THE ADMINISTRATION OF ITALIAN SEAPORTS DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE
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The scope of this study is limited in several respects. We will consider only seaports in Italy, and not those in the provinces, and we will deal only with the administration during the pre-Diocletianic period. Neither the fleets nor paramilitary units such as the vigiles will be treated here, although either might justifiably be considered a part of the imperial administration. Finally, no attempt will be made to provide a complete description of the administration of these ports, for the available evidence will not permit such a description. We will rather focus upon a relatively limited and unified series of closely interrelated problems, so that we may both treat these problems in some detail and attempt to see what conclusions may reasonably be drawn from the evidence that does survive.¹

The Administration at Ostia

From at least the time of Augustus, and perhaps well back into the Republic,² the coast of Italy, and with it Ostia, was supervised by one or more quaestors. Cassius Dio tells us that under Augustus certain quaestors (ταυτικοί) were assigned «to serve along the coast near Rome,»³ and we know the name of at least one such magistrate, a certain Pacceius, who as quaestor pro praetore was honored by the shipowners of Ostia.⁴ Although this Pacceius is very likely Augustan in date, we know nothing of his responsibilities, and we are told nothing specific concerning his staff.

It is only from the time of Claudius that we begin to find information concerning the administration of the port, and even here the first stages in its development are known to us only in outline. Dio records, in his description of the year AD 44, that Claudius abolished the Italian quaestorships outside of Rome,⁵ the position at Ostia presumably being included. From an Ostian inscription, CIL XIV.163, we learn that the quaestor was replaced by a procurator portus Ostie(nsis) of freedman rank, and again we have the name of one such official, Claudius Optatus, who is usually identified with the Optatus mentioned by Pliny as prefect of the Misenum fleet.⁶ This official certainly had a staff, for we hear of a T. Flavius Aug. l. Ingenuus, tabularius portus Augusti,⁷ who must be dated no later than Trajan: freed by one of the Flavian emperors, he died at age twenty-eight, and so cannot have survived long after the Flavian period, if at all. Other members of the staff do not appear in extant inscriptions, but we may no doubt safely assume that the procurator’s staff included not only tabularii, but also dispensatores and one or more a commentariis; whether at this stage there was a hierarchy of offices in the bureau it is impossible to say. It seems probable that this procurator was responsible to the praefectus annonae, but it should be noted that we have no positive evidence on this point, and the title of the procurator perhaps militates against such an assumption.⁸ Yet when we consider the evident connection between the new procuratorship and Claudius’ harbour, as well as Claudius’ attempts to stimulate the grain trade,⁹ it seems reasonable to conclude that
the new official was in fact concerned largely, if not exclusively, with the grain supply, and that he was therefore responsible to the office of the *annona*.

As had Claudius' new harbour, so also Trajan's harbour seems to have prompted administrative changes. Here, however, they are both more complex and more problematic, and will need to be considered in greater detail. We may begin by noting that Hirschfeld, over a century ago, posited a sequence of port administrations as follows: from Claudius to Hadrian, a *procurator portus Ostiensis*; from Hadrian to Septimius Severus, a *procurator annonae Ostis*; from Septimius on, a more military organization, directed by a *procurator portus uritusque*, with the grain supply no longer under the control of the *praefectus annonae*, but rather under that of the *praefectus praetorio*\(^{10}\). Meiggs and Rougé have argued on various grounds that both the *procurator annonae* and a *procurator portus* must have coexisted throughout the second century, and probably during all of the first three centuries,\(^{11}\) but in fact it was true then, and it is still true today, that no absolutely certain examples of the coexistence of the two positions have yet appeared: the attested *procuratores annonae* begin early in the second century and continue until early in the third,\(^{12}\) while the certain *procuratores portus* are attested only in the first and third centuries.\(^{13}\)

New inscriptions have been discovered since Hirschfeld wrote, however, and scholars such as Pflaum, Meiggs, and Boulvert have made important contributions to particular aspects of this problem. A careful consideration of this more recent material, and of the advances made by these scholars, will show that we are now close to a complete understanding of the evolution of the principal port officials during the period extending from Claudius to the middle of the third century. The chief points are as follows.

1. An inscription of Thuburbo Maius in Africa Proconsularis, published by Poinssot in 1939,\(^{14}\) gives us the career of one M. Vettius Latro. This man, of equestrian rank, held the *tres militiae* entirely or largely under Trajan, was then *procurator annonae Ostiae et in portu*, and finally proceeded to procuratorships in Sicily, the Cottian Alps, and Mauretania Caesariensis. He is attested in the last position in 128 and was probably procurator at Ostia sometime in the period from ca. 107 to ca. 117.\(^{15}\) The title of his procuratorship at Ostia is important but ambiguous. Was Latro in fact *procurator annonae Ostiae et (procurator annonae) in portu*—that is, procurator of the grain supply both at the old port of Ostia and at the new imperial harbours— or was he *procurator annonae Ostiae et (procurator) in portu*, i.e. procurator of the grain supply and procurator of the harbour? No certain answer is possible, but I believe the later is the more probable alternative, and that this title, otherwise unknown, is evidence that, at least from the time of Trajan, the port administration was recognized as having two discrete functions: supervision of the grain supply, and administration of the port itself. Both functions existed earlier, of course, but both were handled, to judge from the available evidence, by the single official called the *procurator portus*.\(^{16}\) Thus the inscription mentioning Latro suggests that Trajan made an important change in the port administration, no doubt in connection with the construction of his new harbour: he appointed an equestrian rather than a freedman procurator, and, by expanding the procurator's title, he recognized officially the dual nature of the procurator's responsibilities, control of the *annona* and supervision of the port.

2. We still have no indisputable evidence of the existence of the *procurator*.
portus utriusque before the third century. In this matter, however, as in so many others relating to procurators, H.G. Pflaum has made an important contribution based upon a brilliant observation. Pflaum noted that one Agricola Augusti libertus appears not only as procurator p(ortus) u(триusque) on an inscription of 224, but also as procurator (without further definition) on a lead pipe likewise dated in the principate of Severus Alexander. As it happens, we have a whole series of Ostian lead pipes with inscriptions similar to the one in which Agricola appears. They give the name of the emperor, usually mention the rationales, name a procurator, and regularly give the name of the slave or freedman whose officina produced the pipe. Pflaum inferred, from the equivalence in the case of Agricola, that all of these procurators were in fact procuratores portus utriusque, and although we cannot be absolutely certain that this is the case, I believe he is correct. The earliest known such procurator is Hylas, under Hadrian, the last is Hesperianus, under Trebonianus, and a complete list of those known to me is provided in the Appendix to this paper. If Pflaum is right, in short, we at last have evidence for the existence of the procuratores portus utriusque not only in the third century, but also throughout the second, but not—and this is an important point—before Hadrian.

3. We know that there was a procurator annonae at Ostia not only from inscriptions mentioning the procurator himself, but also from inscriptions that give us some of the subordinate members of his staff, such as T. Aelius Augg. lib. Saturninus, attested on CIL VI.8450 as tabularius Ostis ad annonae(m) under Pius or later. Similarly, the existence of the procurator portus utriusque in the Antonine period can be inferred from the existence of a tabularius portus utriusque under Hadrian or later. The evidence available at present, therefore, suggests the following reconstruction of the evolution of the imperial administration at Ostia. First, in connection with his new harbour, Claudius replaced the questors who had formerly been in charge with procuratores portus of freedman rank, and he provided these procurators with a staff of unknown size. Probably under Trajan this freedman procurator was replaced by an official of equestrian rank, and he in turn gave way, no later than the principate of Hadrian, to two officials: a procurator annonae of equestrian rank, and a procurator portus utriusque of freedman rank. The probable date of appearance of these two officials, together with the fact that we have no evidence whatsoever of the existence of either of these procurators or of any members of their staffs before the principate of Hadrian, strongly suggests that this administrative arrangement was Hadrian’s work, following in the lines first suggested by Trajan. Both procurators exist without further change into the third century. The last adjustment for which we have evidence is the advancement of the procurator portus utriusque from a freedman to an equestrian position sometime between 224 and 247, but the reasons for this change remain unknown.

Careers, Staffs, and Responsibilities of the Procurator Annonae and Procurator Portus Utriusque

So far as we can tell, the procuratura annonae was considered one of the more important sexagenarian posts, but there seems to have been little attempt either to choose as procurators men who had had previous experience with the annonae or to advance the procuratores annonae eventually to the position of praefectus annonae;
not a single known procurator is certainly connected with the grain supply either before or after his procuratorship. It is clear that the procurator at Ostia was subordinate to the praefectus annonae in Rome, both from the title of the position and from such inscriptions as AEpigr 1973.126, dated May 12, A.D. 179, on which the prefect and procurator appear in complementary roles: . . . locus acceptus ex auctoritate Flavi Pisonis pr(aefecti) ann(onae), designant Valerio Fusco procurator(ae) Aug(ustorum). But we are not told exactly which responsibilities were assigned to the procurator, nor how duties at the port were divided between the procurator annonae and procurator portus; such matters can only be inferred from such evidence as honorary inscriptions, or the staffs that were assigned to each of the official.

The procurator annonae was assisted by a freedman who was also called procurator annonae. We have one certain example of this freedman procurator, P. Aelius Aug. lib. Liberalis, and a second probable example is one Orfitus, who is paired with Sallustius Saturninus, both being called procurator Augustorum nostrorum, on an inscription erected at some point in the years 198 to 209. One freedman tabularius is attested in the bureau, and there appears to have been a treasury from at least the time of Hadrian, to which is presumably to be assigned the paymaster (dispensator) Chrysanthus, an imperial slave who was also, at some point, stationed at Puteoli. There is at least the possibility that the paymasters had assistants, for we have vicarii of dispensatores attested at Ostia, but not assigned specifically to the bureau of the annonae. Three inscriptions, two of which certainly date from the early years of the third century, attest to the possible presence of military men in the administration of the annonae. We know of a cornicularius procuratoris annonae, a centurio fru(m(entarius)), and a centurio annonae. The last, however, is coupled with a centurio operum, and the names of both appear on the inscription after that of Agricola Aug. lib., procurator portus utriusque, so that both these centurions, perhaps detached on special missions, may have been subordinate to or cooperating with the procurator portus utriusque.

Additional help in defining the responsibilities of the procurator annonae may come from honorary inscriptions erected by the Ostian collegia. Following is a list of the collegia that honoured procuratores annonae who were not also patrons of the guilds that erected the inscriptions.

CIL XIV.4459 Lyntr[arii]
CIL XIV.154 Corpus me(n)sorum frument(ariorum)
adiutorum et acceptor(um) Ost(iensis)
CIL XIV.172 Corpus me(n)sorum frum(entariorum)
Ost(iensis)
CIL XIV.161 Corpus mercatorum frumentariorum
CIL XIV.5351, 5352 Fabr(i) tignuar(ii)
CIL XIV.160 Numerus caliguratorum . . . colleg(i)
fabrum tignuar(iorum) Ostis
CIL XIV.5344 Honorati [coll(egi)] fabr(um)
tign(uariorum) Ost(is) ob insignem
amor[em] ei[us]
CIL XIV.5345 Colleg(ium) fabr(um) ti[gn(uariorum)]
o)b plurima beneficia [eius]
As had already been noted by Meiggs, these inscriptions although not numerous, prove that the procurator had some dealings with the grain merchants, grain measurers, and at least one group of river transports, and we may infer that the procurator’s bureau oversaw the unloading, measuring, storage, and transport upriver of grain. The procurator also was honored frequently by the builders (fabri tignuarii), and we can therefore assume he was responsible for the construction and maintenance of the granaries, and perhaps also for some other public buildings, at Ostia and Portus.

Another instructive point emerges when one contrasts the inscriptions erected by collegia to honour the praefectus annonae at Rome. There are none in Ostia, and only two from Rome: the African grain and oil merchants honoured C. Iunius Flavianus, and the oil merchants from Baetica M. Petronius Honoratus, both at some point in the second century. At Ostia, the collegia never seem to honor the praefectus annonae, although in later times the town (decurions, or ordo et populus) sometimes did, usually making him patrum at the same time. The implication is clear: the procurator and his staff dealt directly with the merchants and workers at Ostia; the prefect did not. We are probably safe in assuming that, at least in the pre-Diocletianic period, the praefectus annonae exercised only a general control (auctoritas in the inscription AEpigr 1973.126, given on page 160 supra) at Ostia, and that the actual work was carried out by the procurator.

Little as we know about the procurator annonae and his staff, we know even less about the procurator portus utriusque. It may be that his bureau was responsible to the office of the a rationibus, for the lead pipes which, as we have seen, seem to mention the procurator, usually describe the work as carried out on the authority of (sub) some member of that office. We know of only one certain member of this procurator’s staff, the tabularius portus utriusque mentioned on an inscription of Hadrianic or later date, and we can point to only three specific activities of the procurator: the laying of pipes (assuming Pflaum’s conjecture is correct) and thus presumably an involvement in construction generally; the granting of a spot for the erection of a statue in 224; and, finally, some activity in connection with the river boats, which we may infer from the fact that in 247 the codicarii navicularii honoured the procurator with an inscription.

In addition to the procuratores annonae and portus utriusque and their staffs, a number of other officials are attested at Ostia. Most of them were concerned, it would seem, with the reception, storage, and transfer to Rome of various products or materials. Among these are attested iron, oil, grain and/or other supplies, and possibly animals for the games. We hear also of a freedman procurator pugillationis et ad naves vagas, who presumably kept track of the destinations of ships other than those in the Alexandrian fleet and dispatched imperial communications on them, of a freedman and a slave tabellarius, conceivably assigned to the procurator pugillationis, and finally of a freedman of obscure function, who was perhaps charged with checking the claims of merchants under Claudius’ law granting privileges to shipowners who transported grain in ships of a certain size. Several records-keepers, all freedmen, and three paymasters, all slaves, are attested at Ostia, but need not necessarily be assigned to the port: some of them, at least, may have been occupied at the salt flats, the imperial properties, or in the bureau of hereditates, which certainly had tabularii at Ostia. We have no effective way of determining which of these posts were permanent, and which ephemeral.
There are scattered references to the activity of yet other imperial officials at Ostia. On at least three occasions the curator alvei Tiberis granted permission for construction, once perhaps even in the town itself, which would imply that his authority was rather far-reaching. Under Hadrian, at least some work was carried out by the bureau of the patrimonium, and there were of course a detachment of the vigiles and, at least occasionally, ships from the Misenum fleet, but it is beyond the scope of this paper to consider the organization and functions of these units. We may perhaps simply conclude that the permanent bureaux at Ostia — those of the procurator annonae and procurator portus utriusque — were on occasion, and perhaps frequently, supplemented, assisted, or replaced by other imperial officials and their staffs.

The Administration at Puteoli.

In the famous passage in which Seneca describes the approach of the Alexandrian fleet toward Puteoli we find an implicit reference to some sort of centralized control over the ships, for, after they rounded Capri, only the ships in the grain fleet were allowed to employ the small upper sail called the supparum, while all other boats were ordered (iubentur) to employ only the mainsail. Unfortunately, we cannot say who exercised this control, whether it was simply custom, or imposed by the commander of the fleet, or perhaps mandated by a municipal magistrate or imperial official at Puteoli. It is possible that there was a quaestor at Puteoli, as there was at Ostia, at least until the time of Claudius, for Vatinius was sent there as quaestor in 63 B.C. to control the export of gold and silver, and we know that quaestors were active along the coast near Rome from the time of Augustus. Claudius, however, abolished such quaestorships; whether this presumed quaestor at Puteoli would have been replaced under Claudius by a procurator portus, as was the quaestor at Ostia, is totally uncertain, but the fact that Claudius sent a cohort of the vigiles to each port suggests a parallel administrative development as well.

In fact, however, we still have very little information concerning the port administration at Puteoli in the pre-Diocletianic period. I have found five men who were perhaps involved in the administration of the port:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secundus Aug. lib. M. Ulpius Nicephorus Aug. lib.</td>
<td>tabular(ius)</td>
<td>Hadrian or later</td>
<td>CIL X.1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ulpius Proculus, Domitiani Caesaris verna Chrysanthus Aug(usti) (servus)</td>
<td>prox(imus) comm(enteriorum) ann(onae) tabularius fisci Alexandrini disp(ensator) a frumento Puteolis et Ostis tabellarius</td>
<td>98-ca 155</td>
<td>CIL X.1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Ulpius Proculus, Domitiani Caesaris verna Chrysanthus Aug(usti) (servus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>98-ca 150</td>
<td>NSc 1901.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucesus Augustorum (servus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL X.1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sucesus Augustorum (servus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probably 161 or later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We may make the following points. First, although we have only a single inscription that specifically mentions an official of the annona active at Puteoli, it is clear that the bureau in Puteoli in the second century was fairly extensive, for it included several secretaries (commentarii), enough so that one of them was appointed to be the head of that section (proximus). There seems also to have been at Puteoli a branch of the fiscus Alexandrinus, which had its main office in Rome,\textsuperscript{51} for a freedman tabularius of the fiscus appears in an inscription found there.\textsuperscript{52} In addition, we may probably also assume there was an office of the fiscus frumentarius at Puteoli, parallel to the one at Ostia, since the imperial slave Chrysanthus served as dispensator a fruminto in both cities.

It is, therefore, reasonably certain that there was an office of the annona in Puteoli, and we are probably justified in assuming a procurator annona\textit{e} (whether freedman or equestrian or, as at Ostia, one of each, we cannot tell) as the head of the office. No procurator port\textit{us} Puteolanorum is attested until the mid-fourth century, but the existence of a procurator port\textit{us} then,\textsuperscript{53} combined with the other probable parallels between Ostia and Puteoli, suggests that there may also have been a procurator port\textit{us} at Puteoli in the second century. It should be borne in mind, however, that the two ports were not completely parallel, for curatores rei publicae appear in Puteoli from the mid-second century on, but not in Ostia,\textsuperscript{54} and they were very probably concerned with, among other things, the ports. Moreover, by the time the procurator port\textit{us} appears explicitly in Puteoli, the procurator port\textit{us} has been replaced at Ostia by a comes port\textit{uum}.\textsuperscript{55} Still, on balance, it seems reasonable to assume a procurator port\textit{us} and staff for second-century Puteoli. So far as I know, no evidence survives concerning the administration at Puteoli in the third century.

**Administration of Ports Other than Ostia and Puteoli**

When we turn from Ostia and Puteoli to the other ancient ports of Italy, we meet a completely different situation. I have searched the Italian volumes of the Corpus of Latin Inscriptions and Année Épigraphique in a systematic way, and other publications of inscriptions on a more random basis,\textsuperscript{56} and I have yet to find even one example of a Roman imperial official — other than military personnel — who was certainly involved in the administration of an Italian port other than Ostia or Puteoli. Where we do find imperial administrators attested in seaports, they are either probably to be assigned to Ostia or Puteoli,\textsuperscript{57} or there is no assurance that they are to be assigned to the administration of a port rather than to, for example, the imperial estates.\textsuperscript{58}

This total absence of Roman administrators is, I think, significant. I realize that an argument \textit{ex silentio} is particularly vulnerable, and that the epigraphic record is far fuller for Ostia than for any of the other Italian ports, yet we have, for example, 2156 inscriptions in \textit{CIL} alone from the port cities of Aquileia, Ancona, Ariminum, Brundisium, Centum Cellae, Formia, Genoa, Pisaurnum, Tarentum, and Tarracina (plus 393 from Ravenna), against 1526 from Puteoli, yet among the latter are perhaps half a dozen inscriptions pertaining to persons probably connected with the administration of the port, while the former group provides no such inscriptions.\textsuperscript{59} I would of course be delighted to find evidence of imperial administrators in these ports in the pre-Diocletianic period, but in any case it is clear that, if there were
members of the imperial administration in Italian ports, they were very few in number.

This being the case, we are justified in concluding that necessary work in these ports — for example, building of and repairs to breakwaters and docks, provision of storage facilities, and regulation of commercial activities — was ordinarily accomplished through a combination of imperial subvention, local administration, and private initiative. In addition to his work at Ostia, for example, Trajan improved the port at Ancona,\(^{60}\) and we find Antoninus Pius building or repairing harbour works at Caiaia, Tarracina, and Puteoli.\(^{61}\) We must assume that in these and other similar instances the emperor entrusted the carrying out of the work to one or more imperial officials, and that they in turn contracted with private individuals for the actual physical work, as the censors had done in the Republic.\(^{62}\) In some instances, the cities themselves clearly played a role in the development of port facilities. Puteoli, for example, had a particularly large artificial breakwater and dock by at least the triumviral period,\(^{63}\) and the town of Puteoli seems to have owned warehouses, parts of which were rented out to private individuals.\(^{64}\) It may well be true also that municipal curatores operum publicorum, such as Cassius Cerialis at Puteoli,\(^{65}\) were occasionally charged with carrying out work on ports, but this cannot yet be proved, and ordinarily it would presumably have been the duumviri (or quattuorviri) who let contracts for work on the ports in Italian cities.\(^{66}\) Occasionally, work on a port may have been undertaken by a private individual: thus, late in the first century A.D., T. Abudius Verus apparently built or repaired a mole at Parenzo in connection with his repairs to a temple of Neptune.\(^{67}\)

We should also consider in this connection the commercial organizations, including the collegia, and I would like to return to the problem that Professor Rickman discussed in his paper — the relationship between imperial administration and collegia — but to come at it from a rather different point of view. Waltzing long ago dealt in some detail with the collegia as in effect an extension of the Roman administration (especially the annona),\(^{68}\) so that we may limit ourselves here to the consideration of a single point.

In the following chart, I have arranged in outline form all of the groups of shipowners and boatowners attested as active at Ostia and on the Tiber, whether as collegia or simply as commercial groups. The system of arrangement is of course my own, and is not attested in any ancient source.\(^{69}\)

I. naves marinae (CIL XIV.363, 364, 409, 4142)
   A. classis Alexandrinae (IGR I.380, IG XIV.918)
   B. navicularii maris Hadriatici (CIL XIV.409, AEpigr 1959.149)
   C. navicularii Narbonenses (CIL XIV.4549.32)
   D. navicularii Tarric(onenses?) (CIL XIV.279)
   E. domini (navium) Sardorum (CIL XIV.4142)
      1. navicularii Turritanii (CIL XIV.4549.19)\(^{70}\)
      2. navicularii et negotiantes Karalitani (CIL XIV.4549.21)
   F. domini navium Afrarum universarum (CIL XIV.4142)\(^{71}\)
      1. navicularii Misuenses (CIL XIV.4549.10)
      2. [Hiippione] Diarry(to) (CIL XIV.4549.12)
      3. Sabratensium (CIL XIV.4549.14)
      4. navicularii Gummitani (CIL XIV.4549.17)
5. naviculari Syllecti[ni] (CIL XIV.4549.23)
6. navicularii Curbitani (CIL XIV.4549.34)
7. naves Carthaginienses (CIL XIV.99, 4549.18, 4626).

II. naves annales (CIL XIV.364)
A. codicarii navicularii (CIL XIV.106, 170)
   1. codicarii Ostis (CIL XIV.309)
   2. codicarii naviculari infra pontem S[ublicium] (CIL XIV.185, cf.131)
   3. [codicarii supra pontem Sublicium (not attested)]
B. universi navigarii corpor(um) quinque lenunculariorum (CIL XIV.4144, cf. 352)
   1. ordo corporatorum lenuncularior(um) tabulariorum auxiliares (CIL XIV.250, 251, et al.)
   2. ordo corporator(um) lenunculariorum pleromariorum auxiliarior(um) (CIL XIV.252)
   3. lenunculae traiectus Luculli (CIL XIV.5320, cf. XIV.409)
   4. [lenuncularii traictus marmorariorum? See Meiggs, Ostia 297]
   5. [lenuncularii traiectus togatensium? See Meiggs, Ostia 297]
C. corpus seaphariorum traiectus Rusticeli (CIL XIV.4553-56)
D. lyntr[arii] (CIL XIV.4459)

What strikes one about this chart is, quite simply, that it is so systematic. It approximates the organization of an efficient bureaucrat, charged with administering these groups, might design: it would allow him, for example, to deal with all the owners of sea-going vessels if necessary, or with those of one area such as the Adriatic or the African provinces, or, if need be, with only the shipowners of a single city. Given the large amount of evidence which is lost, especially from the Piazzale delle Corporazioni, we may reasonably assume that many, if not all, of the principal ports of the western Mediterranean were represented by such groups, and it is possible that there were also more comprehensive groups representing, for example, all of the Gallic or all of the Spanish ports. The evidence available at present does not permit the assumption that only ports important for the annonaria or only larger ports were represented, for exceptions to both appear. But the important point remains: even though we must assume that these groups developed through normal commercial cooperation and did not originate in an effort of the Roman administration to regulate trade, yet they have the appearance, when organized in this manner, of a highly organized and systematic bureaucracy.

This being the case, we are surely justified in assuming, especially since many of these groups had curatores, and the collegia of course had a hierarchy of officers, that the Roman imperial civil service made use of those commercial officials rather than creating, for example, a procurator ad naves marinas and under him a staff of freedmen, each of whom was charged with the supervision of ships from one of the several ports. That might help to explain, for example, why so few subordinates of the procurator portus are attested. To a large degree, we may assume, the procurator dealt not with members of his own staff, but with the officials of the collegia offering harbour or river service.

We might, then, suggest that collegia and other commercial groups played a part in the administration of the Roman ports, supplementing, if not replacing, the imperial civil service. Will this help to explain the absence of imperial officials at
ports other than Ostia and Puteoli? The answer is quickly obtained. The following chart lists the principal *collegia* that might be thought to be useful in the administration of a port, and gives all of the Italian port cities, outside of Ostia and Puteoli, where these *collegia* are attested.\(^76\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>collegium</em></th>
<th>Location/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>codicarii</td>
<td>not attested(^77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fabri navales</td>
<td>Pisae (<em>CIL</em> XI.1436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horrearii</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lenuncularii</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lyntrarii</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mensores</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navicularii</td>
<td>Tarracina (<em>CIL</em> XIV.279), Salonae (<em>CIL</em> IX.3337), Pisaurum (<em>CIL</em> XI.6362)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piscatores</td>
<td>not attested (but <em>piscicapi</em> at Pompeii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saccarii</td>
<td>Pompeii (<em>CIL</em> IV.274, 497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scapharii</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urinatores</td>
<td>not attested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be immediately clear that what we know concerning these *collegia* does not support a hypothesis of administration in Italian ports through commercial groups. We are, in fact, compelled to conclude that the ordinary administration of Italian ports outside of Ostia and Puteoli was left in the hands of local officials, and that there was, so far as we can tell, almost no interest in such ports on the part of the central administration during the early Empire: we find no hint, in the administrative record, either of imperial control or of imperial exploitation. It thus appears that, from the point of view of administrative history, Ostia and to a lesser degree Puteoli were anomalies, and conclusions based upon the evidence drawn from those cities cannot be considered valid for Italian ports in general. That, in turn, prompts further questions: are Ostia and Puteoli also anomalous from an economic and social point of view? Can we employ evidence drawn from those cities when we consider the economic and social history of Italy as a whole, or must such evidence be regarded as valid for those cities alone, and not for Roman Italy in general?\(^78\)
Notes

1 A more general survey of the administration of ports, including material from the provinces and from the later Empire, will be found in Jean Rougé, *Recherches sur l’organisation du commerce maritime en méditerranée sous l’empire romain* (Paris 1966) 201-11. hereafter referred to as Rougé, *Comm. marit.* Other abbreviations that will be used in this paper are as follows:


2 See Rougé, *Comm. marit.* 202, for the evidence concerning the period of the Republic.

3 Dio Cass. 55.4.4.

4 *CIL* XIV, 3603, cf. H. Bloch, *NSc* 1953.269.32. We should perhaps list here also Tiberius, who at age 19 was concerned with relieving a grain shortage (Vell. Pat. 2.94.3).

5 Dio Cass. 60.24.3.


7 *CIL* XIV, 4482, 4483. The full name of the port in the first century was Portus Augusti Ostiensis, and presumably the bureau of which the procurator was head had the same name. Thus it might be shortened either to *Portus Ostiensi* or to *Portus Augusti*. For the evidence on the name of the port, see Meiggs, *Ostia* 56.

8 Meiggs, *Ostia* 299, and Rougé, *Comm. marit.* 203, both assume that the *procurator annonae Ostis* was responsible to the *praefectus annonae* in Rome.

9 Suet. *Claud.* 18.

10 KV² 248-50.


12 Lists of the *procuratores annonae Ostis* are available in Pfau, *Carrières* 1031, and in M. Corbier and M. Christol, «Un nouveau vice-gouverneur de Lyonnaise à la lumière d’une inscription romaine,» *REA* 73 (1971) 356-64, Appendix. Corbier and Christol showed that the inscription *NSc* 1933.505.226 = *AEpigr.* 1934.161 probably, if not certainly, records a *procurator et vice praesidis* rather than a *procurator annonae*. To their list, however, we may probably add Salustius Saturninus, *procurator* (annonae?) *Augustiorum* *nostrorum* (duorum), *CIL* XIV, 4285. See note 22 infra.

13 See the Appendix for the certain third century examples. The single first example is Claudius Optatus, *procurator portus Ostiensis*, discussed above.

14 *CRAI* (1939) 138-50 = *AEpigr.* 1939.81.

15 *CIL* VII, 8369 gives the procuratorship in Caesariensis. Latro’s career was discussed in detail by Poissant and by Pfau, *Carrières* 240-43.

16 Meiggs, *Ostia* 300, argued that we should assume that the *procurator annonae* existed even in the first century, and Professor G. Rickman, in a letter to me, indicates that he is inclined to agree. They may well be right. At present, however, we have no positive evidence of the existence of a *procurator annona* before Trajan, not even a potential member of such a procurator’s staff, and it may be, as Professor S. Panciera has suggested to me, that in this case, as elsewhere in the Roman bureaucracy, there was a tendency toward the preservation of older administrative forms. Thus here the *quaestor Ostiensis* perhaps was replaced by another single official, the *procurator portus Ostiensis*, and only later were the separate offices of the *portus* and the *annona* developed.

17 The known procurators are listed in the Appendix.

18 His arguments are presented in his *Mémoire sur les sous-procureurs*, pp. 83-84, which I have not seen. They are reported by Boulvert, *Esclaves* 267-68.


20 P. Aelius Aug. I. Onesinus, *AEpigr.* 1948.103. This point was first made by Boulvert, *Esclaves* 267. The approximate periods of activity of imperial freedmen can be estimated with considerable probability on the basis of their nomenclature. In doing so, I have followed the principles elaborated by P.R.C. Weaver, *Family Caesars, A Social Study of the Emperor’s Freedmen and Slaves* (Cambridge 1972) 24-34.

21 Thus the evidence we now have seems to show that Hirschfeld was correct in assuming there was only a *procurator portus* (Ostiensis) until early in the second century. But after Trajan, the assumptions of Meiggs and Rougé, that there must have been both procurators, seem to be confirmed.
22 Boulvert, Esclaves 326, argued that a new equestrian procurator portus utriusque was created between 198 and 209 and made the superior of the freedman procurator. The evidence is CIL XIV. 4285, a dedication to the genius of the salt-flats by two procurators, one an equestrian, the other a freedman. Boulvert felt the procuratores annonae had nothing to do with the salt-flats, and that therefore the procurators must be procuratores portus. But we find the freedman procurator portus still acting independently in 224 (CIL XIV. 125); we have no other evidence that the procurator portus was connected with the salt-flats; and we do have both an equestrian and a freedman procurator annonae attested. It seems preferable, therefore, to take the procurators of CIL XIV. 4285 as procurator annonae.

23 H.-G. Pflaum, Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain (Paris 1950) 231-33. Among known procurators, six advanced directly from the post at Ostia to centenarian positions, and only one certainly held another sexagenarian post.

24 CIL XIV. 2045. Boulvert, Esclaves 269, showed he cannot have been a single freedman head of the bureau replacing the ordinary equestrian procurator.

25 CIL XIV. 4285. Boulvert, Esclaves 267 n. 31, took Sallustius and Orfius as procuratores portus utriusque, but see n. 22 supra. Weaver, Familia Caesaris, A Social Study of the Emperor’s Freedman and Slaves (Cambridge 1972) 263-65, discussed such combinations of equestrian/freedman heads of bureaux.

26 Tabularius: CIL VI. 8450; treasury—mensa nummularia (i/fiscis) frumentarii Ostiensi—CIL XIV. 2045; Chrysanthus: CIL XI. 1562.

27 CIL XIV. 202, 4485. We hear also of an adiutor (praefecti annonae) ad vecturas naviculariis exsolvendas (Sex. Iulius Possessor, CIL II. 1180), but it is uncertain whether this man was active at Ostia or in Spain, and he was apparently responsible directly to the prefect at Rome, not to the procurator at Ostia.

28 CIL XIV. 160, probably of A.D. 218; CIL XIV. 4487; CIL XIV. 125, of A.D. 224.

29 See further on this inscription Hirschfeld, K 250, with n. 2.

30 The reference to beneficiaria may incidentally help to explain the presence in Ostia of a group of beneficiarii procuratoris Augusti, attested on CIL XIV. 409, if we take beneficiaria here not in a general sense of «favors» but in a more technical sense of «grants of privilege».

31 Meiggs, Ostia 300.

32 Rougé, Comm. marit. 193, argued that the lyrntrarii were employed in river transport, and not just within the harbour.

33 Fabri rignarius should be rendered «builders» in general, and not limited to «carpenters». Note Dig. 50.16.235, fabros rignarios dicimus non eos duxit, qui tigna dolarent, sed omnes qui aedificarent, and cf. J.-P. Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les romains, II (Louvain 1896) 193.

34 CIL VI. 1620, 1625b.

35 See, for example, CIL XIV. 4455, 5342, 5347.

36 CIL XIV. 4721 shows that this had changed drastically by the late fourth century, for there the praefectus annonae himself, now of senatorial rank, is described as seeing to the moving of a statue in order to beautify the forum at Ostia. Note also the settling of a dispute between the grain measurers and river boatmen in 389 by the prefect (CIL VI. 1759, cf. Meiggs’ discussion, Ostia 313-14). In the early Empire, it would surely have been the procurator who arbitrated the dispute.

37 Tabularius, AEpiq 1948.103; erection of a statue, CIL XIV. 125 (the procurator is joined in this by the centurio annonae and centurio operum mentioned supra); codicarii navicularii, CIL XIV. 170.

38 Iron: CIL XIV. 52 and 4459, although Pflaum, Carrières 558, assumed the latter pertained to a procurator active in Gaul; oil: CIL XIV. 20, II. 1180; grain etc.: CIL VIII. 619, cf. 11780, II. 1180 (on the meaning of solamina, see Pflaum, Carrières 506, and note that it also might simply mean supplementary amounts of grain, as during a time of shortage); animals: NSc 1953.276.37. It should be noted that the last, however, was more probably subordinate to the procurator Laurento ad elephanta; see J. Kolendo, «Épigraphie et archéologie: Le praepositus camellorum dans une inscription d’Ostie,» Klio 51 (1969) 287-96.

39 This position has excited much scholarly interest, but no consensus has yet emerged. We know the Alexandrian fleet carried mail (Sen. Ep. 77.3), and Professor Rickman has shown (infra, p. 266) that the Alexandrian boats were regularly treated as distinct from others, as a classis. Professor Thernia suggests to me that the naves vaga were privately owned boats, travelling from port to port, something akin to our tramp steamers. That such ships existed is clear from Hieron. con. Ruf. 3.10. To be useful for a messenger service, however, the naves vaga would need to follow more or less regular routes, and they were perhaps rather like the freighters that arrive at Pozzuoli now, bringing timber from the Black Sea on a regular basis if not a rigid schedule. Such trips on restricted routes seem to be implied in Dig. 14.1.12 (Ulpian), and cf. Petron. Sat. 101, where Lichas is said to be taking his ship ad mercatum, presumably in Tarentum, his hometown. It would be significant if we could show that this procurator exercised some sort of control over these boats, but that does not seem to be implied. Further discussion in: Th. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht, II (third edition, Leipzig 1887)
1030, n. 3; M. Bang. in L. Friedlaender, Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms in der Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang der Antonine, IV (ninth edition, Leipzig 1921) 50; Meiggs, Ostia 302; Bouvier, Esclaves 270, n. 48 and 283, n. 132, with additional bibliography.


42 So taken by Bouvier, *Esclaves* 248, n. 338.

43 See *CIL XIV*.200.

44 *CIL XIV*.5320, with Meiggs’ comments, *Ostia* 331; it may have been the guild house of the *corpus lenunciariorum traiecti Luculli*. The other occasions appear on NSc 1953.287.46 and *CIL XIV*.254.

45 *Fistulae plumbeae*, *CIL XIV*.1977 and 5309.15; *XY*.7739.

46 The evidence for their presence at Ostia is well described by Meiggs, *Ostia* 304-308.


48 Cic. *Vat.* 12; Dio Cass. 55.4.4.

49 Dio Cass. 60.24.3.

50 Bouvier, *Esclaves* 296, n. 219, took Secundus as active not in the port but rather at Hadrian’s Puteolan villa. There must, however, have been *tabularii* active at the port and in the office of the *annona*.


52 In his paper, Professor Rickman called our attention to a papyrus—A. S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar, *Select Papyri, with an English Translation*. 1 (London: Loeb Classical Library 1932) no. 113— in which Irenaeus, from an Alexandrian ship, describes how the members of the fleet went to Rome to be released. It may be that it was the *fiscus Alexandrinus*, with its offices in Puteoli and Rome, from which he sought this discharge.


55 For the evidence, Rougé, *Comm. marit.* 204.

56 I am particularly indebted to Professor Heikki Solin for allowing me to search the material he has gathered for the Supplement to *CIL* Volume X.

57 Thus C. Clodius Maximus, attested as *procurator* Aug(usti) a *frumento* on an inscription from Anzio, *CIL X*.8295. Since Maximus was almost certainly a native of Antium, the provenience of the stone cannot be used to prove he was *procurator* there. He is probably to be assigned to Ostia.

58 Examples: Karus, a *dispensator* attested at Ancona (*CIL IX*. 5892), but not assigned to the port; Hebrus Aug. lib., attested on lead pipes from Civitavecchia, possibly but not certainly to be connected with Trajan’s construction of harbour works there (*CIL XI*.3548a, b); Ti. Claudius *Sect(u)ator*, Aug. lib., *procurator Formis Fundis Caietae* (*CIL VI*.8583), who was probably involved not with ports but with imperial estates (thus Bouvier, *Esclaves* 125, n. 216).

59 This is true also in the post-Diocletianic period, where we have several references to activity in the harbour at Puteoli (e.g. *CIL X*.1690, 1691, 1692, and *AEpigr* 1972.79), but still none from other ports.


61 *HA Anton. Pius* 8.3; *CIL X*.1640, 1641.

62 Thus M. Aemilius Lepidus had a mole built at Tarracina in 179 B.C. (Livy 40.51.2).


66 Cf., e.g., Riccobono, *FIRA* 3.153.


68 *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les romains*, II (Louvain 1896), Chapter One, especially pp. 19-100.

69 The chart includes all such groups known to me except the *navicularii lignarii* (*CIL XIV*.278, 4549.3), the only group apparently characterized by its cargo rather than by its place of origin or operation. It should be noted
that it cannot be proved that all of these groups existed at any one time, but most of the inscriptions date from the second or third centuries, and most, if not all, of these groups were probably active then.

70 It is not certain that these Turritani were from Sardinia. Vaglieri, cited by L. Wickert in his note in CIL ad loc., suggested they were from Turris Libisonis in Sardinia, and I have accepted this suggestion.

71 Note also naviculari Africani, NSc 1953.285.44.

72 It is important to note that no eastern ports except Alexandria are represented here: shippers from the east presumably continued to dock primarily at Puteoli. M.W. Frederiksen, «Puteoli», RE 23 (1959) 2049f., gives evidence for groups of merchants at Puteoli from, for example, Tyre, Berytus, Heliopolis, and Daphnae. The same, and/or others, may also have had representatives at Rome. Professor R.E.A. Palmer has called my attention to L. Moretti, IGUR I.26, attesting a group of shipowners and merchants of Ephesus at Rome.

73 Sicily is not represented at either Ostia or Puteoli, so far as we know, and perhaps there was a commercial connection between Sicily and Tarracina, at least from the time of Trajan on. Note NSc 1900.97, from Tarracina: civis Romanus in Sicilia Panormi qui negotiatur.

74 Sabratha, for example, may have been most important as an exporter of ivory, as suggested by Meiggs, Ostia 287. A comparison of the African ports listed here with a standard survey of important ports, such as that by R.M. Haywood in T. Frank, ESAR IV (Baltimore 1938) 69-70, makes it clear that some important ports are not certainly represented in our surviving evidence (e.g. Hippo Regius, Rusicade, and Hadrumetum), while some unimportant ones are (e.g. Hippo Diarrhytus).

75 Meiggs, Ostia 297-98, for example, suggested that the lenuncularii tabularii were owners of tugboats. If so, they provided a service that the imperial procurators would need frequently.

76 In compiling this chart, I have used the evidence assembled by J.-P. Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les romains, IV (Louvain 1900) 49-128. Recent discoveries would no doubt modify it somewhat, but not enough to affect the basic point. I do not include collegia, such as the fabri lignarii, that are attested not only at ports but also with some frequency at inland cities.

77 CIL XI.2643, included in the Cosa section, is almost certainly from Ostia.

78 I am most grateful to Professor J.H. D’Arms, Director of the American Academy in Rome, for inviting me to participate in this symposium and for making possible the publication of the papers. My debt to scholars who have previously worked on this topic, such as R. Meiggs, J. Rougé, H.-G. Pflaum, and G. Boulver, will be manifest throughout, and I would also like to acknowledge the kind assistance and helpful comments of Professors G. Camodeca, L. Casson, J.H. D’Arms, K. Hopkins, R.E.A. Palmer, S. Panciera, G. Rickman, E. Rodriguez-Almeida, H. Solin, and A. Tchernia. Their contributions have made this a better paper; for its remaining faults I alone am responsible.
APPENDIX. PROCURATORES PORTUS UTRIUSQUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date¹</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Freedmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u(триюску)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u(триюску)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Equestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. L. Mussius Aemilianus</td>
<td>Proc. portus</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>CIL XIV.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u(триюску ad HS [ . . . ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Probable (attested on lead pipes: see p. OO above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIV.5309.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Annius Phleon</td>
<td>Proc.</td>
<td>Pius (?or Elagabalus)</td>
<td>CIL XIV.2008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(or Flagon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CILXIV.5309.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. lib.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XIV.1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(? -- pipe from near Castel Gandolfo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. [ . . . ]salia (?)</td>
<td>Proc.</td>
<td>161-169</td>
<td>CILXV.7741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. lib.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ . . . ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>193-211</td>
<td>AEpigr 1954.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Hermippus Augg. lib.</td>
<td>Proc.</td>
<td>218-222</td>
<td>CIL XIV.5309.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hesperianus</td>
<td>Proc.</td>
<td>151-253</td>
<td>CIL XIV.5309.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For Part II, dates indicate the period within which the pipe was inscribed, not the duration of office of the procurators.