Delphicus) is recorded as a procurator hereditatum, however (see ILS 1518).

58. See again CIL VI, 798: "proc. ab epistulis et a patrimonio, iterum ab epistulis divi Nervae ...... ab epistul. tertio imp. Nervae Caesar. Traiani Aug. Ger." - since Trajan is not given the title "Dacicus" here it appears that Capito moved on to his next post, that of praefectus vigilum, before A.D. 102 (see Pflaum, p. 145).
59. See CIL XIII, 1804: T. Flavius Titianus, a procurator patrimonii (of the central bureau) who held this post at the beginning of Hadrian's reign (see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 99); CIL XIII, 1808 (C. Iulius Celsus), and VI, 31863 (T. Statilius Optatus) also record equestrian procurators of the bureau of the patrimonium under Hadrian (see Pflaum, nos. 106 bis and 119).

T. Haterius Nepos was proc. hereditatium et a censibus at the beginning of Hadrian's reign (CIL XI, 5213; see Pflaum, n. 95), and Valerius Eudaemon (CIL III, 431, see Pflaum, n. 110) appears to have held the surprising combination of the posts of procurator hereditatium et procurator provinciae Asiae. But T. Statilius Optatus (prior to his procuratorship of the patrimonium) held the post of procurator hereditatium as a separate office, also under Hadrian (see again Pflaum, n. 119).

60. CIL VI, 8498 (died in A.D. 217): M. Aurelius Augg. lib. Prosene, proc. patrimonii; AE (1922), n. 122 (mid second century): Graphicus Aug. lib. proc. hereditatium; CIL XIII, 1800: a proc. h/ereditat./ who was a freedman of M. Aurelius; VI, 8432: a freedman of Hadrian, "qui proc(uravit) in ratione hered(itatium) ad leges praedior(um)".

61. Boulvert, EAI, p. 104, argues that "si la ratio patrimonii, la comptabilité de la fortune privée du prince, est ainsi confiée à de nouveaux agents, les rationes du bureau a rationibus ne peuvent donc plus être les comptes relatifs à des fonds publics".

62. For the imperial properties held in the Julio-Claudian period, and for the increasing complexity of the imperial mine and estate administration after this period, cf. above, ch. 2, pp. 40-44.

63. Silvae 3, 3, 87ff.

64. Tiberius had appropriated the gold mines of Sextus Marius, "the richest man in Spain" (Tac., Ann. 6, 19). In the latter part of the first century these mines were administered by a special procurator; cf. above, ch. 2, p. 42.

65. Statius specifically mentions that the father of Etruscus estimated: "quod domini celsis niteat laquearibus aurum" (line 103). Boulvert, EAI, p. 104, who wishes to limit the function of the a rationibus to the supervision of public finance, admits that Statius does appear to refer to patrimonial sources of income, since "quicquid ab auriferis eiecut Iberia fossis" (line 91) evidently denotes the gold mines in Baetica - as Baetica was a senatorial province, in Boulvert's own view, these mines would have been attached to the imperial patrimonium (p. 104, n. 67).
66. To explain the inclusion of "indian ivory" (lines 94-95) in the list of materials with which the rationibus was concerned, Boulvert (EAI, p. 104, n. 67) argues that "Stace parle tout simplement de la nature, au sens matériel, des biens qui parviennent à des caisses qui dépendent de l'rationibus, soit à titre d'impôt, soit à titre d'achat". But it seems unlikely that the emperor would have employed public funds to purchase ornaments for his private use. On the question of whether the various materials listed by Statius, Silvae 3, 3, 89ff. accrued to the emperor as tribute in kind, also see above, ch. 2, note 101.

67. Frontinus, de Aqu. 118.

68. See above, ch. 5, pp. 81-82, as against the opinion of Boulvert (EAI, p. 103, n. 62) that it represented an expenditure drawn on public funds controlled by the emperor.


70. As Hirschfeld (KV3, p. 41), and Boulvert (EAI, p. 106) observe.

71. Cf. above, note 20. Weaver, CQ (1965), p. 325, n. 2, refers also to the Fragmentum de Iure Fisci 12, which rules that if a liberta Caesaris dies intestate everything goes to the fiscus ("totum fisco vindicatur"), but that if she makes a will only half her estate is claimed. The fiscus libertatis et peculiorum also received the moneys with which servi Caesaris purchased their freedom (see above, ch. 3, note 48; cf. Weaver, CQ 1965, p. 146).

72. CIL VI, 8515, with the restorations of Sanders, MAAR (1932), p. 81: "Martialis A/ug. lib.../ tabularius/rationibus?/ proc. fiscorum/transmarinorum et fisci castr/ensis, pr/oc. hereditatium et fisci libertatis et peculiorum". If the fisci transmarini were in fact forerunners of the separate fiscus Alexandrinus and fiscus Asiaticus, the first part of Martialis' career, at any rate, should be dated in the first century, possibly under the Flavians (cf. above, ch. 2, note 124; see Weaver, "Family Dating Criteria", JRS (1968), p. 117, especially, on this inscription. But the possibility that the fisci transmarini continued to exist alongside the fiscus Alexandrinus and fiscus Asiaticus cannot be excluded.
73. CIL VI, 8450 a: Ti. Claudius Aug. /lib./ Primianus, tabula[r.] f(isci) lib./ et peculiorum; cf. 8450 b: librar. /fisci lib. et/ peculior[r.]. The other tabularius is recorded in VI, 772: Gratus Aug. lib., tabul. f(isci) lib. et pec. (dates uncertain).

74. The post of tabularius was generally held soon after manumission, which was normally at the age of 30; see Weaver, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. (1964), p. 84.

75. CIL VI, 8450: T. Aelius Augg. lib. Saturninus.

76. See Jones, Studies, p. 110; Hirschfeld, KV3, pp. 312-313; Boulvert, EAI, p. 164ff.

77. See e.g. CIL VI, 8525: Atimetus Aug. 1. a supell(ectile) castrensi (i.e. the department for the household furniture, or stuff) - the inscription was dedicated by his wife Flavia Dada and Fortunatus Aug. 1. ("parens"); VI, 8532: "... et plebei collegi Concordiae Augustianorum/ familiae castrensis/ Alexander Marcellianus et Encolphi/ Domitianus cubiculari stationis primae d.d.""); VI, 5183a: "P. Aelius Aug. lib. Eutychus praepositus velaris castrensis; XIV, 2832: Alcimus Neronis Caesaris Aug. servus a veste castrensi.

The domestic context of these inscriptions seems conclusive evidence against Rostovtzeff's theory that the fiscus castrensis was the emperor's chest for military expenses, and formed only a section of the court administration (for a brief statement of his view see DE art. fiscus, pp. 106-107). Hirschfeld's view of the fiscus castrensis as the chest handling all aspects of the expenditure of the imperial "court" (KV3, p. 316) is also accepted by Boulvert, EAI, pp. 168-169.

78. Sat. 4, 135. J.D. Duff, in the notes to his edition of the Satires (reprinted 1962) observes that this is the earliest literary usage of "castra" in this sense. Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 312ff., argues that the origin of this usage of the term is clear: the emperor was military commander, and so the imperial palace in Rome was termed a "camp"; cf. Dio, 53, 16, 5: "The imperial residence is called Palatium, not because it was ever decreed that this should be its name, but because Caesar dwelt on the Palatine and had his military headquarters there (καὶ ἐκεῖ τὸ στρατηγίον ἐλέει ἐκεῖ)... Hence, even if the emperor resides somewhere else his dwelling retains the name of Palatium".

79. CIL VI, 8515; see again note 72, above. The dates of Epagathus Aug. 1. proc. f(isci) c(astrensis) (CIL VI, 8514) are uncertain.
80. CIL VI, 33737: Polybius Agrippinianus [dispensator fisci] castrensis - a former slave of Agrippina, probably the mother of Nero. The inscription comes from the eastern wall of the Flavian amphitheatre.

81. CIL VI, 8516: Daphnus Caesaris n. ser., disp. fisci castrensi. Weaver, CQ (1964), p. 139, classifies the status indication "Caes. n. ser." as characteristic of the reigns of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. Also see CIL VI, 8517: Hesychus, dispenser fisci castrensis, and Epitynchanus, Hesychius dispenser fisci castrensis, arcarius (no indication of date); cf. VI, 8520: Astus dispenser castrorum (in this inscription both an Ulpius and an Aelia are mentioned, which probably dates it not earlier than the mid second century).

82. CIL VI, 33738: Ti. Claudius Aug. 1. Scapula, tabul. castrensis; AE (1948), n. 76 (from Rome): Neritus Aug. 1., a tabularius castr(ensi); cf. VI, 8528: Hermeros Aug. lib., praepositus tabular(ii) rationis castrensis. Also see VI, 8526: Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. Philargyrus, tabellar(ius) castrensis. Cf. above, note 74: the post of tabularius would have been held soon after manumission.

83. CIL XI, 3612: Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. Bucolas, proc. castrensis, who prior to this office had held the post of procurator aqvarum, under Domitian (see Dessau, ILS 1567); XIV, 2932: a certain Paean Aug. lib., proc. castrensis (also a proc. hereditat.). Also see VI, 8512: an Ulpius Crater Aug. lib., a freedman of Trajan; VI, 8513: Ulpius Ses[...]; X, 6005: [...]. Aelius Aug. 1. - a freedman of either Hadrian or Antoninus Pius; VI, 8511: Aurelius Hermias Aug. lib.

84. See ILS 1518: T. Flavius Delphicus, who was tabularius a ratio[bus], proc. ration(um) thesaurorum. The inscription is dedicated to an Ulpia Euphodia (not stated to be an imperial freedwoman).

85. Rostovtzeff (DE art. fiscus, pp. 106-107), on the basis of the unsatisfactory restoration of one line of CIL VI, 8515 (cf. above, note 72) as "proc. fiscorum [Aug. n.]", argues that the bureau of the thesauri succeeded that of the fisci. In his view these represented the chests handling the main expenditures of the court - not the fiscus castrensis.

Hirschfeld (against Rostovtzeff) views the thesauri as the department concerned with the oversight of the imperial treasures (KV 3, p. 308); also see Boulvert, EAI, pp. 173-175.
Another procurator of this bureau is recorded: M. Aurelius Aug. lib. Prosenes, who proceeded from the post of a cubiculo Aug. to that of proc. thesaurorum and then that of proc. patrimonii; the inscription records also that Prosenes had been "ordinatus a divo Commodo in kastrense" (CIL VI, 8498). On this official see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 313, n. 3. The supervision of the imperial "treasures" would have carried considerable responsibility in the second century: Marcus Aurelius was able to finance a war against the Marcomani from the proceeds realized by the sale of the gold vessels of the palace (HA v. M. Aurel. 17, 4). Two tabularii are known: tabularius thensauror. (sic) stationum Aug. n. (CIL VI, 9080); Hermeros Aug. lib., tab. thensauror. (VI, 30737).

86. Silvae 3, 3, 103.
87. Suet., Dom. 12, 2.
89. CIL VI, 8604
90. The abuses associated with the exaction of the tax under Domitian (see Suet., Dom. 12, 2) were alleviated by Nerva. This can be deduced from the legend "fisci Iudaici calumnia sublata", which appears on coins of Nerva; see Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, p. 221. The tax continued to be imposed on practising Jews, however; see Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 73, with n. 3.

91. See above ch. 2, esp. pp. 44-45 (imperial freedman officials attested at provincial centres); ch. 3, esp. pp. 57-58 (imperial freedman officials employed in the administration of the portoria, and the establishment of an imperial bureau for the vicesima hereditatium in the Flavian period); ch. 4, esp. pp. 73-75 (imperial freedman officials employed in the administration of the annona).

92. See above, ch. 4, p. 75, with note: 97.
93. See above, ch. 2, pp. 46-47, with note 128.
95. See above, ch. 2, note 126 - an inscription of a (nameless) adiut(or) tabulariorum fisci) Alexander (CIL VI, 5744), reportedly of first century provenance.
96. See ch. 2, note 127 - there may be some grounds for dating the earliest (approximately) datable inscription of an official of the fiscus Asiaticus in the second century, but the more likely date is under Domitian.

97. See above, ch. 4, p. 75 (citing CIL VI, 544).
98. See again, ch. 2, note 123, on Euprositus Aug. lib. proc. fiscorum transmarinorum; also see ch. 2, p. 47, where the grounds for regarding the post as patrimonial are discussed.

99. See Sanders, MAAR (1932), pp. 80-81 - he considers that the minor rank of the procuratorship is borne out by comparison with CIL VI, 8515: Martialis, who was perhaps tabularius a rationibus, then proc. fiscorum transmarinorum, before going on to further procuratorships.

100. Silvae 3, 3, 100 (he had to estimate: "quantumque tribus"); also see 90-91 ("quod messibus Afric/ verritur, aestiferi quicquid terit area Nili"); cf. above, ch. 4, p. 72.

101. Lines 99-100 seem to refer to expenditure on the armies ("... quantum Romana sub omni/ pila die").


103. AE (1913) n. 143 (from Ephesus); AE (124), n. 81 (ἐπί τροπον ......... ἐπὶ τῶν λόγων, λωφευκάτης) - his career is given in descending order. See Pflaum, Carrières, p. 157.

104. Pliny the Younger, Ep. 8, 6, 13; Juvenal, Sat. 14, 259ff.

105. See Juvenal, Sat. 14, 259ff.: "aerata multus in arca/ fiscus et ad vigilem ponendi Castora nummi/ ex quo Mars Ultor galeam quoque perdidit et res/ non potuit servare suas".

An imperial freedman official (undated) is recorded with the title: "pro(c.) a loricata ex ratione peculiari" (CIL VI, 8691 = XV, 7145). Two other imperial freedmen (also undated) are recorded with the title simply of proc. a loricata; see Hirschfeld, KV 3, p. 4, n. 4; Boulvert, EAI, p. 190.

106. Pliny, Ep. 8, 6, 13: "figeretur ad statuam loricatam divi Iulii".

107. CIL VI, 8689 (= X, 8059, 168).

108. See again Juvenal, Sat. 14, 259ff.


110. See above, p. 111.

111. See again the cross-references given in note 91, above.


3. Dio, 53, 2, 1; cf. above, ch. 6, p. 95.


6. See Dio, 54, 8, 4-5 (the highways); Frontinus, de Ag. 99-100; 104 (the water supply); Dio, 54, 1, 3-4 and 17, 1 (the grain supply). Cf. above, ch. 5, pp. 85-6 and pp. 78-9; ch. 4, pp. 62-65.

7. Frontinus, de Ag. 101.

8. Dio, 54, 2, 3.


12. Thus in the s. c. authorizing the appointment of curatores aquarum in 11 B.C., these officials are described as "quos Caesar Augustus ex senatus auctoritate nominavit". (de Ag. 104).

13. Dio, 53, 9, 6 ("ἀποδίδωμι δην καὶ τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τὰ ἔθνη τὰς τε προσόδους καὶ τῶν νόμων ")

14. Dio, 56, 39, 3-4 ("ποῦ δὴ δύναιτ' ἢν τις τῆς Ἀρχοντοῦ μεγαλοφροσύνης ἐφικέσθαι, ὥστις πάσας μὲν τὰς δύναμες δύμων τὴλικάτας οὕσας ἔχων, πάντων δὲ τῶν χρημάτων πλείστων δυνών κατατέθως, καὶ μὴ δορυφορήσωμεν τινα μὴ δορυφόρους, ἀλλ' ἐξενεκτικῷ πάντων συνεπαισώμεθαν μόνω ἔχομεν, οὗτοι ἠγίασαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ὅπλα καὶ τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἐς τὸ μέσον δην κατέθηκεν.")

Sutherland, AJP (1945), p. 155, argues that the reference made in 53, 9, repeated in 56, 39, to the armed provinces, the revenues and the legislature "from its mere repetition, savours of authenticity and presumes a formal theory in a formal document".
15. See again Dio, 54, 2, 3-4; Frontinus, de Aqu. 100; cf. CIL VI, 32323. Millar, JRS (1964), p. 39, n. 110, points out that Marcus Aurelius' request to the senate to vote funds for the war against the Marcomanni (Dio, 71, 33, 2) suggests that in 'purist theory though not in practice, the sole right of the senate was still recognized'.

16. Vell. Pat., 2, 39, 2, states that Augustus enriched the aerarium by the addition of the tribute of Egypt.


18. See Jones, Studies, pp. 105-106, who argues that Augustus, like the great Republican proconsuls, was periodically credited by votes of the senate with such sums as would enable him to discharge his functions as proconsul, and that, in addition, supplementary grants must have been voted him to finance such curae as he personally undertook. Cf. above, ch. 1, pp. 15-17; also see ch. 2, pp. 30-31.

A curious incident is recorded by Dio under A.D. 32 (58, 18, 3): he states that Tiberius commended the senators when they voted that the salary of the Praetorian Guards should be paid out of the aerarium. But as he records that Augustus had in 27 B.C. secured a decree "granting to the men who composed his bodyguard double the pay that was given to 'the rest of the soldiers" (53, 11, 5), Dio's remark in the context of Tiberius' reign is difficult to interpret.

19. See Dio, 53, 2, 2: Augustus' gifts of money to impoverished senators; 54, 23, 7: Augustus gave money to the Paphians, who had suffered from an earthquake - Dio goes on to say (23, 8) that both Augustus and the senators assisted many other cities also, both before and after this occasion, in the case of similar misfortunes; cf. 54, 30, 3: in 12 B.C. Augustus paid the whole amount of Asia's annual tribute from his own funds.

For Tiberius see e.g. Tac., Ann. 1, 75: when an ex-praetor, Propertius Celer, asked to resign from the senate on the grounds of impoverishment, Tiberius, finding that his lack of means was inherited, presented him with one million sesterces - Tacitus states that other senators then applied for aid, but that Tiberius requested them to prove their case to the senate. Cf. Ann. 2, 36-38: the senate favourably received the request of M. Hortensius Hortalus for financial assistance, but Tiberius exerted his authority to have the request turned down, on the grounds that if every poor man approached the senate requesting money for himself and his children, the public finances would be exhausted - in the end, however, Tiberius stated that if the senate approved he would grant two hundred thousand sesterces for each of Hortalus' male children.
20. Tac., Ann. 2, 47; cf. Dio, 57, 17, 7, who records that the cities in question were assigned an ex-praetor (who was granted five lictors), and that large sums of money were remitted from their taxes, and large sums also given them by Tiberius.

21. Tac., Ann. 2, 42-43. It was in connection with these troubles that Tiberius requested special powers for Germanicus ("Igitur haec et de Armenia quae supra memoravi apud patres disseruit, nec posse motum Orientem nisi Germanici sapientia componi ..."").

22. Tac., Ann. 1, 76.


26. Tac., Ann. 2, 42: it was then fixed at \(\frac{1}{2}\)%.

27. Tac., Ann. 1, 78.

28. He was careful of the language used of him and by him with relation to the senators; see Suet., Tib. 27, 29. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 86, remarks on Suet., Tib. 29 that Tiberius could afford to style the senators his masters precisely because they were his "faventes", and would do what he advised. Also, in the same passage, Suetonius reports Tiberius as saying that the senate had equipped the emperor "tanta et tam libera potestate".


30. Tac., Ann. 1, 2.

31. Tac., Ann. 4, 6; cf. Ann. 4, 15: all kinds of public business were still transacted in the senate.

32. Ann. 4, 6. Tacitus also states that up to this time (A.D. 23) the consuls and praetors had maintained their prestige and the lesser magistrates their proper authority, while among the chief members of the senate there was freedom of discussion: their lapses into servility were checked by the emperor himself.

33. Tac., Ann. 4, 15: Tacitus praises Tiberius for insisting that his procurator in Asia (L. Capito) had to stand trial before the senate when prosecuted by the provincials for misconduct.
34. See e.g. Tac., Ann. 4, 15: on the death of Lucilius Longus, a friend of the emperor's, the senate decreed that a statue to him should be erected in the Forum of Augustus "publica pecunia".

35. Tac., Ann. 6, 16-17.

36. Dio, 58, 21, 5, states that Tiberius gave the one hundred million sesterces to the public treasury with the provision that this money should be lent out by the senators for three year terms without interest.

37. If Suetonius (Gaius 37, 3) is accurate in stating that by the end of his reign Tiberius had accumulated 2,700,000,000 sesterces (cf. Dio, 59, 2, 6), it would have been quite possible for him to have lent out the sum of a hundred million in A.D. 33. Indeed, in A.D. 36, after a serious fire on the Aventine Tiberius once again paid out the sum of one hundred million sesterces in compensation for the value of the buildings destroyed in the fire (Tac. Ann. 6, 45; Dio, 58, 26, 5). Tenney Frank, "The Financial Crisis of 33 A.D.", AJP (1935), p. 337, n. 2, concludes that since a senatorial commission was appointed to administer the loans, and since the credits were to be repaid "populo" (Tac., Ann. 6, 17), it was doubtless the aerarium, not the emperor's fiscus, that provided the funds. De Laet, "La crise monétaire de l'année 35 après J.-C.", Revue de la Banque (1941), p. 303, is of the same opinion as Frank. But Tacitus and Dio both emphasize that Tiberius himself provided the money; moreover, if this money was provided in the form of a "no strings" subsidy to the aerarium it would then have come under the jurisdiction of the aerarium officials and the senate. Cf. Dio, 53, 2, 1, who says that when money was needed for the public treasury Augustus borrowed some and supplied the want.

38. Suet., Aug. 28, 1; 101, 4; cf. Gaius 16, 1.

39. Suet., Aug. 101, 4; cf. above ch. 6, pp. 96-7 and ch. 7, p. 108. Although a significant proportion of the financial data used in compiling the rationes imperii must have come from the aerarium's records, there appears to be no evidence that the aerarium officials regularly put together general accounts of the state finances; see Millar, JRS (1963), p. 38. Presumably, however, under the Republic the aerarium officials had furnished the senators with financial data; cf. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 90.

40. Thus in A.D. 15 the senate cancelled the concession of a sixteen-year military term of service (granted following the mutinies of the previous year) when Tiberius warned that the Empire's resources would be insufficient (i.e. to pay the army discharge bonuses) unless the troops served a twenty-year term; Tac., Ann. 1, 78.
41. As under the Republic: Cato the Younger, after his term as an aerarium quaestor, continued to send his slaves to copy the financial documents held by the treasury, and so kept himself well informed (Plut. Cato min. 18); cf. Tac., Ann. 13, 23: under Nero a certain Paetus had copies of the old treasury records of public debtors, and was evidently using them to bring accusations against people whose names had in fact been crossed off the current lists of debtors.

42. Cf. above, ch. 6, p. 97.

43. At least publication of the rationes imperii does not seem to be attested for subsequent reigns. Suet., Gaius 16, 1 and Dio, 59, 9, 4, however, do not appear to support Brunt's conclusion (JRS 1966, p. 91) that Gaius only resumed publication of these accounts temporarily.

44. As Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 91, observes.

45. See Dio, 59, 6, 1: following his accession Gaius promised to share his power with the senators, calling himself their son and ward; cf. Suet., Gaius, 16, 2: he allowed the magistrates "liberam iuris dictionem et sine sui appellatione".

46. See Dio, 59, 9 and Suet., Gaius 16. In the same period he also abolished the tax on auction sales (Suet., Gaius 16, 3); cf. above, ch. 3, p. 55.

47. Suet., Gaius 16, 3 "... et fructum omnem vectigaliorum et reditum medi temporis, ut Antiocho Commageno sestertium milies confiscatum". "Confisco" can also mean "to lay up in a chest", or "to have at hand" - cf. e.g. Suet., Aug. 101: "(quam summam) et confiscatam semper repositamque habuerat" - as well as "to confiscate". It is not clear from Suetonius' reference to the sum returned to Antiochus of Commagene, whether the money in question had accumulated in the aerarium or the fiscus.

48. See Dio, 59, 10-14; 21, 5-6; Suet., Gaius 37 and 38, 1: "Exhaustus igitur atque egens ad rapinas convertit animum vario et exquisitissimo calumniarum, et auctionum et vectigalium genere". The literary tradition regarding Gaius' financial irresponsibility has been questioned by J.P.V.D. Balsdon, The Emperor Gaius (1934), pp. 180-189.

49. Dio, 59, 15, 1-2: he had a senatorial decree passed exempting him from the provisions of the inheritance laws, so that, in spite of the fact he had neither wife nor child at this time, he could accept inheritances. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 90, cites this as an example of how "better emperors recognized that they were not 'supra leges', if only by securing
dispensation from laws which they found it inconvenient to observe". It also appears to illustrate a tendency for the emperor to assume special legal privileges for himself and his patrimonium.

50. Dio, 59, 15, 3-5; cf. 60, 17, 2. Cf. above ch. 5, pp. 86-7.

51. See Suet., Gaius, 40.

52. Suet., ibid. Suetonius' statement that Gaius handed over the collection of these taxes to the Praetorians seems to be supported by Josephus (A.I. 19, 28-9), who relates how Cassius Chaerea, a tribune in the Guard (who later participated in Gaius' assassination - see Suet., Gaius 56), was appointed to enforce payment of: "τοὺς τε φόρους καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα καταβαλλόμενα εἰς τὸν Καῖσαρος ἑθεαυρόν ".

It is interesting that in spite of Claudius' reported policy of reversing the methods of financial gain that had operated under Tiberius and Gaius (see Dio, 60, 6, 3), one of Gaius' new taxes, the vectigal pro edulibus, appears not to have been abolished earlier than Nero. For Pliny the Elder appears to refer to this tax, implying that it had been levied over a considerable period, although when he wrote (under Vespasian) it had been suppressed: "itaque, hercules, nullum macelli vectigal maius fuit Romae clamore incusantis apud omnes principes, donec remissum est portorium mercis huius". (H.n. 19, 56); see De Laet, Portorium, p. 347.

53. See Suet., Gaius 37, 3.

54. See Dio, 59, 23, 3-4; 24, 2-3; Suet., Gaius 26, 2-3.

55. Dio, 59, 30, 3, states that the consuls immediately transferred the funds from the treasuries ("ἐκ τῶν θησαυρῶν τὰ χρήματα ") to the Capitol. It is not clear what funds Dio means here, but it would appear that the purpose behind the consuls' action was to obtain control over the available cash resources in the city. Also see Suet., Claud. 10, 3-4, on the attitude of the senators at this time.

56. Dio, 60, 1, 3; Suet., Claud. 10, 4.

57. Dio, 60, 1, 4.

58. Suet., Claud. 11.
60. Apparently by its own decision the senate granted Phrygian Apamea a remission from taxation for five years, and Nero is said to have spoken in support of applications made by Illium (in Asia) and Bononia (in Italy) for immunity from taxation, on the one hand, and a grant of financial assistance, on the other; Tac., Ann. 12, 58. On another occasion Claudius requested the senate to exempt Cos from taxation, and he is said, also, to have supported the application made by the Byzantines to the senate; Ann. 12, 61, 62.

61. Cf. above, ch. 5, pp. 83-4: from Claudius' reign the curators of the Tiber establish the river boundaries "ex auctoritate Caesaris", instead of by a senatus consultum as was the case when the board of curators was established in Tiberius' reign.

62. Cf. above, ch. 5, pp. 80-82.

63. Dio, 60, 10, 3; cf. above, ch. 6, pp. 98, 101.

64. Tac., Ann. 13, 29; Dio, 60, 24, 1-2; Suet., Claud. 24; cf. CIL XI, 6163. Also, see above, ch. 6, p. 95.

65. As when (presumably to safeguard the interests of the fiscus in the property of the familia Caesaris, cf. above, ch. 7, note 20) Pallas reportedly influenced Claudius to obtain a senatorial decree reducing the freeborn wives of slaves to freedwoman or slave status depending on the circumstances of the "marriage"; see Tac., Ann. 12, 53. On Pallas' influence in Claudius' household see S.I. Oost, "The Career of M. Antonius Pallas", AJP (1958), esp. pp. 123-126.

66. See Tac., Ann. 12, 60; Suet., Claud. 12, 1 (Suetonius also states here that Claudius asked permission of the consuls for fairs to be held on his estates). On the significance of this decree cf. above, ch. 6, note 77.

67. Tac., Ann. 12, 60, also cites here the fact that Augustus conferred jurisdiction on the equestrian governor of Egypt (cf. above, ch. 2, note 7).

68. Cf. above, ch. 6, pp. 104-5. One effect of this tendency was that "the patrimony, however acquired, came to be indissolubly attached to the Princeps as such" - as Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 78, expresses it. The emergence of this tendency at an early stage in the Principate is indicated by the fact that, in deference to Gaius' wishes, the senate set
aside Tiberius' will so that Gaius could inherit the entire estate (Suet., Gaius 14; cf. Tib. 76); Claudius' will may have been set aside too (Dio, 61, 1, 2; cf. Tac., Ann. 12, 69). Brunt (loc. cit.) considers it significant that later emperors seem to have given up the practice of making wills - at least there is no record of their having done so, except for a statement in the H.A. (v. Pius 12, 8) that Antoninus Pius did. Even more significant is the fact that the Julio-Claudian property passed into the possession of the Flavians, and, in turn, their property into the possession of Nerva and his successors (by adoption).

69. Apart from the passages cited above, see e.g. Dio, 60, 25, 4-7: Claudius gave permission for senatorial governors to leave Italy without reference to the senate; but afterwards he ordered that a senatorial decree be passed to sanction the procedure.

70. Tac., Ann. 13, 4.


73. RIC I, p. 147ff.

74. Tac., Ann. 13, 5: he cites the passing of decrees forbidding advocates to receive fees or gifts, and reversing Claudius' regulation ordering the quaestors-designate to hold gladiatorial shows. Suetonius (Nero 17), however, implies that the senate's policy on advocates' fees was rescinded in turn, for he records the passing of legislation under Nero to limit the fees. Claudius had earlier limited the fees to 10,000 sesterces (cf. Ann. 11, 5-6).

Later (A.D. 58) the senate is reported to have decided on cases concerning the internal affairs of Puteoli and Syracuse; Tac., Ann. 13, 48. There is no explicit mention here of imperial intervention, but as Furneaux (Annals vol. II) points out, Nero must have authorized the dispatching of a Praetorian cohort to quell disturbances in Puteoli.


76. In this connection it is interesting that during a dispute in the senate over the passing of the decree authorising the city of Syracuse to hold gladiatorial displays, the critics of the senator Thrasea Paetus attacked him by saying, "si rem publicam egere libertate senatoria crederet, tam levia consecetantur? quin de bello aut pace, de vectigalibus et legibus, quibusque aliis res Romana continetur, suaderet
dissuaderetve? licere patribus, quoties ius dicendae sententiae accepis sent, quae vellent expromere relationemque in ea postulare. an solum emendatione dignum, ne Syracusis spectacula largius ederentur: cetera per omnis imperii partis perinde egregia quam si non Nero sed Thrasea regimen eorum teneret? quod si summa dissimulatione transmitterentur, quanto magis inanibus abstinendum?" (Tac., Ann. 13, 49).

This passage implies it was felt that the senate should deal with the fundamental concerns of government (including "de vectigalibus"), while also implying that those senators who publicised themselves as fervent advocates of a "free senate" often passed such matters over and gave too much attention to trivialities.


79. See e.g. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 81; Sutherland, AJP (1945), p. 165.


82. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 86, considers that it is unlikely the whole senate was consulted, as Tacitus uses the term "senatores" here (Ann. 13, 50), which term, unlike "patres", does not appear to be normal equivalent of senatus - Brunt suggests that the term can be translated as "(some) senators" (note 72, loc.cit.).


84. Ann. 1, 78. Tiberius also insisted that the term of military service had to be restored to a full twenty years; cf. note 40, above.

85. Moreover, Tacitus, Ann. 13, 51, ends his list of the new regulations with the statement that: "temperata apud transmarinas provincias frumenti subvectio, et ne censibus negotiatorium naves adsciberentur tributumque pro illis penderent constitutum". The term "constitutum" may refer here to a formal enactment by the senate.

Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 86, note 72, thinks that Nero's eventual decision was probably endorsed by a s.c., on the grounds that Ann. 13, 48-52 seem to depend on the acta. But this is perhaps not a reliable yardstick for deducing
senatorial involvement on a particular issue. Furneaux (Annals vol. II) thinks Ann. 13, 51 indicates the publication of the tax regulations by a mere imperial edict.

86. Tac. Ann. 15, 18. Just above Tacitus records Nero's successful efforts to keep the price of grain low during a time of threatened scarcity; cf. above, ch. 4, p. 71.

87. Tacitus' use of the verb "largiri" with reference to Nero's subvention indicates that the money represented a grant from his private funds; cf. above, ch. 4, p. 71 on Ann. 15, 18.


89. Furneaux (Annals vol. II) views Ann. 15, 18 as indicating that the aerarium was then under the direct budgetary supervision of the emperor. But while Nero no doubt kept a constant watch on the finances of the aerarium, its administration may not have been under the exclusive control of the emperor in this period; cf. above, ch. 6, p. 100. Moreover, if the late sources quoted by Millar, JRS (1964), p. 37, note 79a are reliable, it appears that Nero, as late as A.D. 67, still felt obliged to request the senate to vote him public funds (Jerome, Chronicle; cf. Orosius, 7, 7, 8).

90. As indicated by Pliny the Younger, Pan. 36, 3.

91. In the Annals there is only one hint of independent senatorial initiative with respect to the allocation of public funds in Nero's reign - Ann. 14, 21 (A.D. 60) indicates that in this period senatorial officials still gave spectacula at their own expense, but it had been proposed in the senate that the cost be transferred to public funds ("nec perinde magistratus rem familiarem exhausturos aut populo efflagitandi Graeca certamina a magistratibus causam fore, cum eo sumptu res publica fungatur").

92. Cf. above p. 132 (on Tac., Ann. 14, 18). Again, when Thrasea Paetus proposed that in order to discourage corruption among provincial officials, votes of thanks to a governor by provincial assemblies should be prohibited, the consuls ruled that no senatorial decree could be passed on the proposal on the grounds that no question on the matter was before the house. But it is quite likely that the consuls felt it politic to refer the matter to the emperor, since a decree embodying such a proposal would have affected imperial legati as well as proconsuls (cf. Furneaux, Annals, vol. II). In fact a decree embodying the substance of Thrasea's proposal was later passed on Nero's initiative (Ann. 15, 20-22). Also, Tacitus states (Ann. 13, 26) that when a motion was proposed
concerning the question of the re-enslavement of ex-slaves, the consuls did not dare put the motion without consulting the emperor, to whom they wrote stating the senate's view - in this case the consuls presumably hesitated since such a decree would have had repercussions for the familia Caesars.

93. See Dio, 61, 5, 5; Suet., Nero, 30, 1-2; Tac., Ann. 16, 3 (Nero's extravagance was "inter causas paupertatis publicae").

94. A great deal of money must have been spent on the re-building of the city following the great fire of A.D. 64, and even if the emperor spent large sums on the construction of his "domus aurea" (Tac. Ann. 15, 42; Suet., Nero, 31), he must also have spent a considerable amount on the construction of colonnades to protect the new buildings constructed after the fire; he also promised bonuses for the speedy completion of new houses and apartment blocks (Ann. 15, 43 - these expenditures Nero contributed "sua pecunia"). Large sums, too, must have been swallowed up by the emperor's unsuccessful project to build a navigable canal from Lake Avernus to the Tiber estuary (Ann. 15, 42; cf. Suet., Nero, 31, 3). Again, Dio records that when the Parthian king Tigranes came to Rome, the sum of 800,000 sesterces was charged daily to the public treasury for provisioning the king's entourage (Dio, 63, 2, 2 = Xiph. 172; cf. Suet., Nero 30, 2 - A.D. 66). In the same year: "cladem Lugdunensem quadrigies sestertio solatus est princeps, ut amissa urbi reponerent; quam pecuniam Lugdunenses ante obtulerant urbis casibus" (Tac., Ann. 16, 13).

But it is doubtful whether Nero's reported impositions of a forced contribution on all citizens, and a housing tax on all tenants of private houses and apartments, were levied for the profit of the fiscus, as Suetonius (Nero 44, 2) says. Suetonius also says that many people refused to pay the contributions imposed, and demanded that, instead, the delatores should be compelled to give up their rewards. Thus it is quite likely that Nero was attempting to raise funds for the aerarium, since under Tiberius, at any rate, all informers received their rewards from the public treasury (see Dio, 58, 4, 8), and there is no evidence that this was not the case at the end of Nero's reign. Moreover the impositions Suetonius mentions appear to have been emergency measures designed to raise money for the defence of Italy after the rebellion of Vindex (cf. Suet., Nero 43), and it is unlikely funds obtained in this way were turned into Nero's private chest.

95. Tac., Hist. 1, 90: "Pridie idus Martias commendata patribus re publica reliquias Neronianarum sectionum nondum in fiscum conversas revocatis ab exilio concessit,
iustissimum donum et in speciem magnificum, sed festinata
iam pridem exactione usu sterile". Cf. Hist. 1, 20 - Galba
attempted to recover the gifts Nero had bestowed on his
favourites: "Proxima pecuniae cura; et cuncta scrutantibus
iustissimum visum est inde repeti ubi inopiae causa erat. bis
et viciens miliens sestertium donationibus Nero effuderat:
appellari singulos iussit, decima parte liberalitatis apud
quemque eorum relicta. at illis vix decimae super portiones
erant, isdem erga aliena sumptibus quibus sua prodegerant".
Thirty equites Romani were appointed to recover the money
(Tac., ibid.; cf. Suet., Galba 15, 1; Dio, 64, 3, 4e). Brunt,
JRS (1966), p. 91, argues that attempts were made to recover
the sums involved because these funds had presumably been
misappropriated from public funds. Alternatively, Galba may
have been trying to recover the money for the benefit of
private imperial funds. But in any case Galba apparently took
great pains to make it known that he, unlike Nero was not
spending public money on his private amusements: he
rewarded a flute player, Canus, who had performed for him
at a banquet, with a few gold pieces, and in taking the money
from his purse remarked "ἐκ τῶν ἵλιων, ὀψὶκτῶν δὴμοσίων".
Plutarch prefaces his account of this incident with the statement
that in his desire to display a great change from Nero's
immoderate and extravagant manner of giving, Galba was thought
to fall short of what was fitting (Plut., Galba 16; cf. Suet.,
Galba 12, 3).

96. Tacitus (Hist. 1, 16) states that under Galba the
majority of the senators cared nothing for the state, only for
their private concerns, and so were ready to express good-
will towards the emperor with ready servility (cf. Hist. 1, 13,
for Galba's own attitudes towards the senate). After Otho's
success, Tacitus relates that the senators "certan adulationibus
ceteri magistratus, adcurrunt patres: decernitur Othoni
tribunicia potestas, et nomen Augusti et omnes principum
honores". Still, it is interesting that Tacitus implies the
pronouncements of the senate were regarded with deference
by the more distant provinces and armies: "longinquae
provinciae et quidquid armorum mari dirimitur penes Othonem
manebat, non partium studio, sed erat grande momentum in
nomine urbis ac praetexto senatus, et occupaverat animos
prior auditus". (Hist. 1, 76). With the victory of the
Vitellians over Otho the senate again immediately voted the
imperial powers to the victor (Tac., Hist. 2, 55 - "in senatu
cuncta longis aliorum principatibus composita statim decernuntur").

97. Tac., Hist. 4, 3. Moreover, the senate was
evidently flattered by the receipt of a letter from Vespasian,
which appeared to have been written before the end of the war:
"ea prima specie forma; ceterum ut princeps loquebatur,
civilia de se, et rei publicae egregia". (Hist. ibid).
98. Tac., Hist. 4, 9. Some commentators (e.g. Spooner, Histories) on this passage assume that these praetores were the same as Nero's praefecti. But Tacitus seems to emphasize the fact that praetores were then in control, which perhaps implies a contrast with the "normal" state of affairs (i.e. with praefecti in control). Millar, JRS (1963), p. 34, assumes there was a temporary reversion to the system of using praetores in A.D. 69.

99. Dio, 53, 2, 1; cf. above, ch. 6, p. 95.

100. See again Tac., Hist. 4, 9 for this whole incident.

101. Tac., Hist. 4, 40.

102. Tac., Hist. 4, 47. It is usually assumed that a real deficit existed; see e.g. Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 87; Sutherland, AJP (1945), p. 166; cf. below, pp. 136-7.

103. This attitude is implied in Vespasian's reported response to an offer by the Parthian king, Vologaeses, to provide him with 40,000 Parthian cavalry - Tacitus writes that "gratiae Vologaeso actae mandatumque ut legatos ad senatum mitteret et pacem esse sciret". (Hist. 4, 51). Apparently Vespasian was deferring to the senate's traditional right to receive foreign envoys.

104. Just after this, when the senate was dealing with the delatores who had been active under Nero, Helvidius Priscus began an attack on Eprius Marcellus. But the senate was "persuaded" by Mucianus and Domitian to abandon its accusations, and, according to Tacitus, "patres coeptatam libertatem, postquam obviam itum, omisere". Yet Mucianus, "ne sperni senatus iudicium et cunctis sub Nerone admissis data impunitas videtur, Octavium Sagittam et Antistium Sosianum senatorii ordinis egressos exilium in easdem insulas reedit" (on these two men cf. Ann. 13, 44 and 14, 48-9). Thus Tacitus seems to imply here (Hist. 4, 43-44) that Mucianus wished to conciliate the senate.

Later Helvidius' "republican" attitudes led to his banishment and eventual execution by Vespasian (see Suet., Vesp. 15).

105. Dio, 66, 2, 5 (=Xiph. 204). The passage continues that Mucianus, in doing this himself, thereby relieved Vespasian of the censure that such a proceeding entailed.

106. See again, Vell. Pat., 2, 92, 2.
107. Tac., Hist. 2, 32, implies that there was still a large amount of money on hand on the eve of the struggle between Otho and Vitellius: Suetonius Paulinus (the senior ex-consul at the time - cf Hist. 2, 37) advised that Otho's hopes lay in delaying the war, and after pointing to what he considered were the deficient resources of the Vitellians, went on to say: "contra ipsis omnia opulenta et fida, Pannoniam Moesiam Dalmatiam Orientem cum integris exercitibus, Italiam et caput rerum urbem senatumque et populum, numquam obscura nomina, etiam si aliquando obumbrentur; publicas privatæ pecuniam, inter civilis discordias ferro validiorem". But during the last stages of the Civil War the regular transfer of revenues from the provinces to Italy, was quite likely dislocated, causing a shortage of liquid assets in the capital itself.

108. When Vespasian arrived in Rome he ordered a cancellation of long-standing debts owing to the public treasury; see Dio, 66, 10, 2a (=Zon. 11, 17).

Sutherland AJP (1945), p. 166, argues that Vespasian's cancellation of debts at a time when Mucianus was doing his best to replenish the treasury was not an act of studied philanthropy, but reflected the need to make a completely "fresh start" with both public and imperial finances. Vespasian is said to have declared at the beginning of his reign: "quadrirgenties milies opus esse, ut res publica stare posset" (Suet., Vesp. 16, 3).

109. See Dio, 66, 10, 1a (=Zon.): on arriving in Rome Vespasian first of all bestowed donativa and congiaria ("παροδχῆς δωρεᾶς" to soldiers and people), and began repairs of the sacred precincts and the public works which had been damaged, and rebuilt such as had already fallen into ruin, and upon completing them inscribed on them, not his own name, but the names of those who had originally built them.

110. See Suet., Vesp. 16. Suétounius says, however, that some people were of the opinion that Vespasian resorted to harsh measures in exacting money because he was compelled "summa àerarii fisique inopia" (16, 3). Tacitus, on the other hand, says that Vespasian was not so inclined to resort to unjust measures at the beginning of his reign, but that "donec indulgentia fortunae et pravis magistris didicit aususque est". (Hist. 2, 84). Also see Dio, 66, 10, 3a (= Petr. Patr. exc. Vat. 100): Vespasian was laughed at every time he would say when spending money that "I am paying for this out of my own purse" ("ἐκ τῶν ἔμαυτος αὕτη δαπανῶ").

111. Dio, 66, 10, 3.
112. This "conscious imitation" is found in his building programme (see Suet., Vesp. 9, 1: "Fecit et nova opera templum Pacis Foro proximum Divique Claudii in Caelio monte coeptum quidem ab Agrippina, sed in Nerone prope funditus destructum; item amphitheatrum urbe media, ut destinasse compererat Augustum"); on the Temple of Peace, completed in A.D. 75, cf. Pliny the Elder, H. n. 36, 34, 84, 102). Again, Vespasian re-issued certain of the coin-types of the Republic, Augustus and the Julio-Claudian family, and this "restoration policy" was also given expression on the coins of Titus and Domitian; see Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, p. 6ff. Mattingly and Sydenham point out (loc. cit.) that the centenary of the battle of Actium which fell in A.D. 70 may have served as another incentive in this direction - apart from the fact that the coinage reform undertaken by Nero in A.D. 63 would sooner or later have condemned the mass of earlier coins to the melting pot, so that it would have been a natural policy to save some of the time-honoured coin-types by re-issuing them on new coins.

Also, in the lex de Imperii Vespasiani emphasis is placed on the transmission to Vespasian of all the powers formerly granted to Augustus, Tiberius and Claudius (see McCrum and Woodhead, Documents, no. 1).

Finally, like Augustus and his successors: "In omne hominum genus liberalissimus expexit censum senatorium, consulares inopes quingenis sestertiis annuis sustenhavit, plurimas per totum orbem civitates terrae motu aut incendio affictas restituit in melius, ingenia et artes vel maxime favit". (Suet., Vesp. 17).

113. Suetonius writes (Vesp. 7, 2): "Auctoritas et quasi maiestas quaedam ut scilicet inopino et adhuc novo principi deerat; haec quoque accessit". Cf. Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, p. 6ff.: the fact Vespasian was founding a new dynasty and needed a strong basis on which to rest it was certainly an aspect of his "restoration" coinage policy (see preceding note).

114. Vespasian eventually executed the uncompromising "Republican" Helvidius Priscus - both Dio and Suetonius, however, regard Vespasian's action as justified in view of Helvidius' open hostility towards the emperor; see Dio, 66, 12, 2 (= Exc. Vat. 273); cf. Suet., Vesp. 15: "Helvidio Prisco, qui et reversum se ex Syria solus privato nomine Vespasianum salutaverat et in praetura omnibus edictis sine honore ac mentione ulla transmiserat, non ante succensuit quam altercationibus insolentissimis paene in ordinem redactus".

115. Cf. above, ch. 5, pp. 84-5.
Cf. above, ch. 5, p. 90: Flavius Sabinus, most probably the emperor's nephew, is attested as a curator operum publicorum (CIL VI, 814), under Titus, and the same inscription indicates that in this period the emperor controlled the allocation of public ground in Rome. Moreover, there is no evidence of the continued existence of a board of curatores viarum with general competence over the highways, or the continued existence of the board of curatores aquarum either, in the Flavian period (cf. above, ch. 5, p. 80, p. 87).

117. See Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, p. 5: although the coinage of Vespasian's reign was more varied than that of any emperor since Augustus, his policy was nevertheless one of centralization at Rome - provincial issues (chiefly early in his reign) being concessions to temporary necessities. Lugdunum was probably the only provincial mint still striking by A.D. 79, and was by then confined to the issue of aes. There is also evidence to suggest that the work-forces of the provincial mints were called to Rome when these mints closed: unmistakable examples of local styles are found on coins which were equally unmistakably struck at Rome - thus in the aes issues of A.D. 71 we find portraits in the style of Tarraco with lettering and reverse types that suggest a Roman origin.

Cf. above ch. 3, pp. 52-53, pp. 55-57, for the earliest attested officials employed in the administration of the vectigalia. It is not certain that an extensive imperial bureaucracy already existed at all provincial centres under the Flavians (cf. above, ch. 2, pp. 43-45); but the appointment of imperial slaves as exactores tributorum may date from the Flavian period; one of those attested epigraphically can be dated in the late first century (see again, ch. 2, note 111). Also, in the Flavian period special procurators were appointed in connection with the exaction of the Jewish tax; cf. above, ch. 7, p. 118.

Vespasian is accredited with the imposition of new taxes: Suet., Vesp. 16, 1; Dio, 66, 8, 3-4 (=Xiph. 205) - he revived old taxes and imposed new ones on the Alexandrians; cf. Dio, 66, 14, 5 (=Xiph. 205); cf. Suet., Vesp. 23, 3 - he imposed a tax on urinals. He is also accredited with establishing monopolies in various commodities; see again Suet., Vesp. 16, 1 ("negotiationes quoque vel privato pudendas propalam exercuit, coemendo quaedam tantum ut pluris postea distraheret"); cf. above, ch. 2, note 101 (the balsam monopoly in Judaea).
Moreover, Vespasian is said to have been especially thorough in pressing the rights of the fiscus over the property of imperial freedmen (Suet., Vesp. 23, 1), the income from which source went to the fiscus libertatis et peculiorum (cf. above, ch. 7, pp. 116-117).

120. During his short reign Titus did, however, carry out a lavish public works programme. Suetonius (Titus 7, 3) writes: "et tamen nemine ante se munificentia minor, amphi-theatro dedicato thermisque iuxta celeriter exstructis (A.D. 80) munus edidit apparatissimum largissimumque". Apart from the expense of these projects, the great disasters of his reign, namely the eruption of Vesuvius in Campania (A.D. 79) and (A.D. 80) "incendium Romae per triduum totidemque noctes, item pestilentia quanta non temere alias" (Suet., Titus 8, 3), must have resulted in extremely heavy expenditures, since he embarked on a large-scale plan of re-building and rehabilitation. Suetonius records that the emperor expended private resources on relief measures to the limit of his means (Titus 8, 3-4). A senatorial commission chosen by lot from among the ex-consuls was sent to the devastated Campanian area, and the work of re-building in Rome was placed under the charge of several equestrians (Suet., loc.cit.; cf. Dio, 66, 24, 3 = Xiph. 212). The death of Titus in the next year left the task of completing the programme of reconstruction to his brother and successor Domitian - Suet., Dom. 5 cites the re-building of the Capitol as the chief example of the "many splendid buildings" destroyed by fire which Domitian restored.

121. Cf. above, ch. 7, p. 115.

122. Cf. above, ch. 3, p. 58.

123. See again ch. 3, p. 58; c.f. p. 59.


126. Suet., Dom. 3, 2. Suetonius writes (Dom. 12, 1) that: "Exhaustus operum ac munerum impensis stipendioque, quod adiecet, temptavit quidem ad relevandos castrenses sumptus numerum militum deminuere; sed cum et obnoxium se barbaris per hoc animadverteret neque eo setius in explicandis oneribus haeret, nihil pensi habuit quin praedaretur omni modo. bona vivorum ac mortuorum usquequaque quolibet et accusatore et crimine corripiebantur".
127. Nerva embarked on an ambitious social-welfare programme after his accession, which included the distribution of land worth 60,000,000 sesterces (Dio, 68, 2, 1-2 = Xiph.; Pliny, Ep. 7, 31), and possibly the initiation of the alimentary programme which Trajan developed (cf. above, ch. 5, note 123).

128. Pliny the Younger praises Trajan for his generosity, specifically for his congiaria (Pan. 25-28); and for his making the burden of the vicesima hereditatium less oppressive (chs. 37-39). Indeed, Pliny claims that if it were not for Trajan's sound management of finances, the revenues would suffer because of these reductions in taxation (chs. 41-42).


It is true that Nerva reportedly had to sell off a large part of the imperial treasures because he "ran short of funds" (Dio, 68, 2, 2 = Xiph. 226); but the need for this measure may have been precipitated by his own expenditures on his social welfare programme (cf. note 127, above). The appointment of an "Economy Commission" (Dio, 68, 2, 3 = Xiph. 226; Pliny, Ep. 2, 1, 9; Pan. 68, 2-3) may have followed from the same cause, as Syme maintains (op. cit., p. 61).

Also, although Domitian's public works must have accounted for a heavy outlay of funds over several years (some major works were apparently not completed before A.D. 94 - see Sutherland, op. cit., p. 160; Syme, op. cit., p. 69; Mattingly and Sydenham, RIC II, pp. 49-50), the increase in army pay (see Suet., Dom. 12, 1) would hardly have been granted, as Syme says (p. 68), without the expectation of sufficient funds to meet the additional expenditure.

130. Pliny once mentions the possibility of filling an exhausted treasury by confiscations, saying to Trajan "ut qui exhaustum non sis innocentium bonis repleturus" (Pan. 55, 5); but (Pan. 50; cf. 41, 2) he puts his emphasis on Domitian's "avaritia" as being the more abominable because superfluous - he robbed not for his own use but to deprive others ("detestanda avaritia illius, qui tam multa concupiscet, cum haberet supervacua tam multa" - Pan. 50, 5). Trajan, on the other hand, sold off a great deal of imperial property, for which he is praised here by Pliny.

131. Suet., Dom. 8, 2: "magistratibus quoque urbis provinciarumque praesidibus coercendis tantum curae adhibuit, ut neque modestiores umquam iustiores extiterint; e quibus plerosque post illum reos omnium criminum vidimus".
Pleket, "Domitian, the Senate and the Provinces", Mnm. (1961), p. 301ff., argues that after Domitian's death the provincial governors again started extorting money from the provincials (citing Pliny, Ep. 2, 11 and 12; 3, 9; 4, 9; 5, 20; 6, 5 and 13; 7, 6 and 10). In a postscript to his article (pp. 314-315), Pleket argues against the view expressed by Brunt ("Charges of Maladministration under the Early Principate", Hist. 1961, 188ff.), that Suet., Dom. 8, 2, can be dismissed on the grounds Suetonius based his theory on the paucity of records of trials. Brunt submits that this paucity might be explained just as well by the "reduced expectation of convictions" as "by the better quality of governors". Pleket dismisses this argument as over subtle: "I feel that, if Suetonius, who was openly hostile to Domitian, praises the emperor for his good administration, the praise must have been deserved". Pleket also dismisses Brunt’s emphasis on Pliny’s comments on Domitian’s conduct towards provincial governors and officials - namely that Domitian neither punished the wicked nor rewarded the righteous (Pan. 70, 7). Pleket considers that Pliny’s words "nec poenis malorum, sed honorum praemiis bonos facias" (70, 2) seem to contrast Trajan’s regime with that of his immediate predecessors: if, then, in Pan. 70, 7, he suddenly speaks of "male consultis impunitatem, recte factis nullum praemia", he appears to be inconsistent to say the least.

132. Pleket, loc. cit. Pleket also cites a recently discovered letter of Domitian to the procurator of Syria, in which the emperor inveighs against what he considers to be the corrupt behaviour of high officials. The text of this document is given in SEG XVII, 755 = Syria (1957), p. 278ff.

133. Earlier Vespasian had come into conflict with this party, and had executed Helvidius Priscus the Elder (Suet., Vesp. 15). Rogers, "A group of Domitianic Treason-Trials", CP (1960), p. 19ff., has shown that there are reasons for disbelieving the literary tradition that Helvidius Priscus the Younger and others of his party were put on trial either because of books written by some of them on the Republican martyrs, or because of a theatre performance in which Helvidius Priscus (the Younger) had made allusions to Domitian’s divorce (Suet., Dom. 10, 3-4; Dio, 67, 13, 1-4). Rogers thinks that they were probably executed for treason, pointing out that Domitian had actually conferred the consulship on Helvidius in A.D. 87, and on another member of this group (Rusticus Arulenus) in 92 (cf. Pleket, Mnm. 1961, p. 298). Again, it was not until after the revolt of Antonius Saturninus in Upper Germany (with associated conspiracy in Rome) in A.D. 89, that Domitian is said to have become especially "saevus" (cf. Suet., Dom. 6, 2 and 10, 5; Dio, 67, 11, 1-2 = Xiph. 221). Also see Sherwin-White, JRS (1957), pp. 126-127, on the dates of these "conspiracy trials".
Frontinus, *de Aqu. 118.*

Frontinus, *loc. cit.*, says the revenue had formerly been dissipated due to mis-management.

See Dio, 68, 2, 3 (= Xiph. 226).


See again *Tac., Hist. 4, 40.*

Dio, 68, 3, 2 (= Xiph. 226); cf. 3, 3 (the mutiny of the Praetorian Guard in Nerva's reign).

Dio,'68, 1, 3 (= Xiph. 226).

Pan. 76, 1-3 (where Pliny is speaking about the final summing-up of the trial of Marius Priscus, who was charged with extortion while in his province - *cf.* Ep. 2, 11): "Iam quam antiquum quam consolare, quod triduum totum senatus sub exemplo patientiae tuae sedit, cum interea nihil praeter consulem ageris. interrogatus censuit quisque quod placuit; *licuit* dissentire discedere, et copiam iudicii sui rei publicae facere; consulti omnes atque etiam dimumerati sumus, vicitque sententia non prima sed melior. at quis antea loqui, quis hiscere audebat, praeter miserors illos qui primi interrogabantur?"

Pan. 36, 3: "at fortasse non eadem severitate fiscum qua aerarium cohibes: immo tanto maiore quanto plus tibi licere de tuo quam de publico credis".

Pan. 41,: "Feres, Caesar, curam et sollicitudinem consularem. nam mihi cogitanti eundem te collationes remisisse, donativum reddidisse, congiarium obtulisse, delatores abegisse, vectigalia temperasse, interrogandus videris, satIsne computaveris imperi redivitus. an taltas vires habet frugalitas principis, ut tot impendiis tot erosionibus sola sufficiat? ......".

Pan. 20. 4-6 (where Pliny contrasts Trajan's modest style of travel when returning from Germany to Rome in 99, with Domitian's return from the Suebian-Sarmatic war in 92): "Persuadendum provinciis erat illud iter Domitianis fuisse, non principis. itaque non tam pro tua gloria quam pro utilitate communi edicto subiectisti, quid in utrumque vestrum esset impensum. adsumscat imperator cum imperio calculus ponere; sic exeat sic redeat tamquam rationem redditurus; edicat quid absumpserit. ita fiet ut non absumat quod pudeat edicere". Trajan's publication of the "expense-account" of his journey, comparing his modest expenditure with Domitian's alleged extravagance, was obviously intended as propaganda on behalf of the new regime; but it is interesting that he chose this as a vehicle for his propaganda.

146. Cf. above, ch. 4, p. 74: the appointment of a procurator Miniciae whose function was connected with the distribution of the dole, over which the praefecti frumenti dandii s.c. presided. Also, see above ch. 5, p. 88: appointment of equestrian sub-curators of the highways.

147. From his reign there is fairly full evidence of the presence of imperial freedman and slave officials at the main centres of both imperial and senatorial provinces; cf. above ch. 2, p. 45, with notes 117-118. Also, from Hadrian's reign the existence of an extensive bureaucracy for the supervision of the indirect taxes is indicated; cf. above ch. 3, pp. 58-59.


149. From Hadrian's time juridicial officers of consular rank were appointed by the emperor for the four districts into which Italy was divided; but this development in fact represented a step in the gradual elimination of the senate's control over Italy; see Boak and Sinnigen, A History of Rome, 5th ed. (1965), pp. 349-350.

150. Cf. above, ch. 6, p. 96.

151. See again the history of the cura alvei Tiberis, especially; cf. ch. 5, p. 82ff.

152. See e.g. CIL V, 5262.

153. See again Tac., Ann. 12, 53; 12, 60.

154. The basis of this theory was that the Princeps, who received his imperium by a lex, had transferred to him in virtue of his imperium the legislative authority of the Roman people; see Gaius, Institutes 1, 5; Dig. 1. 4, 1 pr. and 1.

155. See Jolowicz, Roman Law, p. 374ff.
CHAPTER 9 - FOOTNOTES


4. Suet., Claud. 18, 1.

5. Jos., A. I. 19, 128-129.

6. FIRA² I, p. 98 (lines 67-68).

7. Tac., Ann. 1, 37; cf. Hist. 1, 58: after he had been saluted as emperor by the legions of Upper Germany, Vitellius "vacationes centurionibus ex fisco numerat". It is quite likely that in this passage, too, fiscus denotes an army cash-box. It is difficult to see what other funds Vitellius could have had on hand at that moment. As Tacitus shows in Hist. 1, 46, the provision of free leave allowances to the centurions would have been a popular measure, likely to strengthen the army's support for Vitellius.


If Cicero was in fact talking about a matter connected with the public funds in ad Quint. fr. 3, 4, and 3, 5, the "Scipio" in question may have been Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (cos. 52 B.C.), to whom some of Cicero's letters are addressed. Quintus himself had had a dispute with the aerarium Saturni in 58 B.C. over payment due to him for the governorship of Asia - but these letters (written in 54) seem too late to have any bearing on that dispute. In 54 Quintus was a legatus with Caesar.

9. Dio, 53, 22, 3. In another place (55, 32, 2) Dio uses the phrase "τῷ στρατιωτικῷ ταμιεῖῳ" in recording a confiscation of property to the aerarium militare.

Because fisci could have such a general application, it is not always possible to determine precisely what is meant in a particular context: as in CIL VI, 967 which records Hadrian's remission of debts to the fisci. Since Dio records
that Hadrian remitted debts owed to both the imperial and public treasuries ("τῷ τε βασιλείῳ καὶ τῷ δημοσίῳ" — 69, 8, 12 = Xiph.), Millar, JRS (1963), p. 32, may be correct in suggesting that fisci in CIL VI, 967 is shorthand for aerarium and fiscus. Alternatively, the inscription may record the cancellation of arrears of taxes due to the provincial fisci; cf. HA v. Hadr. 7, 6. See above, ch. 1, p. 20 and note 71.

10. CIL VI, 5197.

11. Edict line 21; cf. line 25.

An equestrian procurator fisci Alexandreae is known from Trajan's reign; see Pflaum, Carrières, n. 77; cf. above ch. 2, note 125.


13. Tacitus, Ann. 1, 11, describes the contents of this document as follows: "Opes publicae continebantur, quantum civium sociorumque in armis, quot classes, regna, provinciae, tributa aut vectigalia, et necessitates ac largitiones". Dio (56, 33, 2) echoes Suetonius more closely, for he says that the document listed "τὸ τε πλήθος τῶν ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς χρημάτων".

Again, Jones, Studies, p. 103, argues that Plutarch's statement (Pomp. 25) that Pompey was empowered (in 67 B.C.) to draw as much money as he needed "ἐκ τῶν ταμιεύων καὶ παρὰ τῶν τελωνίων", becomes intelligible if it is interpreted to mean that he was authorized to draw funds from the provincial fisci, and from the agents of the publicani, in all the provinces in which he was operating.

14. See Boulvert, RHD (1970), p. 432, who considers that in these contexts fiscus can denote the local provincial chest. Cf. above ch. 1, note 112.

15. Tac., Hist. 1, 65: cf. 4, 72 - Cerialis' soldiers wanted to loot the town of the Treviri, but offered to give the booty to the fiscus. Tacitus is most likely referring to the provincial chest in this passage too.


18. As Boulvert, RHD (1970), p. 432, concludes. Brunt, however, holds that in this passage fiscus, without qualification, cannot easily be interpreted as standing for the provincial fiscus (JRS 1966, p. 88); cf. above, ch. 1, note 112.


20. Pliny, H.n. 6, 84.

21. See above, ch. 3, note 44.


23. See above, ch. 2, p. 43, with note 101. Cf. Jones, Studies, p. 108 (whose views concerning these passages are referred to above, ch. 1, note 64.)

24. See Jones, Studies, p. 107; Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 75; cf. above ch. 1, pp. 18-20. Presumably it was also through a kind of transference of the meaning of the term that it came to be applied to a specific revenue, such as the fiscus Judaicus, i.e. the Jewish tax (Suet., Dom. 12, 1).

25. Val. Max. 6, 2, 11.

26. That is, alongside the terms "patrimonium" (see e.g. R.G. 18); "impensa sua" (CIL VI, 1257 and 1258 - repairs of aqueducts undertaken by Vespasian and Titus); "res familiaris" (Tac., Ann. 12, 60; 13, 1); "pecunia sua" (Tac., Ann. 15, 42); "res suas" (Tac., Ann. 4, 6); "principialium opum", as opposed to "publicarum opum" (Pliny, Ep. 8, 6 - cf. above ch. 7, note 21). Equivalent phrases are found in the Greek sources: "τα αὐτοκρατορικα χρήματα" (Dio, 57, 23, 5); "τὰς τοῦ καίσαρος προσόδους" (Jos., B.I. 7, 446); Augustus gave money "ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων" when funds were needed for "τῷ δημοσίῳ" (Dio, 53, 2, 1); and Galba said he was giving money "ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων, οὐκ ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων" (Plut., Galba 16).

27. Pliny, H.n. 18, 114; see Jones, Studies, p. 108, on this passage. Cf. Tac., Hist. 1, 46: (Otho) "fiscum suum vacationes annuas exsoluturum promisit rem haud dubie utilem et a bonis postea principibus perpetuitate disciplinae firmatam". On the other hand, while in Germany Vitellius probably paid the centurions' vacationes out of the army's cash box (cf. note 7, above).

28. Seneca, de Ben. 7, 6, 3; cf. above ch. 1, p. 6, pp. 22-3.
29. Jos., A.I. 18, 158; cf. Plut., Mor. 484a: the estate of a condemned man is confiscated "εἰς τὸ Καίσαρος ταμιεύων ".

30. See Seneca, de Benef. 4, 39, 3: "sponsum descendam quia promisi; sed non, si spondere me in incertum iubebis, si fisco obligabis".

31. CIL XI, 3309 ("impena fisci sμια ").

32. H.n. 111-113; 123.

33. H.n. 6, 84.


35. Boulvert, loc. cit.

36. See again the Edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander, lines 13, 21, 25.


39. As in Frontinus, de Aqu. 118 (on which see above ch. 5, p. 82; Pliny, Pan. 36, 3 and 42, 1 (see below); Suet., Vesp. 16, 3 (Suetonius states that some people alleged that Vespasian was driven to harsh measures in exacting money because of the "summa aerarii fiscique inopia"); Tac., Ann. 2, 47 (the remission of Sardis' obligations "aerario aut fisco", on which passage cf. above, ch. 2, note 57); Ann. 6, 2 ("bona Seiani ablata aerario ut in fiscum cogerentur"); Ann. 6, 17 (numerous convictions and sales of properties had concentrated currency "in fisco vel aerario"). On Tac., Ann. 6, 2 see above ch. 6, p. 103; also see ch. 6, pp. 104-5 on Pliny, Pan. 42, 1 ("locupletabant et fiscum et aerarium non tam Voconiae et luliae leges, quam maiestatis singularis et unicum crimen").

40. Cf. Jones, Studies, p. 111; Boulvert, RHD (1970), p. 434; Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 78 (who concedes that these authors were in fact contrasting the fiscus with the aerarium). See above, ch. 1, p. 24.
41. Pliny, Pan. 36, 3: "at fortasse non eadem severitate fiscum qua aerarium cohives: immo tanto maiore, quanto plus tibi licere de tuo quam de publico credis".

42. Tac., Ann. 6, 19 (on which cf. above, ch. 6, p. 103).

43. Dio, 69, 8, 12 (= Xiph.) and 71, 32, 2 (= Xiph.) with reference to Hadrian's and Marcus Aurelius' remission of debts, respectively. Cf. Dio, 68, 2, 1 (= Xiph.): Nerva restored to those who had been unjustly deprived of their property under Domitian all that was left "τὸ βοσκέων".

44. Pliny, Pan. 29, 3-5 (on which see above, ch. 4, p. 75).

45. Suet., Claud. 28.

46. Tac., Ann. 2, 48 (on which see above, ch. 6, p. 102).

47. See Pliny, Pan. 41, 3 (where Pliny speaks of how imperial officials were only too ready to resort to rapacious methods in order to enrich the fiscus); Suet., Nero 32, 2 (Nero ordered "ut ingratorum in principem testamenta ad fiscum pertinarent"); Nero, 44, 2 (Nero imposed "income-tax" on the Roman population in order to replenish the fiscus - cf. above, ch. 8, note 94); Vesp. 18 (the emperor gave Latin and Greek teachers of rhetoric a regular salary out of the fiscus); Vesp. 23, 1 (an imperial freedman named Cerylus tried to cheat the fiscus of his dues at his death by claiming to be freeborn; on the claims of the fiscus to the property of deceased imperial freedmen, see above, ch. 7, note 20, and pp. 116-117); Tac., Ann. 4, 20 (following Silius' conviction, "liberalitas Augusti avulsa, computatis singillatim quae fisco petebantur" - cf. above, ch. 6, p. 102, on this passage); Hist. 1, 90 (Otho tried to return the estates of those who had been exiled under Nero, in so far as the proceeds had not been turned into the fiscus). Also, see again Seneca, de Ben. 4, 39, 3 (see note 30, above).

48. See Dio, 59, 1.

49. As Brunt, JRS (1966), pp. 78-79 emphasizes; also see Millar, JRS (1963), pp. 32-33, and p. 42.


51. As in the case of Cornelius Gallus (Dio, 53, 23, 7); cf. above, ch. 6, p. 103.
52. Tacitus implies that it was on the motion of the senate that "bona Seiani ablata aerario ut in fiscum cogerentur, tamquam referret" (Ann. 6, 2); cf. above ch. 6, pp. 102-103 for a discussion of this and the other cases recorded by Tacitus for Tiberius' reign.

53. Cf. above ch. 6, note 72 (with reference to Dig. 49. 14, 13, from Paulus, libprimus ad legem Iuliam et Papiam, on two edicts of Trajan and further second century regulations).

54. See Tac., Ann. 12, 60; for discussion of this passage, see above ch. 6, note 77.

55. Under Nerva for example, the fiscus bore the larger proportion of the costs of maintaining the Roman water-supply; also Trajan (though Nerva may have been the initiator) financed the alimenta from his own funds; see above ch. 5, pp. 80-81, p. 93.
CHAPTER 10

1. In chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5.


4. See ch. 3, p. 56ff.

5. See ch. 3, p. 58.

6. See the views of Hirschfeld, De Laet, Boulvert, e.g., which have been discussed in this thesis.

7. As most of the scholars, whose views have been discussed in ch. 1, consider was the case.

8. See ch. 2, p. 44.

9. See ch. 4, pp. 74-76.

10. See ch. 5, pp. 78-79.


12. See ch. 5, p. 82 (the cura aquarum); p. 85, pp. 92-3 (roads and public works).

13. See ch. 5, p. 79.

14. See ch. 6, pp. 98-99 (Claudius).

15. See ch. 6, pp. 99-100 (Nero).


17. Dio, 71, 33, 2 (= Xiph. 265).


22. See ch. 2, note 126.

23. See ch. 2, note 127.

24. See ch. 4, pp. 74-75, with notes 94-97.
25. See ch. 8, p. 123ff.


27. Pan. 41-42.

28. See again Dio, 71, 33, 2 (= Xiph. 265).

29. See again Pliny, Pan. 36, 3.

30. See ch. 9, pp. 148-149.

31. Previously, on the basis of HA v. Sept. Sev. 12, the establishment of the *res privata* was generally attributed to this emperor (see Hirschfeld, KV³, p. 20). CIL VIII, 8810 records a "procura [ ... ] rationis/privatae" of Pius; but Hirschfeld regarded the restoration as doubtful, and emphasized, also, the fact that the inscription is known only from a copy of the text (KV³, p. 20, n. 2). But a recently discovered inscription definitely indicates the existence of the ratio privata under the Antonines: it records the career of Titus Aius Sanctus who was praefectus Aegypti in A.D. 179/180, and who had earlier been a procurator rationis privatae; see AE (1961), n. 280; cf. Nesselhauf, "Patrimonium und res privata des Römischen Kaisers", Historia Augusta Colloquium (1964), p. 75.

32. The HA v. Anton. Pius records that this emperor "patrimonium privatum in filiam contulit" on his accession (7, 9), and that at his death "privatum patrimonium filiae reliquit" (12, 8).

33. If Antoninus Pius had felt the need to set aside his personal fortune on becoming emperor, it shows that he did not wish this property to become absorbed in the patrimonium, which on his death would go to the next emperor, not his own heirs. Nesselhauf, op.cit. p. 81ff., points out that at the time it was created the res privata fulfilled the function of the patrimonium at the beginning of the Principate: it could be transmitted to the emperor's heirs according to the laws of private inheritance. Thus Pertinax (Dio, 74, 7, 3, = Xiph. 286) and Didius Julianus (vita 8, 9), also, set aside their private fortunes to ensure that this property was transmitted to their own heirs. The apparent distinction in the HA between the terms "patrimonium privatum" and "res privata" can be explained by the fact that Septimius Severus took possession of the res privata of the Antonines, so that this mass of property acquired (like the patrimonium) the status of "crown property" (Nesselhauf, pp. 87-88; Boulvert, EAI, pp. 300-301).
34. Dig. 39. 4, 1, 1. Papinian, whose career ranged from Marcus Aurelius to Septimius Severus, wrote: Inter debitorem et creditorem convenerat, ut creditor onus tributi praedii pignera non adgnosceret, sed eius solvendi necessitas debitorem spectaret, tale conventionem quantum ad fisici rationem non esse servandam respondi: pactis etenim privatorum formam iuris fiscalis convelli non placuit". (Dig. 2. 14, 42).

35. Dig. 43. 8, 2, 4.

36. The interpretation of the passage is disputed. P.W. Duff, Personality in Roman Private Law p. 55, maintains that "quasi" can mean "in law though not strictly in fact". On the other hand, Brunt, JRS (1966), p. 86, note 70, maintains that "quasi" here means "in fact though not strictly in law". Cf.: Last, JRS (1944), pp. 57-58 (who also disputes Duff's interpretation); Hirschfeld, KV3, p. 12.
The Ancient Literary Sources

Passages quoted in translation in this thesis are from the Loeb Classical Library, unless an alternative translation is cited below.
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