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This thesis re-evaluates the nature and roles of the Italian classes (fleets) of the Roman empire between 31 BC and AD 193. Studied through the prism of naval history, the classes have been portrayed either as ineffective forces left to decay, or maritime institutions supporting military logistics. By starting from the position that the classes cannot easily be compared to other fleets, I argue that they should be regarded as a flexible manpower pool, placed in the same broad category as other soldiers in the Roman empire, who were drawn upon to perform a range of tasks on land and sea to the benefit of the Emperor, and who were integrated into systems supporting the functioning of the empire, which I term imperial organics. Chapter One discusses primarily epigraphic evidence for the classis servicemen, to argue that they considered themselves and were considered as milites who were trained to row, and who could be given tasks suitable to their abilities and places of deployment. Chapter Two, building on earlier discussion of the origins of the servicemen, examines second century AD papyrological evidence for recruitment from the Egyptian Fayoum. It posits recruitment systems which relied on several elements outside the control of Roman authorities, but which nonetheless ensured that the Italian classes were a well supplied manpower pool, perhaps because they did not rely on the so-called gens de mer. Chapter Three re-examines the main “naval bases” of the classes at Misenum and Ravenna, arguing that rather than purely military ports they should be understood as sites concentrating imperial resources to aid imperial activity in regions where concentrations of imperial property are attested. Drawing on arguments in the previous chapters, Chapter Four considers three case-studies for the functions of the Italian classes: their role in Roman military mobilisation and redeployment systems, their involvement in imperial communications, and their possible place in a coastal system on the western coast of Italy suggestive of imperial authority and benefaction. In all three it seeks to present evidence for imperial organics, low-level systems, possibly engendered by imperial activity, but which could persist of their own accord and which were essential to the workings of empire.
Preface

First thanks are to Nicholas Purcell, who in supervising this thesis has encouraged me in directions which I did not know existed, and who has a remarkable ability to see in the evidence what I have missed. He deserves great credit as sympathetic reader of my ideas. Secondly, I express my eternal gratitude to Jonathan Prag, for stepping in as supervisor for a term while Nicholas was away, for giving so much time when I was a wholly confused MPhil student, and for generally offering a great deal of help.

My examiners, Anna Clark and Greg Woolf, made a potentially unnerving experience enjoyable and informative, and have given me much to ponder as I take the work forward. I must also record my thanks to Anna Clark, Georgy Kantor and Christina Kuhn for their invaluable input as my transfer and confirmation assessors. Their comments undoubtedly saved the world from a piece of writing for which it may never be ready. For their small but invaluable words of wisdom on things Egyptian, Italian and maritime I express my gratitude to Amin Benaissa, Ed Bispham, Alan Bowman and Andrew Wilson. Katherine Clarke, whose undergraduate tutorials sparked my Roman interests, deserves special mention. The writing of this thesis would not have been the same without several members of the Oxford graduate community, whether in sharing ideas, or inevitably trying to avoid Classics “chat”.

For better or worse, this thesis could not have been written without the support of my parents, who have never pressured me into doing anything sensible. Nor my siblings, to whom I hope I offer a cautionary tale, and who will doubtless surpass me in all they do. And lastly some words for Rachael, who has put up with more than is reasonable, and who may now reclaim me from the charms of the Sackler.
# Contents

*Preface*  
vi

*List of abbreviations*  
vi

*List of figures*  
x

Prologue  
1

Introduction  
6

I. *Gens d’empire: the servicemen of the Italian classes*  
36

1. Introduction  
36

2. Dating the epitaphs  
38

3. Social origins  
45

3.1 Citizens, *liberti* and peregrines  
46

3.2 Free peregrines with *tria nomina*  
52

3.3 The Italian *classes* and the imperial house  
56

4. Ethnic origins  
57

4.1 Origins before the Flavians  
61

4.2 Flavian and post-Flavian origins  
64

4.3 *Nationes* and geography  
69

5. The nature of service  
76

5.1 Servicemen as *milites* in epitaphs  
83

5.2 *Classis* service in literature  
90

5.3 *Diplomata, milites and remiges*  
97

5.4 *Milites* and *militia*  
103

6. Conclusion  
107
II. Recruitment and the Fayoum 110

1. Introduction 110

2. Processes of recruitment in the legions and auxilia 112

3. Two Egyptians in search of a classis 115

3.1 A voluntary process 121

3.2 The sailing season and the timing of enlistment 122

3.3 Recruitment, soldiers and veterans 125

3.4 The Gnomon of the Idios Logos 131

4. Conclusion 135

III. The Italian classes and their imperial ports 138

1. Introduction 138

2. The problem of the “naval base” 140

3. Centumcellae: imperial estate and imperial port 148

4. Misenum 151

4.1 Geography and history 153

4.2 Imperial estates and the sinus Baianus 156

4.3 Production, Puteoli and communications 166

4.4 Classis milites in the Bay of Naples 170

5. Ravenna 172

5.1 Natural and strategic advantages 174

5.2 A Republican naval base? 179

5.3 Ravenna and imperial estates: the regio Ravennatium 183

5.4 ‘A second Puteoli’. Aquileia and communications 191

5.5 Leisure and display in the north Adriatic? 193

5.6 The luxury villae maritimae of Histria 198
6. Conclusion

IV. The Italian classes and imperial organics

1. Introduction

2. The Italian classes, mobilisation and redeployment
   2.1 The classes and AD 68-70
   2.2 The Bar Kokhba revolt
   2.3 The cohortes classicae
   2.4 The classes and AD 193
   2.5 Conclusion

3. Communications
   3.1 The cursus publicus and other couriers
   3.2 Conveying the Emperor
   3.3 Commeantes at Brundisium
   3.4 Monitoring ports and classes milites as couriers
   3.5 Conclusion

4. The classes, the annona and the imperial coastal landscape
   4.1 The classes and the annona
   4.2 The Emperor and the annona
   4.3 Coastal benefactions: security and accessibility
   4.4 Astura
   4.5 Rhegium
   4.6 Ostia-Portus
   4.7 Neronian canals, Neronian Antium
   4.8 The via Domitiana
   4.9 Trajan and Centumcellae
4.10 Argentario, Giannutri, Giglio and Tagliata 283

4.11 The imperial coastal landscape and ἐπίνειοι φρουραί 287

5. Conclusion 294

Conclusion 299

Appendix 314

Bibliography 323
### List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAd</td>
<td>Antichità altoadriatiche. Udine (1973-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>L’Année Épigraphique. Paris (1888-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>Annona Epigraphica Austriaca (1979-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ed. H. Temporini and W. Hasses, 1972-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAG</td>
<td>Carte archéologique de la Gaule. Paris (1990-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>Cambridge Ancient History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>Corso di cultura sull’arte ravennate e bizantina. Ravenna (1956-98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCID</td>
<td>M. Hörig and E. Schwertheim, Corpus Cultus Iovis Dolicheni. Leiden (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChLA</td>
<td>Chartae Latinae Antiquiores. Basel (eds. A. Bruckner, R. Marichal et al., 1954-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. Berlin (1828-77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (ed. T. Mommsen et al., 1863-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CILA</td>
<td>Corpus de Inscripciones Latinas de Andalucia. Seville (ed. J. González Fernández et al., 1989-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum. Wiesbaden (ed. R. Cavenaile, 1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diz. Epigr.</td>
<td>Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romana (ed. E. de Ruggiero, 1886-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>Ephermeris Epigraphica, Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum Supplementa. Berlin (1872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRA</td>
<td>Fontes iuris Romani anteiustiniani. Florence (1940-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IDRE**

**IG**
*Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin (1873-)

**IGLS**
*Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie*. Beyrouth and Paris

**IGRRP**
*Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*. Rome (ed. R. Cagnat et al., 1964)

**IKöln**

**I.Kyzikos**

**ILA Nitiobroges**

**ILGN**
*Inscriptions latines de Gaule (Narbonnaise)*. Paris (ed. E. Espérandieu, 1929)

**ILLConcordia**

**ILLRP**
*Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*, (ed. A. Degrassi, 1957-63)

**ILN**

**ILS**

**ILTun**
*Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie*. Paris (ed. A. Merlin, 1944)

**InscrAq**

**Inscr. It.**
*Inscriptiones Italiae* (1931-)

**IScM**
*Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris grecae et latinae*.

**Ital. Landes.**

**M.Chr.**


Naber S. A. Naber M. Corneli Frontonis et M. Aurelii imperatoris epistulae. Leipzig (1867)


P. Fouad Les Papyrus Fouad I. Cairo (ed. A. Bataille, 1939)


PIR1 Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Berlin (ed. E. Krebs, 1897-98)

PIR2 Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Editio altera. Berlin (1933- )

P. Lond. Greek Papyri in the British Museum. London (1893- )


P. Oxy. The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. London (1898- )

PSI Papiri Greci e Latini. Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca del papiri greci e latini in Egitto (1912- )

RE Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassichen Altertumswissenschaft (ed. G. Wissowa, E. Kroll et al., 1893- )


RIC1 H. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham et al., Roman Imperial Coinage. London (1923-67)


Other abbreviations are those found in Année Philologique, and in the Oxford Classical Dictionary.

Where an inscription is cited for the first time in a given chapter, all concordances are provided. Afterwards, only the principal publication is given.
List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Fayoum and its villages</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Misenum and its region</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ravenna and the north Adriatic</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1955, Hans-Georg Pflaum published an inscription on a marble base from Diana Veteranorum in Numidia. It recorded the career of M. Valerius Maximianus, a successful general in the Marcomannic wars and suffect consul of AD 186. He had also been praepositus of vexillations of the classes Misenensis, Ravennas and Britannica:¹

allecto ab Imp(eratore) M(arco) Antonino Aug(usto) et misso in procinctu / Germanic(ae) exped(itionis) ad deducend(a) per Danuvium quae in annonom Panno(niae) / utriusq(ue) exercit(uum) denavigarent praepos(ito) vexillation(um) clas(sium) praetor(iarum) / Misenatis item Ravennatis item clas(sis) Brit{t}an(n)ic(ae) item equit(um) Afror(um) et Mauror(um) / elector(um) ad curam explorationis Pannoniae.

Michel Reddé interpreted this as showing that vexillations of three classes combined under one commander to provide grain for the Pannonian armies during the wars of Marcus Aurelius.² Reddé followed the view of Pflaum that the equites patrolled the Danubian banks while the classes transported provisions.³ This was against Dobias and Leglay, who argued that the cavalry were specifically to patrol Pannonia, and that technically, if on the north bank of the Danube, they would have been outside the provinces. Therefore, the cavalry were not escorting supplies, but scouting in Pannonia.⁴

We shall return to this proposition. But the analysis of Reddé is fundamental for his argument that the main role of the imperial classes, especially in the

³ Reddé (1986) 381.
⁴ Leglay (1957) 107-8 translates the main points of J. Dobias in Listy Filologické 5 (1957), 179-96.
Mediterranean, was to support military logistics.\textsuperscript{5} He thus contributes to the debate over the purpose of the \textit{classes}, understanding them as war fleets. Yet this inscription is the only direct evidence supporting his position, and it is worth a brief reconsideration to show that his argument is far from proven, that there are complications in assuming that the \textit{classes} were simply war fleets, and to suggest an alternative.

The precise circumstances in which Maximianus undertook his duties are unclear, though Kissel has cogently proposed the troubles facing the Roman army in AD 170/1.\textsuperscript{6} Intending to advance against the Iazyges, the Romans were outflanked by the Costoboci, who overran Thrace and Macedonia, while the Quadi and Marcomanni made their way into the Julian Alps, Raetia and Noricum.\textsuperscript{7} Roman supply lines were imperilled, and therefore Maximianus was granted special responsibility for guaranteeing grain provisions. If correct, this endows the command with an emergency character.

We cannot overlook this point: Reddé argues that the \textit{classes} were habitually involved in military provisioning. Yet this example seems to relate to an emergency or at the very least a time of particular difficulty.\textsuperscript{8} Its unusual characteristics are highlighted by the involvement of \textit{milites} from the \textit{classis Britannica} in the Danube region. Thus, the only inscription that apparently attests the normal involvement of \textit{classes} in military supply appears substantially less decisive, and dangerous to extrapolate from.

\textsuperscript{5} Reddé (1986) 370-99; Reddé (2001) and below pp. 11-12. Already briefly suggested by Keppie (1984b) 186. Followed by Le Bohec (1994) 164; Roth (1999) 332 cites only Le Bohec. Konen (2002) offers little direct evidence to support his belief that the provincial \textit{classes} transported troops and supplies. Saddington (2007) 210 suggests that the \textit{classes} were not used for ‘large-scale transport’ until the latter half of the second century AD.


\textsuperscript{7} Amm. Marc. 29.6.1.

\textsuperscript{8} Herz (2002) 27-8 considers the inscription as an example of ‘Notsituationen’.
But we can go further. Pflaum argued that the responsibility of Maximianus for the *annona* was concurrent with his command of the *vexillationes classium* and the cavalry. Reddé essentially follows this interpretation. For a parallel to this joint command of *classiarii* and cavalry, Pflaum pointed to a passage from the *De munitionibus castrorum*.

In the ideal Roman army camp presented in that text, there were to be five hundred men from the *classis Misenensis*, and eight hundred from the *classis Ravennas*. They were to camp among the *Mauri equites* and *Pannonii veredarii*, because those units could provide protection as the *classici* secured routes ahead: *classici omnes ideo praetendunt quod ad vias muniendas primi exeunt et quo sint tutiores, a Mauris equitibus et Pannonii veredariis operantes protegentur.*

Other scholars have suggested that this does not match the tasks described in our inscription, and that we must set the text aside. For instance, Forni argued that the only reason that *classis* servicemen would have been detached from their fleets would have been to escort cargo ships, and that, if they were linked to the *cura explorationis*, this was an entirely different task from that described by Ps. Hyginus.

Dobias was similarly unconvinced: based on his strict interpretation of the cavalry duties, they could not have patrolled along the Danube because its north bank was outside Pannonia. Therefore, they were to scout out Pannonia before the Roman assault began in AD 172. Thus, they had nothing to do with the *annona* or the

---

9 Pflaum (1955) 141-2; cf. (1960-1) 482-3.
10 [Hyg]. *De Mun. Cast.* 30; *classici Misenates D, Ravennates DCCC*. Its dating and authorship are disputed. Domaszewski (1887) 69-72 considered it second century AD, probably pre-Hadrianic. Some scholars connected it with particular dates and wars e.g. Birley (1953) 234, (1981) and (1982) 277-9 argued for the Marcomannic wars of M. Aurelius. Frere (1980) favoured the Danubian conflicts of Domitian. However, I prefer Lenoir (1979) viii-xvi, who argues that the text is theoretical and should not be attributed to a specific conflict, proposing an early second century dating. That the text is a compilation is a problem not fully considered (though see Birley (1982) 279-81).
13 See above p. 1 n.4.
vexillationes classium, making their command by Maximianus subsequent to his supply task, and therefore Ps. Hyginus irrelevant.

Dobias may have been correct to question the connection made by Pflaum between ad deducend(a) per Danuvium quae in annonam Panno(niae) utriusq(ue) exercit(uum) denavigarent and ad curam explorationis Pannoniae. However, his contestation that the cavalry and vexillationes classium had nothing to do with each other is harder to substantiate. This argument only really follows if we assume that the duties of classis servicemen were always connected to boats. We shall see over the course of this thesis that this was not so.

Saxer suggested that we could couple the duties of the classis servicemen with those of the cavalry but separate them from provisioning tasks. I do not follow his argument entirely: he suggested that the inscription provides a precise parallel for Ps. Hyginus, that therefore the cavalry and the classis men must be under the same command and, for Dobias to be right in asserting that the cavalry had no provisioning role, both were deployed ad curam. But the evidence of De munitionibus castrorum is not a precise parallel. Valerius Maximianus also had members of the classis Britannica under his command, not mentioned in the text. Moreover, he had no Pannonii veredarii.

But we do not need the description in De munitionibus castrorum to precisely copy the forces and duties listed in the inscription for the former to provide a useful parallel, and indicate the unit types that the Romans could combine to perform particular tasks. The text describes classici and cavalry dispatched from the camp to prepare the way forward for the army. This could well be termed exploratio. A

---

Suetonian comparison, if not entirely convincing, is the use by Tiberius of a centurion to clear the way ahead of his litter:¹⁵

in quodam itinere lectica, qua vehebatur, vepribus impedita exploratorem viae, primarum cohortium centurionem, stratum humi paene ad necem verberavit.

This man was described as explorator viae, perhaps parodying army practice.¹⁶

Based on the above, it seems possible that the vexillationes of the classes were deployed under Valerius Maximianus alongside cavalry forces to secure routes through Pannonia. It does not necessarily follow that we should completely dissociate these men from the task of supplying the armies. Such missions seem potentially related. However, I suggest that we could go further than Dobias in detaching not only the cavalry from the Danube but also the vexillationes classium. Both groups had a wider role in securing overrun parts of Pannonia up to the Danube in preparation for a Roman advance, an advance supported by the provisions directed by Maximianus.

The career of Valerius Maximianus provides at most an isolated example of an emergency use of classis servicemen to escort supplies to the Pannonian armies. It may even advance no such evidence at all, and could simply show a pattern we shall see elsewhere: the redeployment of the manpower pool of classis servicemen on land to carry out duties, broadly considered militia, which could be unrelated to travel by water.

¹⁵ Suet. Tib. 60.  
¹⁶ Cf. e.g. Hirt. B Gall. 8.35; Vell. Pat. 2.112.5 for exploratores as scouts.
The ideological significance of power over land and sea had its roots in the Hellenistic kingdoms. Greeks had bestowed praise on Pompey for his mastery of both elements; he was declared ἐπόπτης γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, and elsewhere was lauded for bringing peace and freedom through ending war on land and sea. The Romans had their own tradition of naval imagery and triumphs, suggesting that maritime power had a well-established importance in Roman society.

The language of power on land and sea attained its apogee under Augustus. His Res Gestae records wars fought and affairs successfully accomplished on land and sea (bella terra et mari c[ivia] ex]ternaeque...[gessi]; ...ob res a...terra ma[riqu]e pr[o]spere gestas). As a less weighty example demonstrating the cultural capital of the idea in the first century AD, Seneca lampoons it in the Apocolocyntosis during the debate on whether Claudius should become a god. The divine Augustus asks: in hoc terra marique pacem peperi?

Sea power and its trappings were reflected in art and architecture. The captured rams attached to the Actian monument proclaimed peace achieved on land and sea (pace parta terra [marique]). A triumphal triple arch at Orange, probably Tiberian, has four panels decorated with warships, anchors, tridents and other naval

---
17 Momigliano (1942); Schuler (2007).
19 For naval triumphs see Dart and Vervaet (2011). For an example of Republican naval imagery see Coarelli (1997) 397-446 on the aedes of Neptune in the Circus Flaminius. Naval imagery (especially prows) on coins was common towards the end of the third century BC and throughout the second: see e.g. RRC 35, 64/2-6c, 161/2-6, 199/2-6b, 289/2-5. See Zanker (1990) 39-42 for the Triumviral period.
20 Aug. RG. 3.1; 4.2; cf. 13; 26.4.
21 Sen. Apocol. 10.2.
imagery.\textsuperscript{23} Similar elements appear on a group of Capitoline plaques, previously considered Trajanic or Hadrianic but now Augustan.\textsuperscript{24}

Within this context, Augustus established separate, permanent \textit{classes} at Misenum, the outermost promontory in the north-west of the Bay of Naples, and Ravenna, on the Adriatic shore of north-eastern Italy. Their creation is directly attested by Suetonius, who stated: \textit{classem Miseni et alteram Ravennae ad tutelam Superi et Inferi maris conlocavit}.\textsuperscript{25} Tacitus says of the \textit{classes} in AD 23:\textsuperscript{26}

\begin{quote}
Italian utroque mari duae classes, Misenum apud et Ravennam, proximumque Galliae litus rostratae naves praesidebant, quas Actiaca victoria captas Augustus in oppidum Foroiuliense miserat valido cum remige.
\end{quote}

One should note the significance of Forum Iulii in this scheme, though I shall refer little to it here because of the very small amount of evidence, and its arguably short lifespan as a \textit{classis} port.\textsuperscript{27} In any case, the stationing of \textit{classes} at several locations can therefore be placed in the early Augustan period, but I shall not attempt greater chronological precision: there is simply no good evidence.\textsuperscript{28}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[]\textsuperscript{23} Amy et al. (1962) esp. 94-106, 157-8.
\item[]\textsuperscript{24} Ibid. 96. Note also Boube (1996) esp. 19-31 for the Augustan naval monument from the forum of St-Bertrand-de-Comminges; \textit{cf.} Picard (1957) 257-9, 270-4.
\item[]\textsuperscript{25} Suet. \textit{Aug.} 49.1. The suggestion that the \textit{classes} were created \textit{ad tutelam} the seas around Italy may be schematic. As Brunt (1963) 172 noted, Suetonius was writing under the ‘notoriously defensive’ Hadrian, and he may have construed the role of the \textit{classes} in light of his general presentation of Augustus as militarily defensive (Suet. \textit{Aug.} 21.2, 25; \textit{cf.} Tac. \textit{Ann.} 1.11; Cass. Dio 56.33.5-6). For further criticism of Suetonius, see Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 24.
\item[]\textsuperscript{26} Tac. \textit{Ann.} 4.5.
\item[]\textsuperscript{27} For recent re-evaluation of the Forum Iulii port layout and relationship to the sea see Goudineau and Brentchallof eds. (2009); Gébara and Morhange (2010); Rivet (2010). Of older bibliography, see esp. Ihm in \textit{RE} VII (1912), \textit{s.v.} \textit{Forum Iuli}, 69-70; Donnadieu (1935); Février (1963). For Forum Iulii and the \textit{classes} see e.g. Fiebiger (1894) 328-9; Chapot (1896) 44-5; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 12-13; Reddé (1986) 171-7; Gébara and Morhange (2010) 16.
\item[]\textsuperscript{28} For attempts to date Ravenna to the early 20s BC see Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 21; \textit{cf.} Reddé (1986) 177-8. For Misenum see Chapot (1896) 67; Fiebiger in \textit{RE} III (1899), \textit{s.v. classis}, 2623 (before 22 BC); Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 13-14 (27-15 BC); Reddé (1986) 187-9 (possibly after 20-19 BC). For the suggestion that Misenum was established before the death of Agrippa see e.g. Vitucci (1977) 182-3; \textit{cf.} Susini (1967a)
\end{footnotes}
Lacking direct information, scholars have estimated the combined number of *classis* ships at between seventy five and one hundred and twenty five, with around two hundred men per boat, giving fifteen to twenty five thousand servicemen.\textsuperscript{29} The creation of these *classes* could be interpreted as a response to the desire for power over land and sea, or at least its appearance, and therefore appear a logically straightforward act.

Yet the picture is more complicated. The Romans of the Republic had no great tradition of maintaining permanent fleets, but were often content to receive allied naval contributions.\textsuperscript{30} Previous work has paid considerable attention to why the permanent imperial *classes* appeared, and whether their development can be traced in the Late Republican or Triumviral periods.\textsuperscript{31}

I shall offer some comments on the second question at the end of this thesis. However, my prime focus will be the problem of why permanent Italian *classes*, which at a quick glance resemble war fleets, were maintained in a period without naval battles, and when Rome was unchallenged at sea. The answers reached by scholars have so far often proved unsatisfactory, partly because of the assumption that the *classes* can be treated just like other Mediterranean war fleets, and partly due to their isolated study as military institutions. I shall briefly review major treatments to provide a sense of the problem.

\textsuperscript{368} not dismissed entirely by Reddé (1986) 188-9; cf. Roddaz (1984) 182-3. Bollini (1990) 297 unconvincingly used Suetonius and Tacitus to argue for their establishment immediately after Actium. \textsuperscript{29} Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{2} 16-17 based his lower estimate on the formation of the *legiones Adiutrices* in AD 68 – 70. See Reddé (1986) 550-4 for the higher, following a comment by John Lydus (*Mens. 1.27*) that the strength of the naval forces at the start of the fourth century amounted to 46,562 men, and suggesting that the *classes* of the High Empire had a force roughly equivalent, half deployed in the Italian ones. \textsuperscript{30} Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{2} 1-10; Thiel (1946) and (1955); Steinby (2007). Noting that the *duoviri navales* commanded squadrons of ten ships each (Livy 3.30.4; 40.18.7; 41.1.2-3; cf. Thiel (1946) 201, 421-31; and (1954) 9, 23-4, 26-7, 37, 48; cf. Steinby (2007) 60-1), scholars have posited a small number of permanent ships. This appears to be supported by *navalia* at Rome (e.g. Livy 8.14.12; 40.51.6; 41.9.2; for further references and discussion see Rankov (2013) 31-2, 39-41). \textsuperscript{31} E.g. Chapot (1896) 19-23, 38-9; Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{2} 1-8; Reddé (1986) 458-72 and below p. 306.
The first serious studies of the imperial *classes* were undertaken by E. Ferrero, using the epigraphy then available; certainly valuable, if outdated. However, his work established lines of scholarly inquiry: explanations for their creation, catalogues of ports, ship-types, ranks, organisation and studies of their crews, considering especially terms of service and recruitment.

Mommsen devoted some space to the *classes* in works on the Roman army, emphasising their initial status as a private force of the Emperor. This was followed by useful treatments from de la Berge and Fiebiger, before Victor Chapot published his book on the *classis Misenensis* in 1896.

Following Ferrero, these studies were interested in institutional and organisational aspects of the *classes*. Chapot included perhaps the most detailed study of the lower ranks of the *classis Misenensis* specifically, commenting on their origins, status, conditions of service, rewards and punishments, their *honesta missio* and their wives. All examined motivations for their creation. De la Berge suggested several: the need for protection for merchant fleets, war fleets to use against upstart governors from Greece and the East, the projection of power over land and sea, the provision of lawful employment for piratical Dalmatians and Cilicians, and the creation of a loyal military force in an Italy without legions. These arguments were largely followed by
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32 Ferrero (1878), (1884a), (1884b), (1899); cf. his entry in *Diz. Epigr.* II.1 (1892), *s.v.* *classis*, 271-80. Note the bibliographical essay of De la Berge (1886) 5-8 for earlier works, esp. Garrucci (1852).
33 Mommsen (1881) and (1884).
34 De la Berge (1886); Fiebiger (1894); cf. Fiebiger in *RE* III (1899), *s.v.* *classis*, 2632-49; Chapot (1896).
35 Chapot (1896) 171-220.
36 De la Berge (1886) 67-8.
Chapot, who depicted the Italian *classes* as maritime peacekeepers and police forces, but often left with little of great value to do, and at the service of imperial whims.\(^{37}\)

The next vital publication was *The Roman Imperial Navy* of Chester G. Starr, still the only serious English monograph-length treatment.\(^{38}\) Starr covered much old ground, examining the creation of the permanent *classes*, their bases, their ships, their officers and the duties of the rank and file. However, his treatment of social aspects of the *classes* was of greater depth than previous work, partly because he had access to a greater number of documentary sources. Indeed, the source material has not really expanded since. Starr also challenged several established hypotheses: for instance, he argued against the position of Mommsen that the *classes* were initially a private possession of the Emperor and crewed by his slaves, proposing instead that they were public war fleets from their very beginning.\(^{39}\)

This work remains valuable. Yet, as is evident from the title, Starr saw the *classes* as a modern navy, and applied the terminology and expectations of what such a navy should do to his interpretations. He writes of the *classis* members being “sailors”, a decision which will be revealed as problematic.

Starr argued that the *classes* were a public organisation created primarily to assist in military control of the Mediterranean.\(^{40}\) Because the Romans dominated its shores and peace was apparently easy to maintain, the “navy” was given additional tasks, such as supporting commerce (especially the grain trade), transporting dignitaries and working on infrastructural projects.\(^{41}\) However, the “navy” was of

\(^{37}\) Chapot (1896) 42-8.

\(^{38}\) Starr (1960)\(^2\); *cf.* Starr (1989). For a recent, derivative study see Pitassi (2009). Roughly contemporary was Courtois (1939), arguing that the Italian *classes* were established by Augustus for a maritime threat which never emerged, and were then ignored.

\(^{39}\) Below p. 47.

\(^{40}\) Starr (1960)\(^2\) 168-90.

\(^{41}\) Note Starr (1989) 75, putting much greater emphasis on carrying messages.
primary import as insurance: Starr believed that Augustus established a doctrine of naval preparedness, which was reinforced by the events of AD 69-70 but which disintegrated in the second century AD through neglect, with only respect for tradition preserving the “navy”.

While we shall see that the classes undertook many of the tasks Starr attributed to them, we are not compelled to assume that they were of a secondary nature.

Articles by Wickert and Sander returned to technical and organisational aspects of the classes, and argued against Starr on the composition of classis manpower. Some of these points were considered by Dietmar Kienast in his monograph Untersuchungen zu den Kriegsflotten der römischen Kaiserzeit. Kienast concentrated on select problems: the praetorian epithet received by the Italian classes, the social background of the servicemen, and the relationship of both the Italian and provincial classes to political history. Kienast connected the history of the Italian classes with high political developments in Rome. This provided a rather restrictive interpretation of the classes and one which is difficult to sustain in light of trends minimising the historical role of individual Emperors.

We come to the most important recent study, Mare Nostrum. Les infrastructures, le dispositif et l’histoire de la marine militaire sous l’Empire romain by Michel Reddé. Again, one might note that the title emphasises the maritime, implying that we are dealing with war fleets. Reddé provides a thorough treatment of the Italian and provincial classes, dealing in turn with their ships, ports, roles and manpower. While an invaluable reference work, Reddé sometimes adds little himself,

43 Wickert (1949-50); Sander (1957).
44 Kienast (1966).
45 Reddé (1986); cf. Susini (1967a); Bollini (1968) and Viereck (1975), with criticism from L. Casson in Gnomon 49 (1977), 520-1.
largely because his interests are mostly those of traditional naval history, and there is not much more to say.

As mentioned, Reddé has made a useful contribution to work on the purpose of the *classes* by emphasising their military logistics role, but I have already exposed the limitations of this argument.\(^{46}\) He also proposed that the *classes* were responsible for maintaining Mediterranean security, but on a much greater scale than previous scholars, pointing to endemic piracy around places like Cilicia, and the speed with which peace could be disrupted by major outbreaks of violence, such as the raids of the Costoboci under Marcus Aurelius.\(^{47}\) This does not seem unlikely, though there is no good evidence to support the hypothesis and derives from the desire of Reddé to present the *classes* as military institutions.

Since Reddé, articles have focused on specific topics, including the study of social relations at Misenum by Parma, an onomastic investigation by Salomies and an exploration of the identities of Dalmatian servicemen by Dzino.\(^{48}\) The *classes* have been granted cursory overviews in works on the Roman army, or other general histories.\(^{49}\) There have also been treatments of the provincial *classes*, considered alongside the Italian *classes* in the major books.\(^{50}\) But nothing working along traditional lines has changed how we think about the imperial *classes*.

\(^{46}\) See Prologue. Though not a wholly new idea; see e.g. Marquardt in *Staatsver.* II 501; Ferrero in *Diz. Epigr.* II.1 (1892), s.v. *classis*, 273; Starr (1960\(^{\dagger}\)) 134, 187; cf. Starr (1989) 74, more critical of the idea. See the review by B. Campbell in *JRS* 78 (1988), 239, where doubts are expressed concerning the importance of the *classes* to Roman military strategy. While Campbell achieves only a partial view by considering the *classes* purely from a military perspective, I support his conclusions on the significance of the *classes* to military logistics.


\(^{48}\) Parma (1994); Salomies (1996); Dzino (2010).


\(^{50}\) See also below p. 21 n.93.
I therefore propose to return to fundamentals, and ask what kind of institution the Italian *classes* were. Although they shared commonalities with Mediterranean war fleets of other periods, they display sufficient differences that we should be cautious about assuming we can study them similarly. We should first consider the term *classis*, to show the breadth of its original semantic range.

Writers of the later first century BC believed that five (or six) *classes* were created by Servius Tullius when he instituted the census. These had political and military functions, expected to provide different levels of service and military equipment dependent on wealth. Livy wrote: *censum enim instituit... tum classes centuriasque et hunc ordinem ex censu disciprisit, vel paci decorum vel bello.*51 Dionysius of Halicarnassus related the same divisions, saying ἐγένοντο δὴ συμμορίαι μὲν ἕξ, ἀς Ῥωμαίοι καλούσι κλάσσεις.52

Earlier, Polybius provided a slightly different account. In describing how the Roman army was summoned, he mentions four στρατόπεδα into which Roman forces had originally been divided.53 He notes that these στρατόπεδα comprised four διαφοραί, the *velites*, *hastati*, *principes* and *triarii*, ranked by age and equipment.54 These divisions resemble the *classes* described by Livy and Dionysius.55 Otherwise, a passage of Gellius implies that, when summoned under arms, the Roman army was considered the *classis*: *<item religio est> classem procinctam extra pomerium, id est exercitum armatum, videre.*56

The relationship between these accounts, and the degree to which the *classes* developed from purely military to political divisions has drawn attention, but the

51 Livy 1.42.5; see also 1.43.
52 Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.18.2; cf. 4.16-17.
53 Polyb. 6.19.4.
55 *Cf.* Plin. *NH* 33.43; Festus *Gloss. Lat.* p. 331.
56 Gell. *NA* 10.15.4.
evidence is obscure. However, it is striking that even in Augustan or later literature a classis could be understood as an organisational grouping not directly connected to a war fleet.

By the Late Republican period at least, classis appears to have been attached primarily to fleets. In 67 BC, Cicero lamented the attack on a classis in Ostia by pirates: nam quid ego Ostiense incommodum...rei publicae querar, cum...classis ea...a praedonibus capta atque oppressa est? Sallust had C. Cotta (cos. 75 BC), bemoan the small classis maintained on the sea: ita classe, quae comeatus tuebatur, minore quam antea navigamus. A coin series minted in Sicily between 42 and 40 BC by Sextus Pompeius refers to his fleet command on the reverse: praef(ectus) clas(sis) et orae marit(imae).

The imperial period is similar. Velleius Paterculus referred to Staius Murcus, entrusted with a fleet by Cassius, as qui classi et custodiae maris praefuerat. Tacitus described exploration and raids from the sea undertaken by the classis of Agricola in Britain. Later, Vegetius clearly thought of the classes as war fleets in allocating their field of action as the seas and rivers (classibus maria vel flumina...servantur). Therefore, from the Augustan period classis primarily meant nothing other than an organised force equipped with warships. However, the word did not

57 See e.g. Mommsen in Röm. Staatsr. III 262-3; Kübler in RE III (1899), s.v. classis, 2630-2.
58 This applies to cognates e.g. Gell. NA 6.13.1: ‘classici’ dicebantur non omnes, qui in quinque classibus erant, sed primae tantum classis homines. Classicus was also used for the summons in the castra, and the men who sounded it (e.g. Caes. B Civ. 3.82.1; Livy 28.27.15; Veg. Mil. 2.22.3).
60 Cic. De imp. Cn. Pomp. 33; cf. Cass. Dio 36.22.2. For further Ciceronian examples see e.g. Verr. 2.5.101; Arch. 21; Flac. 27.
61 Sall. Hist. 2.47.7.
62 RRC 511; cf. Cass. Dio 46.40.3.
63 Vell. Pat. 2.72.4.
64 E.g. Tac. Agr. 25, 29, 38.
65 Veg. Mil. 2.1.4.
mean only that, and to think of *classes* solely as war fleets lacks nuance. I prefer to emphasise its meaning as an organisational category detached from assumed duties.

Scholarship has normally assumed that the Italian *classes* were simply like other (Mediterranean) war fleets, encouraging a comparative study. Yet differences between the Italian imperial *classes* and other war fleets discourage simple comparisons.

These differences partly reflect the very different political character of the Roman Mediterranean. For most of our period, the region was politically united under the Emperor in Rome. At other times, multiple political entities existed, often in competition. This led to conflict, which given the centrality of the sea often resulted in naval battles. Therefore typical war fleets were needed, often constructed, collected or manned *ad hoc*. They were frequently deployed for particular battles, where one or both sides would be destroyed, necessitating the preparation of new fleets. The numerous examples include Aegospotami in 405 BC, the Battle of the Masts in AD 655 and Lepanto in AD 1571.

In the sixteenth century it was characteristic of the Ottomans to produce large fleets from scratch because of their good access to construction materials. Although in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the Venetians did maintain a relatively large fleet in their Arsenal, their regular requirements were minimal, only calling up most of their citizen naval force in times of trouble. In AD 648 Muawiyah, the Arab ruler of Syria who established the Umayyad dynasty, collected a fleet one thousand seven
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66 See Abulafia (2011) 208-11 for the political uniqueness of the imperial Mediterranean.
68 Lane (1973) 49.
hundred strong to attack Cyprus.\textsuperscript{69} He did not possess a permanently organised naval force, and had to gather ships from various coastal towns.

While for much of the fifth and fourth centuries BC the Athenians possessed comparatively organised naval forces, they still had to construct ships and call up men for specific ventures, as Thucydides describes in his account of preparations for the Sicilian expedition beginning in 415 BC.\textsuperscript{70} Closer to our period, Octavian created a series of war fleets in the early 30s BC to combat Sextus Pompeius. Preparations begun in 38 BC after the loss of a fleet at Scyllaeum demonstrate the somewhat chaotic process of creating a fleet.\textsuperscript{71} Our sources do not always agree on the details, but it appears that Octavian collected ships and men from multiple cities, then gathered in the Bay of Naples and Tarentum.\textsuperscript{72} Appian says that friends and cities promised ships: οἵ τε φίλοι καὶ τῶν πόλεων τινες αὐτῷ ναῦς ὑπισχνοῦντο καὶ ἐποίουν.\textsuperscript{73} Dio mentions ships built along the coast of Italy: ἐγίγνετο μὲν γὰρ ἐν πᾶσῃ τῇ παραθαλασσίᾳ Ἰταλίᾳ τὰ σκάφη.\textsuperscript{74}

The above contrasts with the permanence of the Italian \textit{classes}. The Romans did create fleets for particular expeditions, especially outside the Mediterranean. For instance, Drusus created a \textit{classis} for his German campaign in 12 BC.\textsuperscript{75} Similarly, Trajan constructed ships around Nisibis during his Parthian expedition.\textsuperscript{76} But these should be considered separately.

A second critical distinction is the nature of service in the Italian \textit{classes}. Other Mediterranean war fleets drew on relatively small bodies of citizen sailors who

\textsuperscript{69} Lewis (1951) 54-5.
\textsuperscript{70} Thuc. 6.30-2.
\textsuperscript{71} App. B Civ. 5.89; Dio 48.47-8.
\textsuperscript{72} Vell. Pat. 2.79.2; Suet. Aug. 16.1; App. B Civ. 5.92, 96; Cass. Dio 48.49.1, 4, 51.5; Flor. 2.18.5-6.
\textsuperscript{73} App. B Civ. 5.92.
\textsuperscript{74} Cass. Dio 48.49.4.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid. 54.32.2.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid. 68.26.1.
only served for reasonably short periods, or on mercenaries who might be poached by a rival power. Slaves were used when required. Examples of citizen forces include the Athenian fleets of the fifth century and those of Hellenistic Rhodes. A rower shortage in the Hellenistic period led to the Greek kingdoms hiring mercenaries from across the Mediterranean. While the Venetian fleets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries relied primarily on citizens, outsiders were increasingly recruited from Dalmatia and Greece. At the start of the 1350-55 war with Genoa, around one third of Venetian ships were crewed by these peoples. By the sixteenth century, convicts were being used as rowers. In the same century, Spanish ships were crewed by paid soldiers and slave or convict rowers.

These recruitment strategies countered what Fernand Braudel identified as a chronic shortage of maritime manpower in the Mediterranean in comparison with the North Sea and Atlantic. Thus while the Ottomans in the sixteenth century could construct ships with relative ease, crewing them was more challenging. This manpower shortage encouraged the use of slaves as rowers. Even the Romans, generally hostile to the military employment of slaves, had them manning Republican war fleets in emergencies.

In contrast, the members of the imperial classes occupied something like professional positions, receiving regular and fixed pay, and defined benefits upon discharge, at least from the Claudian period. A fixed period of service to obtain these benefits was established in the first century AD. Moreover, as I shall argue later,
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77 However, Gabrielsen (1997) 96 has argued that the proportion of Rhodian citizen sailors has been overstated.
78 Casson (1991) 112.
79 Lane (1973) 175-6.
80 Ibid. 368.
82 Braudel (1972) 138-40.
83 Brummett (1994) 90 with 214 n.5.
84 Below p. 47 n.172.
recruitment was often voluntary and relied mostly upon free peregrine peoples. There were no visible manpower problems. Servicemen were not exclusively recruited from maritime communities, but Egyptians from the Arsinoite and Coptite nomes served alongside recruits from inland Thrace.

The last point raises the uses to which the classes were put. As is clear from our comparative examples, large Mediterranean war fleets were typically deployed for maritime combat, or to support invasions that required crossing the sea, possibly transporting armies. They have few other clearly identifiable uses.

In contrast, the Italian classes were variously employed. Sometimes their duties were comparable to those typical of war fleets, or at least involved travel over the sea. We shall see that Otho employed the classis Misenensis as a war fleet in AD 69. In the same year, two triremes e classe Misenensi were given to Calpurnius Asprenas, set in charge over Galatia and Pamphylia by Galba. Their purpose was to pursue the false Nero who had arisen in the area, eventually capturing him on the island of Cythnus.

However, we shall also observe that classis servicemen were transferred to land armies on several occasions, implying their similar competence to other milites. Furthermore, Chapter Four will argue that while the Italian classes supported imperial maritime communications, their servicemen may also have acted as land couriers. The classis Misenensis and Ravennas both possessed castra in Rome, and those based there were probably entrusted with duties untypical of men serving in war fleets. An inscription from Lambaesis shows that between AD 137 and 152 classici
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85 See below p. 222.
86 Tac. Hist. 2.8.9.
87 We cannot say precisely when servicemen began to be based at Rome, and when they received permanent castra. Mommsen (Röm. Staatstr. II.2 862 n.3), following SHA Comm. 15.6, believed that this could only be dated with security to the late second century AD. Marquardt (Staatsverw. II 511
milites worked alongside Gesates tunnelling through a mountain near Saldae in Mauretania Caesarensis. Members of the classis Alexandrina were found at the quarries of Mons Claudianus in the Red Sea Desert, as we know from two ostraca from AD 140 and 141. While again pertaining to provinces, the classes Britannica and Germanica had some part in the extraction of iron and stone respectively.

If we then recall that classis not only meant ‘war fleet’, these tasks need not have been the occupations given to a fleet with nothing better to do, but duties otherwise performed by Roman milites also entrusted to classis milites as a particular organisational category. The above encourages a departure from a maritime focus on the Italian classes, adopting instead an approach which acknowledges that this group had both maritime and terrestrial occupations.

With this background in mind, I propose to consider the nature and roles of the Italian classes between 31 BC and AD 193. Primarily, my thesis will argue that the classes were conceptualised and employed throughout our period as a flexible manpower pool of milites to perform militia, broadly tasks in support of imperial activity, on
land and sea. I shall contend that this *classis* manpower pool was integrated into systems of recruitment, manpower mobilisation, communications and coastal “management” which supported the functioning of the Roman empire, or at least the position of the Emperor within it. In Chapter Four, I shall define these systems, which often functioned without interference from a central authority, and may have emerged without concerted design, as imperial organics. Overall, I hope to provide a different interpretation of the *classes* from their portrayal as useless war fleets or military logistics forces.

The date range has been chosen because most of the evidence, especially funerary epigraphy, comes from the first and second centuries AD. Its distribution tends towards the latter century. Its virtual disappearance after the early third century makes extremely challenging any later comprehensive study. The period begins with Actium, the final major sea battle in the Mediterranean until the battle of the Hellespont in AD 324. On a conventional analysis, Actium led to the defeat and deaths of Antony and Cleopatra and the political unification of the Mediterranean and Roman empire under Augustus, establishing conditions which remained broadly constant in our period. AD 193 arguably sees a change in those conditions with the beginning of the Severan period and repeated outbreaks of conflict within the empire.

I shall concentrate on the Italian *classes* because we possess the most evidence for them. These *classes* operated largely within the Mediterranean, a region which has received renewed attention as a testing-ground for historical analysis. This approach will inevitably lead to a focus on Italy, perhaps to the neglect of other parts of the

---

91 For consequences see below p. 32.
Mediterranean, let alone the empire. However, establishing whether any conclusions can be applied to other regions could be a future project.

This decision relegates the provincial classes (Alexandrina, Britannica, Germanica, Moesiaca, Pannonica, Perinthia, Pontica and Syriaca) to the sidelines.\(^93\) The small amount of extant evidence hampers any study. As an extreme example, there is only one reference to the classis Perinthia in a dedication from Perinthos, dated to AD 88-90.\(^94\) Around twelve inscriptions mention the classis Syriaca.\(^95\) We have several thousand brick and tile stamps of the classis Britannica, but this evidence can only tell us so much in isolation.\(^96\)

Moreover, whereas the Italian classes operated under broadly similar conditions, the historical and environmental circumstances in which the provincial classes were located were often quite different. This is especially true of the classes of northern and central Europe. They were in frontier regions, and had more contact with the legions and auxilia, probably encountering more military action. Except for the classis Britannica, they operated largely on rivers, especially the Rhine and the Danube. Their distance from Rome and normally greater separation from the Emperor and his family is significant, as will become clear.

The other Mediterranean classes, the Alexandrina and Syriaca, perhaps had more in common with the Italian. Yet their provincial character, alongside their


\(^{95}\) For the evidence, see Reddé (1986) 493, 513-15 alongside *AE* 2002 1746 (= *RMD* V 354).

\(^{96}\) Above p. 19 n.90 for references.
differentiation from the Italian *classes* by the Romans themselves, through their lack of the praetorian epithet, suggest their distinctiveness.97

I shall not neglect evidence concerning the provincial *classes* entirely, but shall use it when it offers enlightening comparative examples. There are enough similarities between the Italian and provincial *classes* (they were all *classes*, after all, with their servicemen describing themselves in the same manner, as *milités*) to validate this approach. When such evidence is deployed, it will be with appropriate caution over whether we can straightforwardly apply conclusions drawn from provincial to Italian *classes*.

Our sources comprise three main categories: documentary, literary and archaeological. The documentary category, comprising epigraphy and papyri, is the largest. Funerary monuments yield most of the epigraphy, though some religious dedications, honorary texts and especially military *diplomata* complete our picture. Most of the epitaphs are Latin, though a small number, especially pertaining to the provincial *classes* of the eastern Mediterranean, are Greek.

There exists no comprehensive collection of these epitaphs with texts and images, though all serious studies of the *classes* reference them.98 That they are scattered, and often hard to access in museums, hampers the compiling of any such collection. Here I shall offer some remarks on their quantity, provenance, monument typologies and the sort of information they provide. Chapter One discusses dating.
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97 See below pp. 38-42.
98 The appropriate volumes of *CIL* contain most of the material, but many inscriptions are found in smaller publications. Starr (1960) 215-21 and Reddé (1986) 673-9, 707-13 collect references in their indices, though neither is complete. The catalogue of Spaul (2002) is neither comprehensive nor reliable. Giacomini (1990) assembled the evidence for Ravenna, providing references, names and pertinent details, but not texts.
There are around seven hundred epitaphs from the first two centuries AD dedicated to or by *classis* members. There is some subjectivity in the dating process, particularly for those from the end of our period. I have excluded material that is more probably than not of the third century, for instance epitaphs which begin with *D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum)* alongside other later features, including nomenclature which probably dates from the period after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of AD 212.99 Thus there may be disagreement over the inclusion of individual epitaphs. However, this applies to a small proportion of the total, not affecting broad trends identified.

Three sites have produced most of the epitaphs: Misenum (c. three hundred and forty inscriptions), Ravenna (c. ninety inscriptions) and Rome (c. one hundred and twenty inscriptions). Around one hundred and fifteen epitaphs come from the rest of Italy. Otherwise, they are scattered across the Mediterranean and beyond, though with relatively few coming from the western empire, save North Africa (eleven epitaphs from twenty seven inscriptions).

A closer look at the three main sites is worthwhile. Precise provenance is especially difficult to establish at Misenum. Beloch identified two main necropoleis.100 One was located along the road following the west bank of lago Miseno, which then runs northwest to Cappella. The second was on the other side of the same basin, developing towards the north-east up the hill towards Bacoli. Borriello and D’Ambrosio identified several *columbaria* and other funerary material in these areas.101 Evidence for burial has been found elsewhere, such as on the Miliscola, near the road leading to Miseno, round the southern side of the outer
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99 For some details see Salway (1994).
101 Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 114-18; 159-64.
Unfortunately, little classis epigraphy is securely attested as coming from one location or another.

The situation at Ravenna is more positive, but still problematic. Major burial areas have been located right along the sandy bank running to the east of the city, which separated Ravenna from the sea. Evidence for burial has been found extending to modern Classe, south east of the city. A record of provenance is much more common for epitaphs here than for Misenum. However, extensive reuse of stones in later construction means that a great number were displaced. Therefore we retain but a snapshot of the original contexts in which these monuments were erected.

As for Rome, there may have been separate burial areas for members of the different Italian classes. Over twenty epitaphs of servicemen of the classis Misenensis have been found in the area of the S. Sebastiano basilica on the via Appia. Some were found together in the context of columbaria. Epitaphs belonging to members of the classis Ravennas have been found on the grounds of the Villa Pamphili, on the western side of the city across the Tiber, along the via Aurelia. However, other locations complicate this picture. For example, monuments dedicated to members of both classes have come from the area of the S. Paolo church on the via Ostiensis.

Monument types varied with place. At Misenum, the majority were marble slabs, perhaps attached to the walls of columbaria. These slabs are normally
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102 Ibid. 159.
103 For the location of the main necropolis, originally a series of separate cemeteries which grew together to form one large funerary region, see Manzelli (2000) 220. cf. Mansuelli (1967) 9-22 with the map (Tav.1) and more recently Fasold et al. eds. (2004).
104 Mansuelli (1967) 14-16.
105 CIL VI 3093, 3096, 3097, 3101, 3104, 3107, 3110, 3113, 3114, 3123, 3126, 3128, 3131, 3129, 3137-9, 3146, 3910 (= 32767), 32761, 32763; AE 1946 144-6.
106 CIL VI 3148, 3149, 3154-9, 3162, 32770.
107 CIL VI 3125, 3130, 3141, 3161, 3164, 37251, 32770.
extremely plain, with little or no basic decoration.\textsuperscript{108} Susini noted the problem of limited space in the region and probable high population density.\textsuperscript{109} The use of simple wall-plaques may have been a symptom.

Similarly at Rome, despite the wide array of choice and different influences, basic marble plaques were used. Cost could have influenced such choices, alongside the relative status of \textit{classis} servicemen in relation to other military forces in the city, particularly the praetorians. After the Julio-Claudian period, monuments belonging to that group displayed full human figures.\textsuperscript{110}

Different were the marble stelae at Ravenna.\textsuperscript{111} There was a general development from more elaborate stelae with architectural features and human portraits in the first century, towards much simpler, rectangular stelae without portraits appearing from later in the first to the third century AD.\textsuperscript{112} In these, the epitaph takes up much of the main field of the stele. \textit{Classis Ravennas} members followed this trend.\textsuperscript{113}

I shall conclude with what the epitaphs can tell us, and some caveats. We have no idea what proportion of the total number of funerary monuments erected our sample represents. In addition, inscribing anything on stone is a learned habit.\textsuperscript{114} Conceivably, only a select group of \textit{classis} servicemen adopted this habit. Therefore any information gleaned may not reflect standard practices or arrangements. But for

\textsuperscript{108} The best sample of images is that of Tuck (2005). There are a few examples of more elaborate monuments, such as that associated with \textit{CIL X} 3434 (= \textit{ILS} 2853), an epitaph for the \textit{gubernator} L. Percennius Maximus, which was found with a marble statue of a man \textit{ornata nauticis instrumentis}, wearing caligae and with a sword hanging at his right flank. Only a few traces of this statue remain: see Bolini (1968) 91; \textit{cf.} Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{7} 57.

\textsuperscript{109} Susini (1967a) 377-8.

\textsuperscript{110} Durry (1938) 208-11; Coulston (2000) 94-5.

\textsuperscript{111} For a thorough study see Mansuelli (1967).

\textsuperscript{112} See Mansuelli (1967) 23-44 for stelae typology.

\textsuperscript{113} For examples of the earlier type see Append. 20 with Mansuelli (1967) tav. 13 fig.32 and Append. 29 with Bollini (1968) fig.25. For the later type of monument see e.g. \textit{CIL XI} 65 with Mansuelli (1967) tav. 17 fig.42 for the image.

\textsuperscript{114} On the epigraphic habit MacMullen (1982) is fundamental; \textit{cf.} Meyer (1990); Woolf (1996).
the sake of the discussion I shall here assume that our epitaphs are broadly representative: they reflect a range of servicemen holding different ranks, of different ethnicities and at different stages in their careers, which one can reasonably argue looks like a random cross-section.

It is also critical that any information provided in the epitaphs will be determined by the particular epigraphic habits of those responsible for their creation. Relatedly, the information does not necessarily accurately reflect reality, a problem which we shall encounter several times in Chapter One. Because of this, I am wary of utilising epitaphs in the service of statistical analyses of life expectancy, typical ages of marriage or enlistment, and so forth.\footnote{115}

Having highlighted these limitations, the epitaphs of classis servicemen can tell us about their names, ranks, places of origin, the terms they used to describe themselves, whether they married and had children, in some cases how much money they spent on their burial. However, we cannot simply take such data as bare fact, but must examine how it was conveyed to learn something about those who provided it.

Epitaphs, especially in groups, can help to cautiously identify where classis servicemen were based, as we shall see at Centumcellae. Starr strongly criticised Ferrero, Fiebiger and Chapot for identifying ‘preposterous lists’ of ‘naval stations’ through inscriptions.\footnote{116} I agree to an extent: servicemen could have been buried at particular locations for countless reasons. Where I differ from Starr and Reddé is in the assertion that we are looking for ‘naval stations’, as Chapter Three will make clear. A classis presence may be identifiable when we find inscriptions combined with evidence for coastal imperial property.

\footnote{115}{For cautious explorations of typical ages of enlistment and average service length, see e.g. Chapot (1896) 187-90; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 78 with 100 n.44. For statistical analysis of marriage patterns see Phang (2001) 153ff. and 409.}

\footnote{116}{Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 27 n. 21. Reddé (1986) 146, 165-317 is even more cautious.}
Now for bronze military diplomata, of which we currently know over one thousand. The standard position asserts that from the Claudian period these were granted to non-legionary soldiers to confirm privileges (civitas and conubium) obtained after a period of service. By the second century, this period usually coincided with the point at which honesta missio, “honourable discharge”, was granted, though in the first century they were commonly given to serving soldiers. In content, the documents evolved to a more or less standard model over time.

Diplomata were also supplied to the classes: indeed, the earliest diploma known, from AD 52, was granted to a classis Misenensis serviceman.

Although Dušanić proposed that diplomata were only awarded on special occasions, perhaps for bravery on campaign, most scholars have disagreed, considering diplomata and their attached privileges as universally bestowed. That
we possess around one thousand in total, that they were produced in most years, certainly from the Flavian period, and that there is no sign on the vast majority that they were considered special rewards, argues against Dušanić.\(^\text{122}\)

We currently know of around seventy two diplomata pertaining to the classes. Around fifty of these explicitly belonged to members of the Italian classes or the two legiones Adiutrices transferred from the classes.\(^\text{123}\) They can provide information on the names, ranks and origins of their holders, alongside other organisational details, such as the title of their unit, and their praefectus. As such, diplomata usefully complement the epitaphs, because they can give us fairly precise dates for changes in practices that could translate into alterations to epigraphic habits, and potentially provide an “official” view on service.

The find-spots of diplomata have been used to identify veteran retirement spots.\(^\text{124}\) But there are complications. Margaret Roxan noted that many diplomata were discovered before the widespread use of scientific excavation techniques and that others have emerged from the illegal antiques trade, so their find-spots are only known second-hand, if at all.\(^\text{125}\) Furthermore, it is frequently impossible to know how the diplomata ended up where they did. For instance, thirteen diplomata were known to Roxan from Banasa in Mauretania Tingitana. However, most were in fragments, and the possibility that these were part of the stock of a scrap merchant was suggested.\(^\text{126}\)

---

122 There were grants for specific acts (from the classes see e.g. CIL XVI 60 (= AE 1927 3): iis qui naviga[verunt...] and below p. 98 n.413). Such documents imply a subset of diplomata distributed for special deeds, whereas the majority were presented upon completing a period of service.
124 For studies see e.g. Raespaet-Charlier (1978); Roxan (1981) and (1989); Kellner (1986); Holder (2007) 110-12.
125 Roxan (1989) 130.
126 Ibid. 132-3.
As a further problem, it is not clear how representative our current documentation is. Although a fairly large number of diplomata are known, and more are constantly being published, they could represent a tiny fraction of the total. Eck calculated that around one hundred and fifty to three hundred thousand were produced between the Claudian period and mid-third century.\textsuperscript{127} Whether the figures are correct matters less than the general impression created. Within the total, a possibly disproportionate number come from western frontier provinces, especially in the Danubian region. Of the two hundred and forty two diplomata considered by Roxan, just over half came from that part of the empire.\textsuperscript{128} Yet, more documents have recently been found from outside those regions, challenging older suggestions that they were only granted to certain groups of auxilia, and indicating that it may be safe to cautiously generalise from them.

Papyrological evidence for the classes is often extremely scrappy, and the number of documents is not great, although they represent a variety of document types. Mostly from the second century, these include private letters, loan agreements, wills, contracts, tax registers and more. Yet they rarely do much more than mention relevant individuals, and are normally not concerned with the classes themselves. Chapter Two will show that the papyri are useful for studying recruitment and veteran settlement, at least allowing us to draw some conclusions on those topics insofar as they relate to the second century Fayoum, from where the majority of the relevant documents come. Although Finley argued that evidence from Egypt could tell us nothing about the rest of the empire because of the uniqueness of the province, I follow the view of Bowman that Egyptian material can have wider implications.\textsuperscript{129} Or

\textsuperscript{127} Eck (2003) 58.
\textsuperscript{128} Roxan (1989) 136-78.
at least, I accept that it is hard to identify a typical Roman province, and therefore we can cautiously use Egypt to inform us about wider imperial history to the extent that we can extrapolate from any part of the Roman world.

Virtually no ancient literature gives us any useful detail on the *classes* as organisations. The exception is the *Epitoma Rei Militaris* of Vegetius, which devotes a few chapters of its final book to naval organisation and warfare. This late fourth or fifth century text is an epitome of various earlier works on Roman military matters. It is considered not a history of the Roman army, but a political text arguing for a particular type of army, free of barbarians, which would help to solve the military problems of its period. As such, it combines organisational features, ranks, titles and terminology from different periods. Therefore, we must be extremely careful when using it as a source for the Italian *classes* of the first two centuries AD, about which it makes some questionable statements. We shall see several of these in the course of this work, but one could briefly note his claim that under each *praefectus* were *deni tribuni per cohortes singula constituti*. There is no other evidence pertaining to our period for the division of the *classes* into cohorts, or of the presence of tribunes.

Otherwise, we are left with snapshots from the many authors of different genres who wrote in and about the first two centuries AD. We can gain information from, for instance, Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny the Elder and Seneca in Latin, and

---

130 The reign of Theodosius I is the most common choice, though Valentinian III is also popular among some scholars (see e.g. recent discussion by Charles (2007)). For consideration of dating and full bibliography see Milner (1996) xiii-xliii.
132 For the problems with Vegetius on the *classes*, see e.g. Chapot (1896) 1-2, 44, 131; Starr (1960) 24-5; Kienast (1966) 37-8; Gnoli (2012) 162-5. Reddé (1986) e.g. 206, 354 is rather more positive, but acknowledges that the compilatory character of the text presents challenges (p.333) and admits ‘la langue de Végèce n’est pas toujours précise’ (p. 542). Note the commentary by Baatz and Bockius (1997), concentrating on ships and shipbuilding.
133 Veg. Mil. 4.32.1.
134 Thus e.g. Starr (1941) 64 n.39; Kienast (1966) 37-8; Reddé (1986) 595-6.
Cassius Dio, Plutarch, Appian and Herodian in Greek. This is far from a comprehensive list. These writers were not much interested in the specifics of classis organisation, nor did they say much about classes outside combat situations. Rather, they provide incidental, though sometimes critical, details. Each source has its own particular problems relating to date, genre, aims and so forth, which will be considered when relevant.

Finally, archaeology. This thesis is not much concerned with technical details of ships and shipping, so the absence of warships from our archaeological record is not especially problematic. Unfortunately, the main ports of the Italian classes are less well known than would be ideal. The problems are different in each case and will be considered more fully where necessary. In brief, at Misenum and the Bay of Naples, the region has been densely populated since Antiquity, and it is has been difficult to carry out proper archaeological investigations. However, the many remains of the sinus Baianus, even if not securely identified, provide us with some useful indicators of the physical setting of the classis. As for Ravenna, the development of the city in Late Antiquity and the focus of investigations on that period render our knowledge the Republican and early imperial site limited. This must be set alongside major changes to the coastal landscape, especially through alluviation.

Archaeology will also be used to study the relationship of the Italian classes to imperial villae (maritimae), and in some cases harbours associated with them. Different problems are encountered in each instance. A general difficulty emerges in the identification of imperial villae when there is far too little evidence to make such
A good example of this will be encountered in Chapter Four when I discuss possible villa sites around the Argentario peninsula. Ideally, I shall combine archaeology with inscriptions and literary evidence to more securely identify these sites.

Two major points emerge from this summary. Firstly, the evidence is frequently scattered, allusive and difficult. Sometimes, arguments will rest on what would ideally require more evidence. However, I hope that the sum total of the evidence of all kinds, dealt with separately across the thesis but ultimately tied together, will give weight to those cases where more direct data is desired.

Secondly, much of the documentary evidence comes from the second century AD, or at least from the last third of the first century AD onwards. A substantial amount of the literary evidence was produced by second and third century people writing about the first century, projecting their interpretations and traditions upon it. To an extent, the picture of the classes and empire that I shall present may appear something of an ideal system. Given the evidence, it is very challenging to tell how this ideal was affected by major events such as the eruption of Vesuvius or the Antonine Plague. It is even difficult to identify more gradual developments. Nonetheless, I shall attempt to provide some sense of chronological diversity or genuine continuity.

I shall end this Introduction by summarising the chapters to come. Chapter One concentrates on the documentary evidence, especially epitaphs and diplomata, for the men who served in the classes. It aims to make four major points: that the classes may have been considered conceptually close to the imperial house, that we can

---

135 For a recent exemplar of this habit, see the over-enthusiastic catalogue in Maiuro (2012) 241-346.
identify a formalisation, not militarisation, of classis service in the first century AD, that seafaring peoples were not the particular focus of recruitment, the evidence for which imposes considerable limitations on traditional recruitment studies, and that the servicemen were regarded as milites expected to perform analogous duties to other milites in the Roman army. The argument will begin with a discussion of dating the epitaphs, before moving to the social and ethnic backgrounds of the servicemen. I shall end by discussing the epitaphs, literary evidence and diplomata which combine to suggest that the servicemen could be considered milites, but that there is some ambiguity over precisely how classis labour was divided. Important consequences for recruitment, how we should understand evidence for classis duties and the nature of the Roman miles will then be explored.

The second chapter centres on recruitment processes to further argue for the place of non-maritime manpower in classis recruitment, and the influence of low-level dynamics on imperial history. Concentrating on second century AD papyrological evidence for classis servicemen from the Arsinoite nome in Egypt, especially three letters written by recruits, I shall propose a recruitment system which was influenced by matters beyond the influence of Roman recruitment authorities, including environmental factors and the settlement patterns of veterans. Such systems, coupled with the use of recruits who were not the gens de mer, may have counteracted the maritime manpower shortage which Fernand Braudel proposed for the Mediterranean.

Chapter Three will move away from a traditional focus on the “naval bases” at Misenum and Ravenna, instead offering an interpretation of those sites based on their relationship with imperial property, and with imperial activity in regions of leisure, display, production and commerce. First I shall examine the “naval base” as an
ancient and modern typology, revealing its limited application to the main Italian *classis* ports. A Plinian letter and the epitaphs of *classis* servicemen will be used to consider the *classis* detachment at Trajanic Centumcellae, emphasising the pleasurable and political aspects of its nearby imperial estate. I shall then deploy a full range of epigraphic, literary and archaeological material to reconsider Misenum and Ravenna in turn. While devoting some attention to their natural advantages and settlement history, I shall concentrate on their respective relationships to imperial property and activity. Beginning with the property around Misenum and Ravenna, we shall see that there is some evidence for Caesarian property at both sites, perhaps influencing their selection as bases. I shall then expand the study to encompass the *sinus Baianus* and the north Adriatic, concentrating on Baiae, Puteoli, Altinum, Aquileia and coastal Histria. This analysis will suggest that the Italian *classes* had the potential to support a range of activities in complex regions of import to the imperial house, while the regions themselves were more alike than commonly assumed.

In Chapter Four, I shall examine a series of functions performed by the Italian *classis* manpower pools, arguing that the *classes* were integrated into several dynamic systems, which I shall categorise as imperial organics, supporting the functioning of the empire. I shall concentrate on manpower mobilisation and redeployment, imperial communications and the imperial coastal landscape of western Italy. With emphasis on the Bar Kokhba war and the civil wars of AD 68-70 and 193, I shall discuss the use of the *classes* as a manpower pool for the Roman army. *Diplomata* and literary evidence suggest that servicemen could be transferred from the Italian *classes* into land units in response to crises, and that replacements were speedily recruited. However, I shall also suggest that the crisis narrative has been overplayed. Secondly, the role of the *classes* in supporting imperial communications networks will be
considered from two angles: their transport of imperial dignitaries and their monitoring of communications passing through major hubs identified in Chapter Three. Finally, I shall consider the relationship between the Italian classes and the annona by placing them both in the context of imperial infrastructure projects on the Tyrrhenian coast across the first and second centuries AD. I shall argue that the classes were part of a coastal imperial landscape, which ultimately contributed to ensure that the city was well-supplied with grain and that it was clear that the Emperor, as benefactor, was responsible.
I. Gens d’empire: the servicemen of the Italian classes

1. Introduction

As the foundation for investigating the roles of the Italian classes, I shall begin by considering their members. This chapter contains several key arguments: first, that we can identify a conceptual closeness between the classes and the imperial house. Second, responding to debates over the militarisation of the classes in the first century AD, that they instead underwent a process of formalisation, comparable to contemporary developments in the auxilia. Third, that recruitment was not necessarily conducted from the gens de mer, with implications for the character of classis service, but also that the nature of the evidence imposes major limitations on traditional, detailed recruitment studies. Fourth, that classis servicemen were regarded as milites who performed militia, and that while some of their duties were maritime, they could also be entrusted with terrestrial tasks.

To argue these points, the chapter is divided into studies of the social and ethnic make-up of classis manpower, and the nature of service. But an initial section will provide foundations by considering the dating of classis epitaphs. I shall focus on two dating methods: the appearance of the epithet praetoria in the titles of the classes, and the development of the nomenclature of the servicemen. I shall suggest that we can identify two broad groups of epitaphs, pre- and post-Flavian.

I shall then discuss the backgrounds of the classis servicemen, both social and ethnic, based primarily on epitaphs and military diplomata. Concerning social status, I shall suggest that the classes comprised mainly free peregrines, but also imperial freedmen and Roman citizens. The nomenclature both of freedmen and some
peregrines will suggest ties to the imperial house. We shall also see that all servicemen adopted *tria nomina* from the Flavian period, with no evidence for changes to their legal status. I shall argue that this is suggestive of formalisation.

Scholars have based recruitment studies on information on the ethnic backgrounds of *classis* members, and to an extent I shall follow this. However, I shall also pay close attention to how their backgrounds were recorded in epitaphs and *diplomata*, and to changes over time. Alongside points about formalisation, I shall argue that there is little evidence for recruitment from peoples with seafaring skills. It will emerge that servicemen did not usually give precise geographical or ethnic origins, but arguably organised themselves into groups based on a Roman understanding of the world, and reinforced those identities within the context of the *classes* and their Italian surroundings. The difficulties posed for detailed studies of recruitment will be expounded.

Finally, I shall turn to how the men of the *classes* presented their service, and how it was considered by others. By studying epitaphs, literature and *diplomata* in turn, I shall propose that the servicemen were viewed as *milites*, much like, though not exactly the same as, those found in the legions and *auxilia*. Again, any changes in presentation over the first century AD will be explained through formalisation rather than militarisation. I shall also cautiously suggest that these *milites* formed one general group within the *classes*, as there is no evidence for distinct groups of rowers and marines with separate duties. I shall propose that these *classis milites* can best be understood as servicemen trained to row. The consequences of this interpretation for recruitment, the duties of the *classes* and the status and roles of Roman *milites* will be discussed. The Italian *classes* will emerge as a general manpower pool of *milites*
capable of performing *militia* on behalf of the Emperor, rather than as a military fleet with specifically maritime duties and members.

2. Dating the epitaphs

Epigraphic handbooks and studies of particular regions or groups provide general guidance for dating Latin epitaphs, based on external evidence and stylistic grounds, such as formulae or onomastics.\(^\text{136}\) These methods are well enough known as to not require detailed elaboration, but as examples consider the use or abbreviation of *Dis Manibus*, which became more common in the later first and second century AD. Additionally, the omission of the *cognomen* from the *tria nomina* is normally considered the marker of an early date, while a later second century AD date is often suggested if the *praenomen* is omitted. These observations do not provide particularly accurate dating methods, and there was considerable inter- and intraregional variation. However, in combination they do provide broadly accepted ranges for dating.

Alongside these are features specific to the *classes*. A particular Italian *classis* is explicitly named in around 44% of relevant epitaphs. The appearance of the *praetoria* epithet inserted into the *classis* title aids dating. Its first precisely datable occurrence is in a *diploma* of AD 100 (*iis qui militant in classe prae/toria Ravennate*), though following Fiebiger scholars have argued that it was bestowed under the Flavians because there is no obvious context for a grant under Nerva or during the

first years of Trajan.\textsuperscript{137} Without explicit evidence, Vespasian has been suggested as the conferer of the title because the Italian classes supported him against Vitellius.\textsuperscript{138} The grant is also often connected to the probably Vespasianic change in individual nomenclature habits.\textsuperscript{139}

I am broadly persuaded by the Flavian dating, though the assignation to Vespasian is hard to prove. Kienast preferred Domitian.\textsuperscript{140} He suggested that the Emperor disliked the praetorian cohorts because Titus had been their prefect. Therefore, Domitian gave the appellation to the Italian classes as an insult to the praetorians. Yet this argument lacks any compelling evidence.

Reddé acknowledged this but also preferred a Domitianic date. He suggested that Domitian formally separated the provincial and Italian classes in the 90s, and elevated the latter through their special title.\textsuperscript{141} This, Reddé argued, was indicated by the change from servicemen of the provincial classes receiving their own diplomata to classici being included in auxiliary diplomata for soldiers of the same province.\textsuperscript{142} However, Reddé was not aware of a diploma of AD 119 granted to \textit{[iis qui militia]taver(unt) in classe Syr[iaca]}, which shows that provincial classis diplomata did not disappear until the early second century AD.\textsuperscript{143}

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{RMD} III 142 (= \textit{AE} 1989 315) with \textit{AE} 1999 703; Fiebiger (1894) 298-303; see Reddé (1986) 511-22 for full discussion and bibliography.

\textsuperscript{138} Fiebiger (1894) 298-303; Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{2} 71, 185-6; cf. Chapot (1896) 50-1, who argues it denoted an administrative reform. For the classes and Vespasian see Tac. \textit{Hist.} 3.12-13, 50, 56-8, 76-7.

\textsuperscript{139} See below pp. 42-4.

\textsuperscript{140} Kienast (1966) 71-5.

\textsuperscript{141} Reddé (1986) 516-22.

\textsuperscript{142} The earliest example dates to 28 February AD 98: \textit{AE} 2000 1017 (= \textit{RMD} IV 216), found in Elst in the Netherlands.

\textsuperscript{143} \textit{AE} 2002 1746 (= \textit{RMD} V 354).
Two epitaphs may support a Flavian date, possibly even early. C. Nervilius Iustus erected a monument at Velia in Lucania to a *liberta* called Nerulia and his son, the praetorian C. Nervilius Iustus:144

D(is) M(anibus)
Nerviliae Narbuliae lib(ertae) b(ene) m(erenti)
vix(it) a(nnos) IV et C(aio) Nervilio Iusto filio qui mi-
litavit in praetorio annis X vixit a(nnos) XXXII
C(aius) Nervilius Iustus veteranus deductus
Vellias militavit centurio in classe
praetoria Misenensce fecit sibi et
suis
b(ene) m(erentibus).

Nervilius the elder was a veteran of the *classis praetoria Misenensis*, settled at Velia after discharge. The editors of *L'Année Épigraphique* and Reddé connected the deduction at Velia with that attested in *diplomata* at nearby Paestum in AD 71, the only known settlement of *classis* veterans in Italy.145 This seems an attractive association, though only one other inscription may attest a *classis* burial at Velia.146

Assuming the epitaph was set up a few years later, Mann presented this as our earliest known attestation of the *praetoria* epithet, which he suggested was granted during the censorship of Vespasian and Titus in AD 73-4.147

Although this sketch is very tempting, it rests on the assumption that the deduction mentioned can be dated to around AD 71, and probably that the son died relatively soon after. While the first point is reasonably possible, the second can only

---

147 Mann (2002) 232-3
be a conjecture. Thus, this epitaph is not conclusive evidence for dating the grant of
the praetorian epithet.

The second indication comes from an epitaph, probably originally from
Rome, set up for a member of the *classis Germanica* by a *miles* of the *classis
praetoria Misenensis*:148

```
D(is) M(anibus)
Mucatral[is?] 
Teres mil(es) cl(assis) G[erm(anicae)]
[centuria] Rutili Mo[---]
milit(avit) an(nis) X[---] 
vix(it) an(nis) L[---]
C(aius) Sulpic(ius) Ru[---]
mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mi[sen(ensis)]
frat(er) et h(eres) p(osuit).
```

After AD 89, the *classis Germanica* gained the appellation *Pia Fidelis* for its support
of Domitian in the revolt of Saturninus.149 The editor Marengo felt that there was no
room on the stone to follow *CL G[ERM]* with *PF*.150 If correct, this indicates that the
*classis Misenensis* had gained its praetorian appellation before AD 89, as noted by
Marengo, who also emphasises that none of the stylistic elements of the epitaph rule
out a late first century AD date.151

Perhaps the title was simply omitted, denying us our *terminus ante quem*. Yet
of the eight other epitaphs mentioning the *classis Germanica*, only two lack the title.
The first, from near Aoste around 40 miles south-east of Lyon, reads:152

---

149 For the title see *CIL* XIII 7681, 7723 with Starr (1960) 146-7; Reddé (1986) 512.
150 S. M. Marengo in Paci and Marengo eds. (2005), 124. Infrequently *G* alone can stand for
*Germanica* (e.g. *CIL* XIII 7716, 8160), so *cl(assis) G(ermanicae) [P(iae) F(idelis)]* is possible.
151 S. M. Marengo in Paci and Marengo eds. (2005), 124-5.
152 *ILN* V 2.606 (= *CIL* XII 2412 = *ILS* 2909).
Claudiae Albinae
Tib(eri) Cl(audi) Albini
nauarci(hi) clas(sis)
Germ(anicae) filiae
Pompeius
Pr[---]i[---]
co(n)iug(i) optim(ae).

The names given and the absence of Dis Manibus point to a mid-first century AD date. Thus, the epitaph is earlier than the granting of the title. The second example, from the villa of Hadrian at Tivoli, is second century, and thus yields our single good example of (deliberate) omission. Acknowledging the small size of the sample, a date of before AD 89 thus seems more likely for the monument to Mucatralis than that P(ia) F(idelis) was omitted. However, once more, this inscription is not as conclusive for praetorian dating as Marengo presents it.

Based on the above discussion, I am inclined to cautiously accept that praetorian appellation was granted to the Italian classes during the Flavian period, though it is very difficult to be more precise. Therefore, those inscriptions terming the Italian classes praetorian should be dated to the Flavian period at the earliest. This indicator is imperfect. It is not especially accurate, nor can we date with certainty to before this time inscriptions not including the epithet. Such titles could be excluded at the whim of the inscriber. Moreover, around half of our second century epitaphs do not name the classis, so this is only helpful for a subset.

A second classis epitaph dating aid is the nomenclature of servicemen. We can observe a change, arguably again in the Flavian period, from a range of name types to the almost universal utilisation of tria nomina.

\[153\] AE 2006 394: D(is) [M(anibus)] / Titianus Victorinus miles class(is) Germaniciani / natio(ne) Agrippine(n)si[s] / vix(it) annis XXVIII stip(endum) VI Secundinus Peculli(aris) b(ene) m(erenti) fecit.
With their accurate dating, *classis diplomata* are the best guide for this change. In all first century AD *diplomata*, servicemen had peregrine names (normally single peregrine name plus filiation). Our earliest *diploma*, from AD 52, names *Sparticus Diozeni f(ilius) Dipscurtus*, an unusual name formula but his filiation clarifying his peregrine origins.¹⁵⁴ Sixteen other examples date to AD 71 or earlier, including *Dernaius Derdipili f(ilius)* appearing in a *diploma* from 26 February AD 70, and *Liccaius Birsi filius* and *Velagenus Covionis filius*, both named in *diplomata* of AD 71.¹⁵⁵ However, by the early second century Italian *classis* servicemen all but universally possessed Roman names in *diplomata*. These included *M(arcus) Baebius Athi f(ilius) Firmus*, discharged on 25 December AD 119, *D(ecimus) Numitorius Agisini f(ilius) Tarammonius*, mentioned in AD 134, and *C(aius) Iulius Seuthi f(ilius) Bithus*, a veteran from AD 160.¹⁵⁶ The first certain *tria nomina*, *L(ucius) Bennius Liccai f(ilius) Bueza*, appears in the *diploma* from AD 100 mentioned above.¹⁵⁷

A second century AD papyrus letter written by a *classis* recruit indicates that these names were taken upon enlistment. Having signed up, Apion stated that he had received a new name: ἐσ[τ]ι [δέ] μου ὄνομα Ἀντωνις Μᾶξιμος.¹⁵⁸ Although this is only one example, there is no reason to regard it as unusual. By the end of the first century AD *classis* service usually lasted twenty six years or more.¹⁵⁹ Thus, the

---

¹⁵⁴ *CIL* XVI 1 (= III p. 844 = X 769 = *ILS* 1986). Dipscurtus could be an unparalleled *cognomen* (e.g. Tatscheva (1999) 870), or a unique ethnic identifier, as Nesselhauf in *CIL* XVI (1936), p. 1 and Kienast (1966) 24 supposed.
¹⁵⁵ *AE* 1997 1771 (= *RMD* IV 203); *AE* 1997 1273; *AE* 2002 1771 (= *RMD* IV 205). The others are *CIL* XVI 7-17; *AE* 2004 1282 (= 2007 1232); *AE* 2006 1833.
¹⁵⁶ *AE* 2005 1738; *CIL* XVI 79 (= III p. 878 = X 7855): *RMD* II 105 (= *AE* 1975 245). There are around eighteen other examples in our *diplomata*. A possible exception is *AE* 2007 1787, dated to AD 158, naming [---]iconis f. Thrac(i). However, *Thrac (?)* could be a *cognomen*: the entire left half of the document is lost, and *Thrac* ends one line on the right, so what follows is uncertain. Even if this is a genuine exception, a few deviations from standard practice would be unsurprising.
¹⁵⁹ Established by six first and five second century AD *diplomata* e.g. *CIL* XVI 12 (AD 71): *qui sena et vicena stipendia aut plura*, the last being *AE* 1977 793 (= *RMD* I 38) from AD 139. Second century documents increasingly omit *aut plura*, the earliest example being *AE* 2008 1756 (AD 119): *sex et
recipient of the AD 100 diploma enlisted in about AD 74, presumably when he took his name and thus, as Pferdehirt noted, around the time tria nomina perhaps began to be adopted.\textsuperscript{160}

Therefore, if a classis epitaph documents a serviceman with the tria nomina, it will normally be Flavian or later. Other types of name should be from an earlier period, allowing for some exceptions. For instance, where the person mentioned is a Roman citizen, as opposed to a free peregrine, they would possess the tria nomina even before the Flavian period.

Utilising the above, we can identify two chronological groups of epitaphs for servicemen. The first, forty one monuments in total, dates from the start of the imperial period down to Flavian times. The Appendix collects these for convenience, but does not attempt to fully re-edit the inscriptions, and only provides major references.

The second group, and the majority of epitaphs, can be dated from the end of the first century AD down to the beginning of the third. The following, found outside the Porta Maggiore in Rome, is a typical example:\textsuperscript{161}

\begin{verbatim}
D(is) M(anibus) Q(uinti) Cati Firmini
viginti stipendiis emeritis dimissis honesta missione, alongside twenty others. The diploma of AD 52 (CIL XVI 1) was granted simply to those sunt dimissi honesta missione. For further discussion see Starr (1960) 80-1, 88ff.; Reddé (1986) 533-4.
\textsuperscript{160} Pferdehirt (2002) 169-70; cf. Reddé (1986) 525-7. Two inscriptions are problematic. CIL X 7592 (Cagliari, Sardinia): M(arcus) Epidius Quadratus / miles / ex classe / Misenens(e) / centuria) Cn(aei) Valer(i) / Prisci / militavit an(nos) III / vix(it) an(nos) XXVI / hic situs est; CIL X 8329 (Mariana, Corsica): L(ucius) Gellius Niger mil(es) / ex classe Misenense / militavit an(nos) XIIIX / vix(it) / ann(os) XL h(ic) situs est. These epitaphs are probably first century AD and, given our discussion of the praetoria epithet, should be pre-Flavian. If correct, these men could be Roman citizens by birth, as the monuments would predate the adoption of tria nomina by serving peregrines. However, Starr (1960) 97 n.20, followed by Panciera (2006d) 1275, suggested that praetoria was simply omitted. Panciera (2006d) 1275 n.15 provides parallels. The title may have only recently been bestowed and perhaps the habit had not become universally adopted. The second stone in particular is quite crudely cut; a hasty inscribing could have caused the omission.
\textsuperscript{161} CIL VI 3105.
\end{verbatim}
Common elements include *Dis Manibus*, the *tria nomina* of the serviceman, his description as a *miles*, the titling of the *classis* as *praetoria*, the naming of his boat (the trireme *Pax*), a statement of his origin (a Sardinian), his age at death and length of service, and then the naming of the *heres* who erected the monument. Not every epitaph includes all features, but most contain a good selection.

3. Social origins

With dating methods proposed, we can consider the origins of the servicemen, beginning with social background. Based on epitaphs and *diplomata*, I shall argue in support of the general consensus that the *classes* comprised Roman citizens, freedmen and free peregrines from their creation. I shall present the adoption of the *tria nomina* by peregrine *classis* servicemen in the later first century AD as an example of formalisation, rather than due to changes in the legal status of servicemen, and compare such formalisation to developments in the *auxilia*. Furthermore, the presence of imperial freedmen and certain features of nomenclature will suggest a conceptual connection between the imperial household and the *classes*. I shall then turn to ethnic make-up and the ways in which servicemen expressed their origins. This discussion will inform work on recruitment in Chapter Two, but will also consider how identities within the Italian *classes* were constructed, and what this can reveal about what the Romans and others thought about their empire.
3.1 Citizens, *liberti* and peregrines

From *classis* epitaphs dating to the Flavian period or earlier, we can identify three status groups: imperial freedmen, free peregrines and Roman citizens. Status expressions define the first group. For instance, one epitaph, probably Augustan, commemorates *C(aius) Iulius Caesaris l(ibertus) Automatus.* The second group used peregrine name formulae. Examples include *Phallaeus Dioclis f(ilius)* from Ravenna and *Verzo Themi f(ilius)* from Brundisium. The earliest precisely datable *classis* peregrine, Sparticus, appears in the *diploma* of AD 52, from which we can infer that such men served in the *classes* from the mid twenties at the latest, assuming a service period of twenty six years or more. Roman citizens are relatively rare. They include *L(ucius) Trebius L(uci) f(ilius) Ruso* from Aquileia and *Appaeus A(uli) f(ilius) Agricola* from Sarsina.

Libertine status has been attached to a fourth group from the pre-Flavian era. Here, the single personal name is followed by that of an Emperor in the genitive, and then by a rank, such as *Helios Caesaris trierarchus* and *Malchio Caesaris trierarchus.* It has even been suggested that these men were slaves, and that slaves initially made up a considerable proportion of *classis* servicemen. This problem is of considerable significance, because its resolution influences our understanding of the *classes* and their evolution.

---

162 Append. 1; see also Append. 2-5.
163 Append. 20 and 28. See also Append. 14-32 and 33-6 for the mixed nomenclature of first century *classis* veterans.
164 CIL XVI 1. Point noted by Wickert (1949-50) 108; Kienast (1966) 24-5; Panciera (2006c) 1290 n.53. However, in the early first century there is no evidence for fixed period before receipt of *honesta missio*: *classis milites* occasionally served for over thirty years: see e.g. Append. 41; see Starr (1960) 80-1; Reddé (1986) 524 with n.319.
165 Append. 39-40; see also Append 37-41.
166 E.g. Fiebiger (1894) 386; Cichorius (1922) 257ff.; cf. Starr (1960) 44.
167 Append. 7-8. See also Append. 6 and 9.
168 See Reddé (1986) 472-86 for detailed discussion and further bibliography.
Mommsen thought that these men were slaves with *servus* omitted from their nomenclature.\(^{169}\) This informed his view that the *classes* were in their early stages a servile ‘Privateinrichtung’ of the *Princeps* to use ‘zum Besten des Reiches’.\(^{170}\) Mommsen suggested that only with Claudius was military organization introduced to the *classes*. Their members were then treated as soldiers and recruited from peregrines, hence the appearance of peregrine names in *diplomata* from AD 52 onwards.

However, Starr argued that slaves never served in the *classes*, which he envisioned as public, military forces, and that free peregrines were present from the start.\(^{171}\) He suggested that there was such prejudice against slaves serving in military institutions that Augustus could never have established *classes* crewed by them.\(^{172}\) Therefore, examples such as Malchio could not have been slaves.\(^{173}\)

An unconvincing challenge to Starr came from Wickert, who revived the thesis of Mommsen.\(^{174}\) Focusing on *Malchior Caesaris trierarchus*, he argued that *Caesaris* was to be taken with *Malchior*, rather than *trierarchus*, therefore designating him as a slave. To support this, he pointed especially to the epitaph of *Anthus Caesaris trierarchus Livianus*.\(^{175}\) This was to be read as belonging to a slave of

---


\(^{170}\) *Röm. Staatsr* II.2 862.

\(^{171}\) Starr (1960) 66-74.

\(^{172}\) Slaves were employed in Republican *classes* during emergencies, such as the Second Punic War e.g. Polyb. 10.17.11, 14; Livy 24.11.7-9; 26.47.3; 34.6.13. See Starr (1960) 68-9; Thiel (1946) 77-9, 195-8; Casson (1966) 41-2; Libourel (1973). The Triumviral period also saw the use of slaves by e.g. Sextus Pompeius: *App. B Civ.* 2.103; 5.131 (though for the propagandistic presentation of Sextus as a slave or pirate commander see Hadas (1930) 70-1; Gowing (1992) 186-7 and (2002); Welch (2002) 42-3) and Octavian: *Suet. Aug.* 16.1; *Cass. Dio* 47.17.4; cf. 48.49.1; 49.1.5.

\(^{173}\) Starr (1960) 69.

\(^{174}\) Wickert (1949-50) esp. 105-12; followed by Sander (1957) 347-8; cf. Starr (1960) 229. See also Weaver (1963), (1972) 52-3.

\(^{175}\) Append. 9.
Augustus who was *trierarchus* on the ship which escorted Livia, against the standard interpretation of Anthus being a former slave of Livia who then passed into the ownership of Augustus.176

But Kienast contested this.177 He noted that Anthus was interred at Forum Iulii, an unlikely place for a man at the constant service of Livia to be stationed. Rather, Anthus was simply a freedman of Livia enrolled in a *classis*. Our ignorance over why Anthus was buried at Forum Iulii weakens this argument.178

In 1968, Panciera drew on the interpretation of the *agnomen* Livianus by Wickert to argue that neither he nor any other members of the group in question were slaves. He considered *Ti(berius) Iulius Aug(usti) l(ibertus) Hilarus nauarchus Tiberianus*.179 A traditional reading of the *agnomen* would regard him as a former slave of Tiberius, not sold to another household, and then manumitted by the same owner. Therefore, as Panciera noted, the *agnomen* would appear redundant if a part of his nomenclature rather than connected specifically with *nauarchus*.180 Instead, and admitting that the solution was not wholly satisfactory, Panciera followed the view of Wickert that such an *agnomen* could reveal which imperial family member a particular *nauarchus* or *trierarchus* was responsible for, while noting that there was no other evidence suggesting that Anthus was a slave, taking into account the arguments of Starr on their use in Roman fleets.181 His position represents the most developed case against the presence of slaves in the Italian *classes*, a position which I am inclined to follow.

---

176 By e.g. Starr (1960) 44; Weaver (1964) 126; Chantraine (1967) 322, 364-5. This follows the usual understanding of such *agnomina*: see Hülsen (1888); Weaver (1964) 124-6; Chantraine (1967) 293-388.
178 Note Reddé (1986) 480 for further criticism.
179 Append. 3; see now the reprint in Panciera (2006c). Comparison already noted and used by Wickert (1949-50) 108 to support his own argument; cf. Kienast (1966) 12.
180 Panciera (2006c) 1287.
181 Ibid. 1288.
Panciera argued that examples such as *Malchio Caesaris trierarchus* were actually freeborn peregrines, expressing their loyalty to their commander, Augustus.\(^{182}\) He noted that, during the civil maritime conflicts of the thirties BC, *classis* members, especially former slaves freed by Sextus Pompeius and Octavian, were loyal to particular commanders, loyalty which may have endured into the imperial period.\(^{183}\) He drew attention to a marble slab from Velitrae with a bilingual inscription, probably dated to 36-27 BC, set up to the Caesarian *praefectus classis* Mindius Marcellus by *nauarchi* and *trierarchi* who fought on behalf of Octavian (*quei meilitant Caesari nauarchi / et trierarchi patrono // οἱ στρατεύόμενοι Καίσαρι ναύαρχοι / καὶ τριήραρχοι*).\(^{184}\) While not a precise parallel for the construction used in the imperial inscriptions, this seems to express similar ideas. I would add the appearance of partisan groupings in some civil war literature, such as the *Pompeiani* and *Vatiniani*, suggestive of loyalty to specific generals.\(^{185}\)

We can possibly reinforce this point, and show that a professed attachment to an Emperor in a *classis* inscription did not necessarily denote servile (or even libertine) status, by looking at several free servicemen who considered themselves *trierarchi Augusti*.\(^{186}\)

Perhaps the earliest appears on a second century AD marble statue base from Paestum to M. Pomponius Diogenes, the son of a *trierarchus*, M. Pomponius Libo.\(^{187}\)

---

182 Ibid. 1289.
183 Ibid. 1289-90.
184 AE 1925 93 (= SupIt. II.V.8 = SEG IV 102); cf. G. Mancini in NSA (1924), 511-13.
185 E.g. B Alex. 9; *eo biduo legio XXXVII ex dediticiis Pompeianis militibus*; 45; *parabant se Vatiniani repente oppressi*; cf. e.g. B Alex. 59; BHisp. 13, 14, 16; Caes. B Civ. 1.15, 28; 2.17.
186 Some have been noted: see Starr (1960) 59 n.66; Kienast (1966) 13 n.20; Panicera (2006c) 1290 n.51, but here I provide an update.
187 AE 1975 253: *Marco Pomponio M(arci) / Pomponi Libonis tri/erarchi fil(io) Maec(ia) Diogeni duovir(o) q(uit)q(uennali) / coloni ex aere collato / statuam quam honoris / caus(a) vivo ei summ(a) / effecta optulerunt / Titius Flavius Marullus trie/rarchus Aug(usti) et L(ucius?) Arte/midorus heredes ponendam / curaverunt.*
The inscription mentions an heir, *T(itus) Flavius Marullus trie/rarchus Aug(usti).* He could have been a freedman of Vespasian or Titus. Indeed, Keppie has suggested that he was among the men deducted to Paestum in AD 71. However, he may well have been a free peregrine who had adopted the *tria nomina*, perhaps influenced by a Flavian Emperor.

A controversial example is that of M. Cocceius Stephanus, *tr(ierarchus) Aug(usti) C(aesaris)*, as Mommsen restored the text, who set up an epitaph at Misenum for his wife, Aelia Chryseis. Mommsen considered the *trierarchus* to have been a freedman of Nerva. Naturally, this is not necessary, and he could have been a free peregrine. However, Gervasius originally read not *Aug. C.* but *Augg(ustorum).* Possibly influenced by his view that Cocceius was a *libertus* of Nerva, Mommsen dismissed this. However, if *Augg(ustorum)* is correct, the inscription would be from the reign of Marcus Aurelius or later, and Cocceius would clearly not have been an imperial freedman.

A late second or third century AD epitaph commemorated *M. Plotius Paulus qui et Zosimus tr(ierarchus) Aug(usti).* A further later second or third century example is a *C(aius) Valerius Macrinus [tr(ierarchus)] Augg(ustorum)*, the restoration made on the basis of another epitaph of similar date mentioning a

---

188 Expanded by Mello and Voza (1968) no.89 (cf. Mello (1974) 48-9) to Aug(ustalis), but our other examples encourage Aug(usti). The limited space given to the father in the nomenclature of his son could explain why he was not trierarchus Augusti.
190 *CIL X* 3356: *D(is) M(anibus) / Aeliae Chry/seidi Aeli / filiae cas/tissimae / feminae / M(arcus) Cocceius / Stephanus / tr(ierarchus) Aug(usti) C(aesaris) / coniuci / b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).*
191 Followed by Kienast (1966) 13 n.20; Panciera (2006c) 1290 n.51; contra Starr (1960) 50 n.66, who proposed *c(astae)*, going with *coniugi*, but this usage is late and unlikely.
193 *CIL X* (1883), p. 324.
194 *CIL VI* 3621; Starr (1960) 49 n.66 wondered whether he was a ‘free trierarch’ of Octavian, but the inscription is clearly much later.
trierarchus of the same name. But, as Mommsen noted, he could have been [vet(eranus)] Augg(ustorum), and I am inclined to be very cautious here. Whether we accept one or both, neither men were of the imperial familia. An inscription from Bettoua in Algeria, ancient Portus Magnus, records the repair of an altar to Jupiter Optimus Maximus by T(itus) Octavius Longus trierarch(us) Aug(usti). This is undated, but one could reasonably place it in the second century AD.

These examples are later than the early group which has drawn so much debate, and therefore are not the products of identical circumstances. They are also a small set, which must limit our conclusions. However, they appear to reflect similar habits, and indicate that one could be a trierarchus Augusti without having to be a freedman or slave, adding some support to the identification by Panciera of the contested group as free peregrines.

Panciera himself raised the point that these men, if they were peregrines, did not follow the common practice of including filiations. Yet that does not absolutely deny them a freeborn peregrine identity. Four further early inscriptions could record free peregrines with single names, and provide parallels: Athenius, Linius, Aurelius(?) and Marcinus. Moreover, the inscriptions of the Caesaris/Augusti type are similar to those of the freedmen, but it does not follow that they were freedmen themselves. Certainty is impossible; some of the men could be freedmen, others free peregrines. Crucially, they were not demonstrably slaves.

195 CIL X 3354; restoration based on CIL X 3355. See above p. 49 n.186 for acceptance.
196 CIL X (1883), p. 324.
197 AE 2008 1704.
198 Append. 10-13.
3.2 Free peregrines with *tria nomina*

*Diplomata* suggest that by the Flavian period freeborn peregrines dominated the Italian *classes*.199 This is supported by Tacitus. In describing the defection of the *classis Ravennas* from Vitellius in AD 69, he stated that its men favoured Vespasian because he controlled their home provinces, Dalmatia and Pannonia: *quod magna pars Dalmatae Pannonique erant, quae provinciae Vespasiano tenebantur, partibus eius adgregaverat*.200 Whether or not Tacitus accurately reported their motivations, epigraphy supports his assertion on the make-up of the *classis*.201

As mentioned above, by the Flavian period these free peregrines had all adopted *tria nomina* upon enlistment.202 Debate exists over whether this reflected an immediate change in legal status. I shall not cover this in detail because there is little to add to previous work. Mommsen and his followers believed that servicemen were granted Latin status on enlistment, probably from the Hadrianic era, based on the absence of a *tribus* from their nomenclature.203

However, I follow the consensus developed by Starr: there was no such status change, and peregrine servicemen only gained Roman citizenship after completing a period of service, as stipulated in *diplomata*.204 Starr pointed out that, besides *tria nomina*, there is no evidence for a status alteration, and that there are many examples of people without Latin or Roman legal status possessing *tria nomina*. Moreover,

199 See below pp. 66-8.
200 Tac. *Hist.* 3.12. This must be set within the context of the characterisation of Roman soldiers as behaving like foreign invaders in the *Histories* (e.g. 1.45; 2.12; 3.72). See Ash (2009) esp. 94-5.
201 See below pp. 60-1.
202 See above pp. 42-4.
203 Mommsen (1881) 467-71. In the *diplomata* record of the time, *tria nomina* only appeared in AD 129 (*CIL* XVI 74 (= III p. 875 = V 4091)). See more recently e.g. Grosso (1965) 550-60; Le Bohec (1994) 101; Parma (2002) 186.
Gardner has argued that the *lex Iritana*, a Flavian municipal law for the Latin *municipium* of Irni in Spain, indicates that the *ius Latii* simply allowed citizens of Latin *municipia* who had served as magistrates (and later decurions), along with certain members of their families, to obtain Roman citizenship *per honorem*.205 It would serve little purpose to grant this status to *classis* servicemen when they were entitled to receive Roman *civitas* after twenty six years.

Alternatively, Pferdehirt has argued that *classis* servicemen received specifically Junian Latin status, normally held by slaves improperly manumitted who either effectively had no citizenship or sometimes that of their homeland.206 But again, this status simply offered routes towards Roman citizenship, as catalogued by the jurist Gaius, rendering the status redundant for men who obtained citizenship through *classis* service.207

The adoption of *tria nomina* should not therefore be explained through legal developments, but by a formalisation of *classis* service, or at least of some of the epigraphic habits used by their members.208

---


207 Gai, Inst. 1.17-35.

208 Unconvincingly, Mann (2002) (followed by e.g. Roxan and Holder (2004) 274; Holder in RMD V (2006), p. 787; cf. Eck, MacDonald and Pangerl (2002) 201) argued that Roman citizenship was granted upon enlistment because from AD 100 servicemen possessed *praenomina* in *diplomata*. The *praenomen*, he argued, was the marker of a Roman citizen in official documentation. He drew on examples from auxiliary *diplomata*, from which it can be reasonably concluded that some auxiliaries using *tria nomina* were granted citizenship during service (e.g. *M(arcus) Ulpius Adcobrovati filius* in *CIL* XVI 160). All such individuals use the *praenomen*, whereas those with *peregrine* status never do. There are problems with this argument regarding the *classes*. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is whether *tria nomina*, even with a *praenomen*, indicate citizen status. Non-citizens did falsely use Roman names, as indicated by Claudius attempting to forbid the practice (Suet. *Claud. 25.3*). Mócsy (1986) argued that we can never use *tria nomina* in *diplomata* as certain evidence for Roman citizenship. Later views (e.g. Dušanić (1996); Saddington (2000)) have been more positive, suggesting that certain auxiliaries were citizens using genuine *tria nomina*. But it does not follow that all *tria nomina* are genuine. Furthermore, *classis* members were granted citizenship in their *diplomata*, wholly redundant if there was a universal grant of citizenship upon enlistment.
We shall return repeatedly to this formalisation, its precise nature obscure. However, contemporary developments in the auxilia provide suggestive parallels. The standard modern position holds that the essentials of the auxilia were established by Augustus, for instance their division into infantry cohortes and mounted alae of particular sizes, and with identifying titulature.  However, much still distinguished many units from the “professional regiments” of later first and second century diplomata. Thus, scholars have proposed processes of formalisation and regularisation operating across the first century AD, particularly under Claudius and Vespasian, though the fragmentary evidence resists neat conclusions.

Changes to unit titles are one example. The latest attested regiment named after its current commander is the cohors A[e[...] Habeti, recorded in a papyrus of AD 27. M. P. Speidel has argued that such regiments possessed permanent names, but that in particular circumstances the name of the commander better served to identify them. Perhaps to reduce confusion, such practices ended during the Tiberian period.

Formalisation can also be seen in the Claudian attempt to create a standard ‘career path’ for equites commanding auxilia, the so-called tres militiae, whereby an eques would serve as praefectus cohortis, then tribunus legionis and finally praefectus alae. Previously, a mixture of equites, tribal chiefs, centurions and

---

210 Saddlington (1982) 2 identifies a ‘professional regiment’ as one sharing the characteristics of those known from diplomata e.g. with particular forms of titulature, a Roman citizen commander, the receipt of civitas and conubium after a fixed period of service.
212 SB XVI 12609 (= ChLA XLX 1340).
214 For attribution to Claudius see Suet. Claud. 25.1 with Cheesman (1914) 90-5; Holder (1980) 75-8. For equestrian commands see e.g. CIL IX 3610; XIV 2960, 3458 and Domaszewski (1967) 122-31.
senators had commanded *auxilia*, with no fixed hierarchy.\footnote{Cheesman (1914) 90-2; Holder (1980) 75, 141; Haynes (2013) 42.} Grants of *civitas* and *conubium* after a fixed period of service can also be attributed to Claudius.\footnote{See above p. 27.} We shall see below that certain information, such as the number of years a *miles* had served, or perhaps his origins, was more frequently supplied in *auxilia* epitaphs later in the first century, perhaps reflecting regularisation.

I suggest that similar developments could have occurred in the Italian *classes* and could be reflected in their epigraphy, though we cannot easily characterise the nature of any changes, and the data set for the pre-Flavian period is a small one. The very titles of the *classes* may be one product of this formalisation, as they evolved throughout our period.\footnote{As Starr (1941) 26 n.9 observed.} For convenience, I refer to them as the *classis Misenensis* and *Ravennas* throughout this work. Yet the earliest dated reference to either *classis* by its accepted titulature is on a *diploma* of unknown provenance granted to *beneficiarii qui militant in classe Raven/nate* in AD 70.\footnote{AE 1997 1771 ll.2-4.} *Diplomata* of the following year name this fleet and the *classis Misenensis*.\footnote{E.g. *CIL* XVI 12.} Before that, the latter is named in the AD 52 *diploma as classis quae est Miseni*.\footnote{*CIL* XVI 1.} Nothing directly explains why these names emerged, though presumably the length of association of the *classes* with particular bases encouraged their naming from them. Nor did the evolution stop: funerary or honorary inscriptions from the second century can record the *classis praetoria Misenatium* or *Ravennatium*, though this never appears on *diplomata*.\footnote{See Fiebiger in *RE* III (1899), s.v. *classis*, 2636 for names of the *classes*.}

The topic of formalisation has not previously received much notice, possibly because there has not been a systematic treatment of the epitaphs. There has been a
related debate over whether the *classes* underwent militarisation in the first century AD, which we shall discuss in greater detail below, but formalisation may offer a preferable framework for understanding visible developments.\(^{222}\)

### 3.3 The Italian *classes* and the imperial house

Evidence has emerged for particular ties between the *classes* and the Emperor. This relationship has already been commented on, by Kienast especially, who supposed a bond between the *classis Misenensis* and the Emperor, while Starr understood it as a feature of the very early imperial period.\(^{223}\) One should especially note the *liberti Augusti* and those possible peregrines identifying themselves as *trierarchi* or *nauarchi Augusti*, alongside the handful of later *trierarchi Augusti* examined above. The titling of the *classes* as *praetoriae* towards the end of the first century AD can be recalled in this connection.\(^{224}\) This does not demonstrate that the *classes* were a ‘Privateinrichtung’ of the Caesars, any more than the praetorian cohorts or *Vigiles*, but could imply a significant relationship between the *classes* and the Emperors.

To sum up on social status: I have argued that free peregrines, (imperial) freedmen and Roman citizens formed the *classis* manpower pool. *Diplomata* and limited literary testimony indicate that from the second half of the first century AD, the large majority of servicemen were free peregrines. Although they probably adopted *tria nomina* upon enlistment, their legal status only changed at discharge, becoming Roman citizens. The adoption of *tria nomina* may reflect processes of formalisation within the *classes*, comparable to those observed in the evolution of the

\(^{222}\) Below pp. 76-80.

\(^{223}\) Starr (1960) 67; Kienast (1966) esp. 48-81 and below p. 146.

\(^{224}\) Above pp. 38-42.
auxilia, and could be regarded as a response to their service in Italy. We have also identified hints of a close conceptual relationship between the classes and the imperial house, which persisted into the second century.

4. Ethnic origins

We shall now consider ethnic origins, and their expression in epitaphs and diplomata. This section aims firstly to adduce further evidence for the formalisation of classis service in the first century AD, suggested by the increasing provision of origin statements in epitaphs. Secondly, to provide preliminary evidence suggesting that the Italian classes did not recruit purely from the gens de mer, people who lived by and off the sea.225 Thirdly, to demonstrate the limitations the evidence imposes on recruitment studies.

First, I shall briefly consider practices found in the funerary epigraphy of other types of milites. This is not a comprehensive study but provides useful context.226 In the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods, citizen soldiers would name specific towns as their origin, for example: Q(uintus) Bruttius / Q(uinti) f(ilius) Sergia / Crescens / domo Tucci / mil(es) leg(ionis) IIII Mac(edonicae)...227 Precisely how common the practice was, especially across the empire, is very difficult to determine. For instance, origins are mentioned in eleven of the thirty five pre-Flavian epitaphs belonging to milites of the legio XIII Augusta collected by Le Bohec.228 Of the forty

---

225 For definitions of gens de mer, see Cabantous (1979) 12-23.
226 For different types of army origin statements, see Mommsen (1884) 23-6; cf. Forni (1953) 57-8.
227 CIL XIII 6856: cf. CIL III 9939 (= AE 1890 51); CIL XIII 6854.
four praetorian epitaphs from Rome which Clauss dated to before the Flavian period, thirty four (77%) record origins.²²⁹

Auxiliary epitaphs are rare in the pre-Flavian period, and attestations of origin were not common, perhaps because many units were organised along ethnic lines, their titles revealing their origins.²³⁰ However, because they were peregrines based in Italy, a useful example to compare classis servicemen to are the custodes corporis, the German bodyguard of the Emperors until their abolition under the Flavians.²³¹ Although the total sample is small, Claudian and especially Neronian epitaphs frequently supply the origin of the custodes, for instance Postumus / Ti(beri) Claudi / Caesar(is) Aug(usti) / corpor(is) cust(os)...nat(ione) Ubius and Fannius / Neron(is) Claudi / Caesaris Aug(usti) / corpor(is) custos...nation(e) Ubius.²³²

Origin statements were more common in epitaphs of the later first and second centuries, though for the auxilia the proportions apparently remained fairly low, at around 10% in a recent survey.²³³ This includes all types of inscriptions, and one could conjecture that the figure for epitaphs may have been somewhat greater.

At any rate, proportions in Italy appear higher, relevant for the potential influence on origin expression practices among the classes. For instance, the equites singulares mentioned their origins in at least 43% of surviving epitaphs from this period, and given that many of the inscriptions are fragmentary, the true number

²²⁹ Clauss (1973b) 92-5.
²³⁰ For tribal units see Saddington (1982) 170-1; cf. Cheesman (1914) 46.
²³² CIL VI 8809 (= ILS 1726); AE 1952 145. Of twenty two epitaphs collected by Bellen (1981) 105-13, seventeen (five Claudian, ten Neronian) mention origins. Two probably pre-Claudian epitaphs (AE 1923 73; CIL VI 4437) do not. Three epitaphs (CIL VI 8812, 37754, 37754a) are too damaged to be certain.
²³³ Gallet and Le Bohec (2007) 283. They do not explain what their overall sample is based on, only that the 10% amounts to just over seven hundred documents.
could have been greater.\textsuperscript{234} As a further example from Italy, around 56\% of two hundred and sixteen contemporary praetorian epitaphs from Rome mention origins.\textsuperscript{235} Again, citizen soldiers typically named the specific town or city from which they came.\textsuperscript{236} Auxilia often gave an ethnic or regional adjective, rather than a specific political community, as with Triton Batoni / mil(es) coh(ortis VII / Breuc(orum) c(ivium) R(omanorum) eq(uitaet) / dom(o) Pann(onius) or T(itus) Aurelius Claudianus / eq(uit) sing(ulari) Aug(usti)...nat(ione) Surus.\textsuperscript{237} While in the Danubian provinces domus is found before the adjective, in Germany and Italy natio or civis were more usual.\textsuperscript{238} M. P. Speidel has produced probably the fullest study on origin expressions in auxilia diplomata.\textsuperscript{239} Having examined ninety two diplomata from AD 54-178/90, he proposed two general ‘rules’: that if the soldier served away from home, his origin was recorded as his province, but if his unit was local, he gave his tribe or city.\textsuperscript{240} While broadly sensible conclusions, there are many exceptions, especially to the first ‘rule’. We would not anticipate such a contrast in classis diplomata, because virtually all milites served away from home.

Now for the classes, beginning with past scholarship. Mommsen concentrated on how the origins of servicemen were presented in epigraphy.\textsuperscript{241} He suggested that the adjectives used, on which more below, did not necessarily correspond to any administrative region or political community.\textsuperscript{242} He believed that the slaves, who he

\begin{itemize}
  \item Based on two hundred and seventy epitaphs collected by Speidel (1994a) 109-234.
  \item Based on Claus (1973b) 92-5.
  \item E.g. CIL XIII 5206: C(aius) Allius C(ai) f ili us / Pom(ptina) O r i ens / domo Dert(ona)... Domus was not always required e.g. CIL VI 2441.
  \item AE 2010 1620; CIL VI 3197 (= Speidel (1994a) no.115).
  \item Mommsen (1884) 28-9.
  \item Speidel (1986); cf. Mirković (2007) 335-7; Talbert (2013).
  \item Though see below p. 67.
  \item Mommsen (1884) esp.31-39.
  \item See below pp. 64ff.
\end{itemize}
thought comprised the *classes* until Claudius, gave their origins in imitation of free soldiers.\textsuperscript{243} As slaves, they did not have legal homelands, but felt some ties to their birthplace. Therefore, they adopted categories based on ‘volkstümliche Zusammengehörigkeit’, grouping themselves with people of similar languages and customs.\textsuperscript{244} According to Mommsen, when Claudius militarised the *classes*, these habits remained.\textsuperscript{245} Given our rejection of the proposed servile nature of the early *classes*, these arguments cannot be fully accepted.\textsuperscript{246}

After Mommsen, scholars have focused simply on where servicemen came from.\textsuperscript{247} For example, Reddé examined the proportions of different ethnicities in the *classis Misenensis*, comparing it with the *classis Ravennas*.\textsuperscript{248} According to his data, Egyptians and Bessi predominated in the *classis Misenensis*, while Dalmatians and Pannonians were most common in the *classis Ravennas*.

This is broadly supported by my own data set, for which I collected all epitaphs from Misenum and Ravenna recording origins, and all others naming the *classis* of the deceased. This amounts to half of the corpus, which imposes limits on our conclusions. Nonetheless, from two hundred and eighteen epitaphs of the *classis Misenensis*, forty (18%) commemorated Bessi, thirty six (17%) *Aegypti* and eighteen (8%) *Alexandrini*. There were also eighteen Cilicians and Sardinians each. The number of inscriptions for the *classis Ravennas* was far smaller at sixty two; we

---

\textsuperscript{243} See above p. 47.
\textsuperscript{244} Mommsen (1884) 34.
\textsuperscript{245} Followed by Chapot (1896) 181-7.
\textsuperscript{246} See above pp. 47ff.
\textsuperscript{247} E.g. Chapot (1896) 186-7; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 74-7.
\textsuperscript{248} See Reddé (2000) 187-8; cf. Reddé (1986) 531-3. Note Susini (1961) 37ff. on the *classis Ravennas*. Specific ethnic groups have received attention e.g. for Bessi see Kolendo (1988-9); Topalilov (2013); for Sardinians see Sotgiu (1961); for Pannonians and Dalmatians see Mócsy (1968); Domić-Kunič (1996); Dzíno (2010).
should be cautious over how much can be inferred from this sample. Nevertheless, seventeen (22%) commemorated Dalmatians, while five (8%) were for Pannonians.

This approach fails to consider the nature of the expressions used in epitaphs and *diplomata*, and does not take into account how “real” the origins given were. Thus, I shall return to the nature of origin statements. First, I shall demonstrate that strategies for conveying this information in *classis* epitaphs and *diplomata* changed over time. While statements were rare in pre-Flavian epitaphs, the formula of *natio* plus ethnic adjective becomes common later. In contrast, *diplomata* always provided this information, though its presentation changed, with a developing interest in geographical origins. Despite the increasing divergence between the origin statements in *diplomata* and epitaphs, I shall propose that there could have been some relationship between the introduction of the former and the sort of information recorded in the latter. These developments can be considered part of our proposed formalisation of *classis* service. I shall conclude by analysing the types of ethnic adjectives employed in epitaphs to delineate how they may limit recruitment studies.

4.1 Origins before the Flavians

Here, I shall largely pass over the three examples of origin statements in the epitaphs of the pre-Flavian period, partly for reasons of space, but more because there is little of wider significance to say. Thus we have Velageno from the unidentified *vicus* Clabulum, C. Mucius Claudius from Cemenelum and Ditius Pa(...?) from a place
called Savona. In all three cases a specific community is recorded, conforming to the habits of contemporary citizen *milites*.

The general omission of origin statements in this group of epitaphs contrasts with their appearance on seventeen near-contemporary (AD 52-71) *classis diplomata*. This group includes seven documents granted to men from the *legiones Adiutrices* discharged in AD 68 and 70.

Typically a single word was used. Before AD 71 this was usually an ethnic adjective: *Bessus, Sardus, Desidias, Surus* and *Dacus*. One serviceman was described in AD 70 as *natione Bessus*, a common construction in epitaphs as we shall see below. However, *natio* is difficult to explain here, only otherwise appearing on a couple of third century *diplomata*. Apparently exceptional is a *diploma* from AD 68 for a member of the *legio I Adiutrix*, who was described as *Phrygius Laudic(ea)* on the external side of the tablet, but only *Phrygius* on the interior. If the external reading is correct, the precise city from which the recipient came was provided.

The documents of AD 71 show greater variation. Four cases resemble the above, though one serviceman described broadly as *Pannonius* contrasts with other

---

249 Append. 22, 38, 41.


251 CIL XVI 10 (= AE 1932 27).

252 AE 1979 626 (= RMD II 131) from AD 214: *n(atione) Isaurus*; CIL XVI 152 from AD 247: *n(atione) Ital(icus).*

253 CIL XVI 7 (= III p. 847 = X 770 = ILS 1988 = Magalhaes (2006) no.14). Line 14 contains the *origo*, recorded by Nesselhauf in CIL XVI (1936), p. 6 simply as *Phrygio <L>audic(ea).* But the photograph in Magalhaes (2006) 185 fig. 13b shows that the text runs *Phrygia (vac.) Iudic.* Magalhaes (2006) 96 rendered the text *Phrygi(a) (vac.) audic(ea)(sic).* While there may be an interpunct between *G* and *I*, I am not wholly confident in the standard restoration.
more specific ethnics: *Sappaeus, Eraviscus and Maezeius.* However, the anomalous *diploma* is otherwise problematic, several scholars suggesting it was awarded to a provincial *classis* serviceman. In another example, the origin of the recipient was given as *Marsonnia* or Marsonia, a settlement in Pannonia Inferior on the site of modern Slavonski Brod. The identification of a place cannot be explained, though it foreshadows later practices. One serviceman was *Gallinaria Sarniensis*, an unidentified pair of toponyms or ethnics. Our final recipient was *Surus Garasenus*. *Surus* appears to be a general ethnic, while *Garasenus* identifies his home city as Gerasa.

In sum, a single ethnic adjective was the most common means of expressing origins in Italian *classis diplomata* up to AD 71. Occasionally a home settlement was identified, though none of the examples can be explained with any confidence. We could simply be dealing with inconsistency in *diplomata* contents, well-attested for this period.

The appearance of this information on *diplomata* could reflect the organisational concern in its being recorded. Forni argued that *diplomata*, alongside *laterculi*, represent good guides to information kept in official military rolls, held by individual units and created for each *miles* on enlistment. However, this interest did not yet usually translate to the servicemen themselves relaying the information on their epitaphs. This trend can perhaps be explained with reference to the rare

---


258 *CIL* XVI 15.

259 See above p. 27 nn.119-20.

260 Forni (1979); cf. Gilliam (1957); Davies (1969);
provision of origins in early first century *auxilia* epitaphs, though oddly contrasts with practices found among the *custodes corporis*, in particular of the Neronian period.\(^{261}\) However, and although the sample is tiny, that two pre-Claudian epitaphs mentioning *custodes* do not give origins may indicate a habit only emerging from the mid-first century AD in non-citizen military epigraphy.\(^{262}\)

Already, one can see that there is no clear evidence for an exclusive concern with recruitment from maritime regions, or among people known particularly for seafaring skills. The data set is small and should not be given too much weight, but evidence for the later period will corroborate this observation.

### 4.2 Flavian and post-Flavian origins

In contrast with earlier epitaphs, around 47% of those from Misenum and Rome and 63% from Ravenna in this later period explicitly reference origins. This is most commonly stated with an adjective qualified by *natio*, for instance *L. Carisius Blandus...nationale Bessus*, *C. Iulius Apollinaris...nationale Aegyptius*, *M. Marius Dexter...nationale Graecus* and *L. Superinius Severus...nationale Pannonius*.\(^{263}\) One should note how broad-brush these ethnics are, in contrast with the specific tribal identifications made in earlier *diplomata*, and the settlements cited in pre-Flavian epitaphs.\(^{264}\) Because of its frequency, we shall focus on this origin formula, though there were alternatives. For example, the adjective alone is found.\(^{265}\) Very

---

\(^{261}\) See above p. 58.
\(^{262}\) See above p. 58 n.232.
\(^{263}\) CIL X 3555, 3583, 3603; CIL XI 97.
\(^{264}\) Mommsen (1881) 33 strongly distinguishes these from provincial designations, an approach with which I agree, though cf. below p. 67.
\(^{265}\) E.g. CIL X 3365 (= ILS 2851): *Formianus*; CIL XI 90: *Del(matus)*. cf. e.g. CIL X 3553 (= Tuck (2005) no.54): *Bithynus*; 3599: *Med(iolanensis?)*; 3622: *Nicaensis*; 3666: *Delmatus*; 7535:
occasionally the deceased also provided their home community, identified as a *domus* or *civitas*.\(^{266}\)

*Natio* was the usual noun to attach to an ethnic adjective in the auxiliary epitaphs of Italy.\(^{267}\) This probably determined its usage by *classis* servicemen. Indeed, the apparently increasing proportion of *auxilia* epitaphs containing origin statements in this period, even if from a very low base, may have encouraged the overall trend visible in the Italian *classes*. In any case, we might consider this development another symptom of the formalisation of *classis* service.

However, the particular *natio* and adjective combinations used in the *classes* are unusual, as an illustrative sample demonstrates. Only around 30% (twenty five out of seventy eight examples found) of those who call themselves *Bessi* (*natione* or otherwise) were not members of the *classes*. The majority were soldiers, nine (at most) of those being *equites singulares Augusti*.\(^{268}\) Beyond *classis* epitaphs, there appears to be only one example of *natione Aegyptus*(sic), found at Rome on the epitaph of a gladiator.\(^{269}\) There are only seven examples at most of *Alexandrinus* used outside the *classes*.\(^{270}\) As for *natione Pannonicus/-ius*, this is uncommon outside

\(^{266}\) AE 1998 24.

\(^{267}\) Speidel (1994a) nos. 83 (= *CIL* VI 3177), 134 (= *CIL* VI 3205), 345 (= *CIL* VI 3303), 209 (= *CIL* VI 37257), 216, 243, 253, 545-6. Only nos. 83, 134, 345 and 216 are certain examples with no or little restoration.

\(^{268}\) AE 1988 24.

\(^{269}\) Speidel (1994a) nos. 83 (= *CIL* VI 3177), 134 (= *CIL* VI 3205), 345 (= *CIL* VI 3303), 209 (= *CIL* VI 37257), 216, 243, 253, 545-6. Only nos. 83, 134, 345 and 216 are certain examples with no or little restoration.
Rome and largely found on military epitaphs, especially those of the *equites singulares Augusti*.\(^{271}\)

This is normally quite reasonably understood as reflecting realities of recruitment. On this basis, there is again little evidence for recruitment from *gens de mer*. While there were some recruits from areas with strong seafaring associations, such as Cilicia and arguably Dalmatia, other peoples such as the Bessi and Pannonians are less straightforwardly regarded as maritime.\(^{272}\) We shall say more below on difficulties in interpreting these ethnic adjectives.

In the three Italian *classis diplomata* known from AD 72 to AD 129, a single ethnic term was used to identify the origin of the recipient: *Delmatus* (AD 100) and *Bessus* (both AD 119).\(^{273}\) This may represent a divergence from the more specific ethnics seen in *diplomata* of AD 71 and is comparable to the generalising ethnics of contemporary epitaphs, alongside the anomalous *Pannonius* from AD 71.\(^{274}\) In contrast, two *diplomata* from AD 129 identify their recipients both as Corsicans and specify a native people.\(^{275}\)

From AD 134, origins were almost always given in two parts.\(^{276}\) The first identified either which city or tribe the recipient came from. N. Lollius Neon came from Laertes in Pamphylia (AD 139), and Sex. Memmius Mannes from Oenoanda in given that there were no legal ramifications. Note *CIL* XI 6735 (= *AE* 1892 136) from Ravenna, lines 3-4, unconvincingly restored by Bormann (*CIL* XI (1926), p. 1229) as *[n(atione)] Aeg[ypt(ius) / ci]vitatis Al[ex]andriae).

\(^{271}\) E.g. Speidel (1994a) no.624 (= *AE* 1968 31); Speidel (1994a) no.322 (= *CIL* VI 3184). For a civilian see *CIL* XIII 7247 from Mainz: *Capito / Arri l(ibertus) / argentarius / natione Pan/nonius...*; similarly Dzino (2010) 107 on Dalmatians.

\(^{272}\) A point noted long ago by Ferrero (1878) 45 but cf. below p. 103.

\(^{273}\) *RMD* III 142; *AE* 2005 1738; *AE* 2008 1757.

\(^{274}\) See above pp. 62-3.

\(^{275}\) *AE* 2005 691: *Corsus Cobas(ius); CIL* XVI 74: *Corsus Vinac(enus). The Cobasii are nowhere mentioned, but Mommsen in *CIL* III (1873) p. 875 identified the Vinaceni with the Οὐανακινοὶ mentioned by Ptolemy (*Geog.* 3.2.7).

\(^{276}\) Note *AE* 2007 1790, a Commodan *diploma* for an unknown *classis* where the recipient was perhaps simply *Pann[onian]*.
Lycia (AD 140). M. Sollius Gracilis was a member of the Pannonian Scordisci (AD 139), while C. Valerius Dasius was *Scirtonus ex Dalmatia* (AD 152). Drawing on the available evidence, a broadly east-west split may determine whether the city or specific tribe was given.

The second part comprised *ex* plus a region. Some can be identified with Roman provinces, though also allow a non-administrative interpretation, including Cilicia (AD 158), Dalmatia (AD 152) and Thracia (AD 160). Others do not conform to a strictly provincial analysis, such as Phrygia (AD 145), Pamphylia by itself (AD 139) and the strange case of Bessia (AD 142). Similarly, Pannonia did not exist as a united whole in this period (AD 139, 145). Therefore, I suggest that provinces did not form the basis for identifying origins in these *diplomata*. M. P. Speidel thought otherwise regarding similar regional tags in *auxilia diplomata*, but one surely cannot interpret Bessia, among several of the other examples, as provinces? The provision of regions distinguishes these *diplomata* from the epitaphs, and from most earlier *diplomata*.

Therefore, one can detect an evolution, if without uniformity, from predominantly using ethnic adjectives to greater interest in geographical regions. This could reflect changing conceptions of the empire at Rome, though questions remain

---


279 Cilicia: AE 1985 994; possibly AE 1977 798 (= RMD I 44) but the attribution to a member of a *classis* is conjectural; Dalmatia: CIL XVI 100; Thracia: AE 1975 245; AE 1995 1822; AE 2006 1854, 1855.


281 AE 2007 1786 and above note.

282 Note below p. 72 n.310.

about the representativeness of the diplomata sample. The character of these regions is extremely difficult to delineate, and whether they bear much relationship to the ethnic adjectives of the epitaphs is equally unclear. Despite offering some promising insights into recruitment, diplomata may raise more questions than they answer.

I proposed above that the epigraphic habits of other milites may explain the more frequent recording of origins by classis servicemen from the later first century AD. One wonders if the probable introduction of military diplomata under Claudius had a delayed influence on the information inscribed on the tombstones of all non-citizen milites.

That is not to say that this information was not previously recorded by military authorities; rather, it received new significance for those enrolled. Domaszewski suggested that official records on milites influenced the content of their tombstones. M. P. Speidel acknowledged that such records had some impact, but argued that the auxiliary milites themselves had more influence on diplomata contents, with those documents reflecting practices underlying funerary epigraphy habits. This is based on the two ‘rules’ mentioned above, indicating that personal choice influenced diplomata origin statements. We cannot know if such practices were found in the Italian classes because all the peregrine milites served away from

---

284 For development of geographical conceptions of empire see the classic Nicolet (1991). Talbert (2004) has argued that provinces were clearly understood as geographical entities existing in relationship to each other; cf. Talbert (2010).

285 See above p. 27.

286 See above pp. 63-4.

287 Domaszewski (1885) 21 with n.4, drawing on Tac. Ann. 1.44: citatus ab imperatore nomen, ordinem, patriam, numerum stipendiorum, quae strenue in proeliis fecisset, et cui erant, dona militaria edebat.

288 Speidel (1986) 475.

289 See above p. 59.
home. The problem is extremely difficult to untangle, with a complex relationship between official and personal concerns possibly determining habits.

In any case, influence either way only went so far. We have observed differences in origin statements between *diplomata* from the mid-Hadrianic period and contemporary epitaphs. This could be explained by the different purposes of the media. Those in charge of the Italian *classes* were apparently concerned to identify precisely which community and geographical region each man came from. However, it was enough for the servicemen in Italy to provide a broad *natio* in personal epitaphs.

4.3 *Nationes* and geography

Unfortunately, at least some of the *nationes* used could hinder detailed studies of recruitment patterns. By considering *Pannonius* and *Bessus*, I shall suggest that neither can be convincingly connected with particular geographical or administrative regions, and that their use may reflect Roman perceptions of their empire, rather than the “real” identities of the deceased servicemen. The following could apply to the majority of adjectives used, though perhaps not all: for example, those servicemen who claimed identities derived from cities, such as *Alexandrinus* or *Nicaensis*, could be considered a separate category.290

Concerning identity, scholarship has increasingly focused on its pluralities within the Roman world, and their relationship to the development of the empire.291 Given that simply being Roman had many different meanings, the identities of others

---

290 For Nicaea see *CIL* X 3406 (= *ILS* 2886); 3416 (= *ILS* 2896), 3419 (= *ILS* 2868), 3622.
within the empire represent a great challenge in their examination. At least in Roman contexts, indigenous peoples would often describe themselves using Roman formulae created for them, based on Roman conceptions of their empire and the place of those people within it. For instance, Mitchell has convincingly argued that the identity of the Pontici was “created” by the formation of the Roman province of Pontus by Pompey.

Regarding the classes, consider *natione Pannonius/-icus*. The Romans applied the term *Pannonii* to several Illyrian tribes spread over a substantial area on both sides of the river Save extending from Noricum into Dalmatia. The Roman-ness of the adjective is highlighted by Appian: Παίονες μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων λεγόμενοι, καὶ ῥωμαϊστὶ Παννόνιοι. Strabo identified six main tribes as Pannonian: the Andizeti, Breuci, Daesitiateae, Ditiones, Mazaei and Peirustae. When a miles called himself *natione Pannonius* rather than mentioning his tribe, he appears to have adopted a Roman analysis of his ethnic group.

To complicate matters, in the imperial period only the first two Strabonian tribes dwelt in Pannonian provinces. The Ditiones, for instance, were to be found in Dalmatia. It is therefore difficult to tell whether a miles *Pannonius* was from the provincial territories of Pannonia Superior or Inferior, or whether he belonged to a Pannonian tribe settled elsewhere.

The Bessi are even more problematic. From Mommsen onwards, it has often been asserted that when found in *classis* epitaphs, *Bessus* describes servicemen of

---

292 For Roman identity and self-representation, see Dench (2005).
293 Mitchell (2002).
296 Str. 7.5.3.
Thracian origin, rather than the specific tribe of Bessi. This would explain the absence in *classis* epitaphs of *natione Thrax/Trax/Traex*, despite *diplomata* attesting Thracian recruitment.

The Bessi were located by different ancient writers in different parts of what became the *provincia Thracia*. Herodotus placed them in the Rhodope Mountains region. Strabo (Βέσσοι δὲ ὀπέρ τὸ πλέον τοῦ ὀροὺς νέμονται τοῦ Αἴμου... συνάπτοντες τῇ τῇ Ῥοδόπῃ) and others have them further north, around Haemus, though penetrating the Rhodope. A recent synthesis argues that their tribal lands comprised the Upper Hebrus region and the western Haemus Mountains, extending to the Rhodope. These lands were the basis for the *Bessike* strategy described by Ptolemy, one of the pre-Roman administrative divisions of Thrace which persisted after its annexation in AD 46 down to the Trajanic period.

There is little evidence for *classis* Bessi being recruited only from this administrative region. We have seen that two servicemen discharged in AD 142 came from *Nicopolis ex Bessia*, thought by the publishers of the *diplomata* to be Nicopolis ad Nestum, on the upper Nestus river in western Thrace. However, the relationship of this *Bessia* to the area of the former strategy remains unclear, and just because some men came from *Bessia*, it does not follow that all Bessi did.

---

298 Mommsen (1881) 33-4; Chapot (1896) 186-7; Starr (1960\(^2\)) 77 with 99 n.36; Kolendo (1988-9); cf. Speidel (1986) 468 n.5.
299 See above p. 67.
300 For an overview see Oberhummer in *RE* III (1899), s.v. *Bessi*, 329-331; Tacheva (1997).
302 Str. 7.5.12; Amm. Marc. 27.4.11; Eutr. 6.10. See also Polyb. 23.8.4; Caes. *B Civ.* 3.4; Livy 39.53; Plin. *NH* 4.40; Suet. *Aug.* 3; Ptol. *Geog.* 3.11.6; Cass. Dio 47.25.
305 Tatscheva (1999) 870-2 collects the epigraphic evidence for Roman army Bessi. The majority are *classis* servicemen, but there are twenty two auxiliaries, thirteen *equites singulares*, two legionaries and four praetorians.
Indeed, there is direct evidence for Bessi recruited from outside their proposed homeland within Thracian territories, as epitaphs for Bessian *equites singulares* who originated from Apri in the south east of the province and Scupi in Moesia Superior demonstrate.\(^{307}\) Furthermore, Bessi were to be found in the Dobrudja region of Moesia Inferior.\(^{308}\)

It is therefore very difficult to establish a precise region from which Bessi were recruited, and whether *natione Bessus* meant anything other than “Thracian” in a very wide sense. Kolendo has argued that the Dobrudja Bessi, residing in marshlands near the Danube estuary and familiar with boat travel, were the original Thracian group recruited into the *classes*.\(^{309}\) He proposed that when recruitment extended across all Thrace, recruits simply adopted the *Bessus* tag. This presumes that the Romans keenly desired recruits familiar with water travel, which we have already questioned. Perhaps the first regional *classis* recruits instead came predominantly from the pre-provincial strategy of *Bessike*. One could then envisage a similar process to that described by Kolendo, with future recruits from wider Thrace copying their precursors.

Whatever the solution to its origins, the use of *Bessus* in *classis* epitaphs suggests that servicemen were not especially concerned with revealing their precise tribe or geographical origins. Instead, they were part of a broad organisational category, adopted in Italy primarily by groups of non-citizen *milites*.\(^{310}\) Like those

\(^{307}\) *CIL VI* 3177: *D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublio) Ael(io) Basso...eq(uiti) sing(ulari) Aug(usti)...nat(ione) Bessus Claudia Apris...; *CIL VI* 3205: *D(is) M(anibus) / T(itio) Aur(elio) Gaio b(eneficiar)io eq(uitum) sing(ularium)...Fl(avia) Scupis nat(ione) Bessus.

\(^{308}\) Tacheva (1997) 206-10; Zahariade (2009) 35-7. Ovid mentions the Bessi and Getae around Tomis (*Tr*. 3.10.5; 4.1.67) while inscriptions from *vicus Qu tintonis* and Ulmetum on the Black Sea coast record *cives Romani et Bessi consistentes: IScM* I.324, 327-8, 330-1, 340-1 (AD 139-77); V.62-3 (AD 140-72).

\(^{309}\) Kolendo (1988-9).

\(^{310}\) See Mommsen (1881) 34 for a proposal that the world was divided according to an ‘ethnologisches Schema’ from which the *nationes* were selected.
who were natione Pannonicus or say Graecus, they claimed membership of a group created by the Romans and not necessarily tied to a clearly defined geographical area. This places limits on detailed recruitment studies, or examinations of changes in recruitment patterns over time, because in many instances it would render impossible explorations of whether servicemen were recruited from a particular city, rural region or even province. Perhaps we should not be too pessimistic: the examples considered may be regarded as extreme: the general origins of a natione Aegyptius are not too difficult to recover. But problems of specificity remain: where in Egypt?

It would be overly-simplistic to argue that the various ethnic-organisational groups had no input into the construction of their self-identity. A worthwhile comparandum are the Batavi, partly because they formed an important part of the custodes corporis, with whom we have already compared the classes.\textsuperscript{311} Tacitus reports that the Batavi were originally an offshoot of the Chatti who migrated (Chattorum quondam populus et seditione domestica in eas sedes transgressus) to live in unpopulated land (extrema Gallicae orae vacua cultoribus) in the Rhine/Meuse delta, probably between 51 and 15 BC.\textsuperscript{312}

However, Roymans has argued that there is no archaeological evidence for the region being abandoned, and suggests that the Batavi were formed from a small group of Chatti who had offered their military service to the Romans, and the remnants of tribes who had once belonged to the Eburonean group which previously dominated the area.\textsuperscript{313} Several other tribes, including the Cananefates, were subordinate to the

\textsuperscript{311} As Bellen (1981) 36 noted, ten out of fifteen references to the origins of custodes in the Claudian and Neronian periods are to those who were natione Batavus.

\textsuperscript{312} Tac. Germ. 29; Hist. 4.12; for the date see Roymans (2004) 24.

Batavi as part of the pre-Flavian *civitas Batavorum*. These people were probably considered Batavi by the Romans, and may have seen themselves in that way.

Van Driel-Murray has argued that the Batavi were a ‘martial race’ whose external definition as such by the Romans helped to forge an identity which had no basis in their history, but was encouraged by mass recruitment into the Roman military forces. This recruitment was seemingly based on a treaty with the Romans, partly explaining their presence in the bodyguard of the Julio-Claudian Emperors. Roymans adduces a range of literary and material evidence which suggests that the Batavi not only passively received this identity but actively reinforced and developed it. For example, he cites the mid-first century AD gravestone of Imerix, a *Batavus*, found in Dalmatia, decorated with the image of a cavalryman.

Similarly, one could imagine that *classis* servicemen, when stating that they were *Bessi, Pannonii* and so forth, did not simply passively accept Roman-formed identities, but actively developed them within the context of the *classes*, while surrounded by people from different ethnic backgrounds. There is no evidence for what this meant in practice. We can however state that these different groups, alongside Italian locals, were the main audience for the epitaphs set up in Italy. This audience would probably not have heard of the particular tribe or settlement from which a serviceman came. Yet they may have recognised the broad ethnic groups found in the epitaphs.

---

314 Ibid. 205-9.
315 Ibid.
318 Roymans (2004) 221-34.
319 AE 1971 299.
320 Speidel (1986) 474 uses not dissimilar arguments to explain his two categories of origin statements in *auxilia diplomata*.
I shall not here discuss what the servicemen may have been trying to say with these adjectives, if revealing their geographical origins is accepted as not a prime concern. However, one could recall a passage in the *Digest*, where Ulpian discusses the relevance of the *natio* of a slave to their buyer, because certain *nationes* were associated with certain characteristics.321 This seems to have influenced how the Batavi were regarded, and perhaps could contribute to a deeper understanding of the character of the *classis* groupings.

In the above, I have argued that evolution in the frequency and nature of origin provision in *classis* epitaphs may be evidence for the formalisation of *classis* service in the first century AD. While origins were initially rarely expressed, the later first and second centuries saw the presentation of this information in around half of the surviving inscriptions, normally through *natio* plus ethnic adjective. This development can reasonably be explained through the influence of the epigraphic habits of *milites* in Italy. I tentatively suggest that the interest in recording origins in military *diplomata* may have encouraged this. The manner in which origins were recorded in *classis diplomata* varied considerably over time, and the many variations resist complete explanation. However, we can observe a broad trend whereby geographical origins became increasingly important, perhaps because of changing views of the Roman empire.

If we take the epitaphs and *diplomata* at face value, there is little good evidence for attempts to recruit exclusively from maritime peoples. We shall return to this problem in Chapter Two, but this may indicate that the *classes* were expected to perform a mixture of terrestrial and maritime tasks. By considering the nature of *classis* service, the following section will reinforce this point.

321 *Dig.* 21.1.31.21.
The above must take into account that the ethnic adjectives employed in epitaphs may reflect a Roman view of the world, their use encouraged by recruitment from particular peoples who then employed Roman organisational divisions to develop a particular self-image. The comparative example of the Batavi may support this contestation. The nature of this self-image is very difficult to recover. However, at least for the Pannonii and Bessi, the precise identification of geographical origins does not appear to have been a particular concern.

Although perhaps allowing a hazy sense of their regional origins, the above must hinder attempts to identify precisely where servicemen came from. The problem is greatest for considering localised recruitment, relatedly seeing whether there were changes over time, or investigating the significance of urban or rural recruitment. Diplomata can be of some help, but the apparently schematic division between naming cities in the east and tribes in the west for much of the second century AD undermines their reliability. Only where we have other evidence for enlistment from a particular place, as we shall see for the Fayoum, can more extensive investigations into recruitment processes be undertaken.

5. The nature of service

I shall now examine the composition of the lower ranks of the Italian classes and the terminology used to describe them, to work towards an understanding of the sort of tasks they were expected to perform.\textsuperscript{322} Scholars agree that classis servicemen presented themselves and were regarded as milites, at least from the Claudian period.

\textsuperscript{322} For officers see Ferrero (1878) 32-9; Fiebiger (1894) 346-416; Chapot (1896) 109-70; Starr (1960) 30-45; Wickert (1949-50) 113-20; Sander (1957); Reddé (1986) 534-45, (1995). This section concentrates purely on the basic milites, and does not consider the wide range of individuals with particular functions in the classes e.g. architecti, gubernatores, medici, custodes armorum.
However, there are debates over the real division of labour. Ferrero and his followers argued that there were separate groups of rowers, sailors and marines.\textsuperscript{323} Thus, the situation remained much as it had in Hellenistic and Republican war fleets.\textsuperscript{324}

In contrast, De la Berge and more fully Starr argued that there was only one main group of \textit{classis} members who had combat training alongside their nautical skills.\textsuperscript{325} Starr acknowledged that there may have been a small group of deck soldiers with extra training, but these would have been formally indistinguishable from the other ‘sailors’.\textsuperscript{326} Similarly, at least regarding the second century AD, Reddé could not detect any difference between ‘épibates’ and ‘matelots’, asserting that even if there was a weak formal distinction, both groups received military training and were equipped for land combat.\textsuperscript{327} He referred to this general group either as ‘matelots’ or ‘soldats’.\textsuperscript{328}

There is also debate over changes to the \textit{classes} in the first century AD. We saw that Mommsen argued that the \textit{classes} were militarised by Claudius.\textsuperscript{329} This could suggest that the tasks envisioned for the \textit{classes} were quite different at the start of the empire from later periods. However, the evidence for this transformation is weak, and the hypothesis should probably be rejected.

More recently, Oorthuijs has argued that the Augustan \textit{classes} retained the essential form of Hellenistic war fleets, but that Claudius created a marine corps.

\textsuperscript{323} Ferrero (1878) 40-1; Chapot (1896) 171-2; Wickert (1949-50) 121-3; Kienast (1966) 23-4; Oorthuijs (2006).
\textsuperscript{324} For this arrangement in Greek fleets see Casson (1971) 304-9. For marines in the Republican period see e.g. Caes. \textit{B Civ.} 1.57; 3.24; Vell. Pat. 2.84.
\textsuperscript{325} De la Berge (1886) 101, 162; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 55-61. Followed by Webster (1985\textsuperscript{3}) 166; Saddington (2009).
\textsuperscript{326} Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 58.
\textsuperscript{328} ‘Soldats’ also used by Chapot (1896) 171; cf. e.g.: Speidel (1986) 467: ‘soldiers of the fleet’; Phang (2001) 464: ‘fleet soldier’.
\textsuperscript{329} Mommsen (1881) 463-4; see above p. 47.
divided into *centuriae*.\(^{330}\) I shall concentrate on a few emblematic flaws to argue against his position.

As we shall note repeatedly, no epigraphy supports the hypothesis of a Claudian marine corps. Oorthuijs suggests that the extremely obscure post of *suboptio* could have been created to assist the management of a *centuria* of marines divided over several ships, but nothing backs this assertion.\(^{331}\) A further major problem arises because of a second century AD epitaph from Misenum for a *gubernator*, recording that he belonged to a *centuria*.\(^{332}\) Oorthuijs summarily dismisses this evidence, but it clearly shows that not only men outside a putative naval hierarchy considered themselves part of *centuriae*.\(^{333}\)

Beyond epigraphy, Oorthuijs claims that Vegetius clearly distinguished between different groups on ship, and, in describing the arms which a crewman should carry, refers specifically to *milites*, not *remiges*.\(^{334}\) These *milites* should then be understood as marines. But we shall see that Vegetius is quite obscure when discussing different groups in the *classes*, and should be set in a wider context of literary vagueness about the division of labour in the imperial *classes*.\(^{335}\) Moreover, as the Introduction notes, although claiming to accurately present the earlier imperial *classes*, Vegetius was writing a political text, heavily influenced by contemporary circumstances and containing some major errors or misunderstandings.\(^{336}\) Thus, even

---


\(^{331}\) Ibid. 177-80 (note also Sander (1957) 356). There are only seven documentary references to *suboptiones*, none revealing their duties: *CIL* X 3496, 3497 (= Tuck (2005) no.25); *CIL* XI 67, 349 (= *ILS* 2860), 3531 (= *ILS* 2859); *AE* 1985 401; *ChLA* III 200 (= *P. Lond.* II 229 = *CPL* 120 = *FIRA* III 132 = *AE* 1896 21); cf. Chapot (1896) 163; Starr (1960) 60; Reddé (1986) 538.

\(^{332}\) *CIL* X 3385: *D(is) M(anibus) / M(arci) Antoni Apol[...] / guberna[...] / centur(ia) Ar[...]--*. For the ship as a *centuria*, see below pp. 85-6.

\(^{333}\) Oorthuijs (2006) 177 n.4.

\(^{334}\) *Veg.* Mil. 4.44: *ut catafracti vel loricati, galeati etiam et ocreis muniti sint milites*. Oorthuijs (2006) 177.

\(^{335}\) See below p. 95.

\(^{336}\) See above p. 30.
if Oorthuijs is right to identify the heavily-armed *milites* as marines, they did not necessarily exist in our period.\(^{337}\) Given this very poor evidence for a marine corps in our period, one cannot demonstrate the creation of one by Claudius.

There is therefore little evidence for fundamental alterations to *classis* manpower in the first century AD. At the other extreme, Starr argued that the *classes* were fully militarised from their creation, with no sense of change over time.\(^{338}\) Yet, Reddé identified a slow evolution, which he termed ‘militarisation’, whereby the *classes* were progressively integrated with the Roman army.\(^{339}\) He has expressed some uncertainty over the character of the *classes* during the first century AD, noting documentary references to *remiges*, the appearance of rowers and marines in a passage of Tacitus discussed below, and the presence of a *trierarchus* and *centurio classicus* at the death of Agrippina the Younger.\(^{340}\) He considers the latter as possible evidence for split naval and military command hierarchies in the first century, though admits it is far from decisive. He does not engage closely with pre-Flavian epigraphy, which seems to me very important for this problem.

In an attempt to shed further light on these two issues, I shall re-examine the epitaphs, literature and *diplomata* in turn. Agreeing with the *communis opinio*, I shall suggest that the *classis* servicemen presented themselves and were regarded as *milites*. Cautiously siding with Starr and Reddé, especially because of situations demonstrating that *classis milites* as a group could switch between sea and land tasks, I shall argue that these men may have been organised as one group, trained in and

---

\(^{337}\) Oorthuijs (2006) 177 sees the marines of Vegetius in second century AD tombstones portraying *classis* servicemen, but see below p. 95 n.404.
\(^{338}\) Starr (1960) *passim* but e.g. 66-74.
\(^{339}\) Reddé (1986) 524-6. Though it is unclear how this evolution fits with his statement on p. 503 that the Augustan *classes* were an integral part of the army.
entrusted with the general functions of other Roman milites but who could also row. That is not to argue that all Roman milites were identical: we shall see that legionaries could be considered of a higher status. Instead, my emphasis is on rejecting occasional scholarly distinctions between high status land troops and low status mariners.

Regarding our second problem, I shall suggest that while there is evidence, especially in epitaphs but also possibly in diplomata, for changes across the first century AD which could be regarded as symptoms of militarisation, we should interpret these as the formalisation of classis service, or perhaps simply of the epigraphic practices of their members.

The overall argument will lead to some conclusions on the implications for classis recruitment, for how we should regard the duties undertaken by classis servicemen, and for the status and functions of the Roman imperial miles, and the nature of Roman militia.

As is evident, a range of modern terms has been used for the members of the Italian classes. Regarding whether servicemen should be considered ‘sailors’ or ‘soldiers’, I shall suggest that the former is a wholly unsatisfactory term because it can apply only to a small technical subset of classis members. However, ‘soldier’ is a rather restrictive category, which does not fully take into account the broad character of the Roman imperial miles, as we shall see. Thus, when translating miles in a classis context, I have employed the neutral “serviceman”.

The coming arguments partly rest on milites being able to master rowing relatively easily, with time remaining for other training. Rowing and ships therefore merit consideration. Epitaphs indicate that the majority of Italian classis vessels were liburnians and triremes, though each classis also possessed several quadriremes and
quinquiremes, and the *classis Misenensis* a hexereme. Following Morrison, it is generally thought that liburnians were powered by two banks of oars on each side of the ship, with one rower per oar. Triremes are argued to have had three banks of oars. Above that, ships were named after the number of rowers on each side of the ship. So a quadrireme could be a two banked ship with two rowers per oar.

The arrangements proposed for the polyremes are based on the modern hypothesis concerning the trireme layout. This rests on relatively limited literary, documentary and iconographical evidence. However, it has been tested through the construction of the trireme *Olympias*, trialled in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Although the ship achieved lower speeds than projected and the bottom bank of rowers operated inefficiently, it has generally been considered a vindication of the hypothesis.

The *Olympias* trials have shown that the rowers required good training. Ancient evidence repeatedly shows a concern with crew training. For instance, Thucydides has Pericles put the maritime superiority of the Athenians to the Spartans...
down to their greater experience and practice. The account of Polybius of the Battle of the Egadi Islands in 241 BC contrasts the excellent training of the Roman oarsmen (τῶν δὲ πληρωμάτων εὐχερῶς ἀναφερόντων τὸν κλύδωνα ταῖς εὐεξίαις...; τὰ τε πληρώματα συγκεκροτημένα διαφέρουσαν αὐτοῖς τὴν χρείαν παρείχετο) with the inexperience of the Carthaginians (τὰ δὲ πληρώματα τελέως ἦν ἀνάσκητα καὶ πρὸς καιρὸν ἐμβεβλημένα). The training of the crews of Octavian in 36 BC before his Sicilian expedition is given considerable coverage.

This could indicate that classis milites had to devote considerable time to rowing training, and that perhaps skilled oarsmen were desired recruits. However, the Olympias trials have shown that only a brief period of intensive training for inexperienced rowers, perhaps two or three days, is sufficient for basic needs. Secondly, our evidence for the importance of training concerns vessels operating in politically divided waters which demanded skill in sea battles. Italian classis members never needed to perform particularly elegant battle manoeuvres. We can therefore reasonably argue that, although servicemen would have been well-trained, the standards required may not have been as high as in earlier fleets. Rowing practice need not have deprived them of time for sufficient training in other tasks useful to the Roman miles. Nor were talented oarsmen necessarily in great demand, because the desired skills could be learnt in relatively little time. We have already seen that gens de mer were not the focus of recruitment.

348 Thuc. 1.142.6-9.
349 Polyb. 1.60.9, 61.3-4.
350 Vell. Pat. 2.79.2; Suet. Aug. 16.1; Cass. Dio 48.51.5.
Classis ship-types prompt a final observation. Triremes and liburnians were fast and not especially spacious.\textsuperscript{352} Important functions of the classes included the transportation of imperial dignitaries, and being able to speedily redeploy.\textsuperscript{353} There was no sense in lumbering them with armed marines unless expecting naval combat. This provides circumstantial evidence for the hypothesis that there was only one main group of servicemen in the Italian classes.

5.1 Servicemen as milites in epitaphs

This section will consider classis funerary epigraphy. First I shall review the evidence for the Flavian period and later, which indicates that, if they described themselves as anything, classis servicemen used miles, and produced epitaphs which shared the characteristics of Roman military funerary epigraphy. As for pre-Flavian documentation, I shall argue that although its military character is less prevalent, changes across the first century should be understood as the product of formalisation, not the militarisation of the classes and their transformation from quite different institutions. I shall then consider reasons for the almost total absence in the epitaphs of sailors, rowers or separate marines. Finally, I shall examine some Greek evidence supporting the overall argument.

Both pre- and post-Flavian epitaphs are united in the lack of variation in describing the low-ranking men expected to appear in Mediterranean war fleets: rowers, sailors and marines. There are no rowers (remiges). There is one example of a

\textsuperscript{352} See Casson (1991\textsuperscript{2}) e.g. 87, 92 for the limited space on triremes; cf. Morrison, Coates and Rankov (2000\textsuperscript{2}) 226-30.

\textsuperscript{353} See Chapter Four.
sailor (nauta) from the first century AD. Often no rank is mentioned, probably commemorating “ordinary” rankers. Where such men are defined, they are usually termed milites.

At Rome in the later first and second centuries, approximately eighty four deceased classis servicemen (71% of the total, including officers) were called milites. The proportions of normal servicemen elsewhere are lower, and so are the corresponding proportions of explicit milites. Ninety men from Misenum (26%) were described as milites. No rank was recorded in fifty five cases (16%) while there are thirty seven examples (11%) of manipularis, perhaps a local synonym for miles. That just over 50% of the total were normal servicemen cannot reflect reality: the expense of erecting stone funerary monuments was perhaps prohibitive, thus the artificially high proportion of officers represented.

At Ravenna, there were only four milites named in the surviving epitaphs, though in thirty six instances (45%) no rank was given. The total proportion of normal servicemen at Ravenna is therefore roughly similar to that at Misenum. Why so many fewer men called themselves milites is uncertain. There is no reason to suppose that the composition of the classis Ravennas was any different from that at Misenum and therefore no reason to think that only one classis possessed milites. Different epigraphic habits, or chance-survival, are likelier explanations. The higher proportions of normal servicemen at Rome may reflect, among other things, greater access to cheaper marble or higher survival rates.

354 Append. 36.
355 Starr (1960²) 59, followed by Reddé (1986) 522-3 and (2000) 180, Wickert (1949-50) 121 and Kienast (1966) 23 n.61 suggested that manipularis was a term of specification, perhaps used of deck soldiers. But they cannot explain why the term was limited to the classis Misenensis.
356 CIL XI 32, 103, 6740; Mansuelli (1967) no.148.
Therefore, while the proportion of *classis* servicemen who termed themselves *milites* was not always overwhelming, if calling themselves anything they normally used that word. The “military” nature of *classis* service, even when the deceased were not labelled *milites*, can be seen in records of service length and the use of *militare*. This verb features in approximately 50% of *classis* inscriptions from Misenum, Ravenna and Rome. *Stipendiorum* was a rare alternative.357 The use of *militavit* by *milites* in general was common in the later first and second century, in particular in Italy, whereas *stipendiorum* was popular in the provinces. By way of demonstration, at Rome, *militavit* appears in inscriptions eight hundred and thirty six times. There are only eighty instances of *stipendiorum*. There are three hundred and sixty two examples of *stipendiorum* in German epigraphy, but only seventeen of *militavit*. To give some further details, service length was recorded in around 66% of the reasonably complete two hundred and thirteen praetorian epitaphs from Rome of the second century.358 Of the two hundred and seventy epitaphs of the *equites singulares*, it is mentioned in virtually all reasonably intact inscriptions.359 Thus, as with forms of origin statements, *classis* servicemen adopted the military epigraphic habits of Italy.

We should briefly mention the designation of ships with numerals on *classis* epitaphs, especially in the second century. Thus in an epitaph from Misenum the trireme Mars was designated by *III (D(is) M(anibus) Cn(aei) Silani Pii / III Mart(e)...*) , while the same numerals were used of the Victoria at Ravenna (*D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucius) Fulvi(us) Sever(us) / scrib(a) III Vict(oria)).*360 Alternatively, the deceased identified their *centuria* with the name of its *centurio*, sometimes employing the 7 symbol used in army epitaphs for a *centuria*. Examples include *M(arcus)*

---

357 Eight examples at Misenum, two at Ravenna, three at Rome.
358 Based on Clauss (1973b) 92-5.
360 CIL X 3627; CIL XI 59.
Epidius Quadratus / miles / ex classe / Misenensi / (centuria) Cn(aei) Valeri / Prisci and T(iti) Atti Nepotis qui Zeaer(?) / miles clas(sis) pr(aetoriae) Misen(ensis) [(centuria) Iulii Quinti].\(^{361}\) A blurring of the two occurs, whereby the ship itself could be described as a centuria (e.g. L(ucius) Antonius Leo q(ui) / et Neon Zoili f(ilius)... c(enturia) III Asclepio...), though this tends to be a later second or third century habit, and there can be some ambiguity.\(^{362}\) In any case, it could further demonstrate the military character of classis funerary epigraphy.

The above describes the situation in later first and second century AD epitaphs. However, earlier funerary epigraphy possesses a somewhat different character. It is perhaps significant that our sole attested nauta was probably Julio-Claudian. The following will consider the nature of any differences, and whether they can be ascribed to major changes in the Italian classes in the first century AD, or perhaps the militarisation mentioned by Reddé.\(^{363}\)

Of the forty one pre-Flavian funerary monuments, sixteen were erected by or for men not of officer class or with a specialised function. On these sixteen, three peregrines and one Roman citizen were described as milites; the others gave no rank.\(^{364}\) The infrequency of the word could suggest that the classes, or at least the epigraphic habits of their members, had less of a military character in this period.

It is worth briefly discussing L. Trebius, who described himself as classicus miles.\(^{365}\) This phrase appears only here in funerary epigraphy and is otherwise

---

\(^{361}\) CIL X 7592; CIL X 3386.

\(^{362}\) CIL X 3377 (= ILS 2839); cf. CIL III 7327; CIL X 8119; ILS 2838. Problems arise because, as Starr (1960) 64 n.31 noted, the symbol used for centuria could sometimes stand for centurio e.g. how should one interpret CIL X 3382: D(is) M(anibus) / M(arcus) Atime/tianus | (centurio/a?) III Vene/...?

\(^{363}\) See above p. 79.

\(^{364}\) Append. 16, 18, 30, 39.

\(^{365}\) Append. 39; cf. AE 1972 199 (from Aquileia, possibly early, see below p. 171): M(arcus) Mevius / Praxii f(ilius) Telephus | (centurio) classicus; CIL VIII 21042 (from Cherchell, perhaps second century AD): Magius Maxim(u)s / (? (centurio) c)lassicus...
confined to Livy, whose usage suggests that *classicus* was purely descriptive. It was the equivalent of *miles auxiliarius*. Because of this, the use of *classicus* would be superfluous for calling oneself a *miles*, explaining its infrequent use, but nevertheless hinting at how even in the early first century AD *classis* servicemen could regard themselves as similar to other *milites*.

Moreover, length of service is given in eight of these epitaphs, so in approximately the same proportion (50%) as noted for later funerary monuments. *Militavit* was used five times, wholly expected in the context of Italian military epigraphy. Difficult to explain are two servicemen who recorded their period of service with *stipendiorum*. Different because of his explicit reference to discharge is the epitaph of L. Trebius Ruso.

While taking into account the very small sample of early epitaphs, that service length was recorded in the same proportions as it would be later encourages us not to overstate differences in the character of the *classes* over time. A further observation can be made by comparing these habits with those of the *custodes corporis*. The only *custodes* to use *militare* on their epitaphs were a pair whose service dates to the...

---

366 E.g. Livy 21.61.2: *haud procul Tarracone classicos milites navalesque socios vagos palantesque per agros... ad naves compellit* (referring to an attack made by Hasdrubal in 218 BC). After the capture of Carthago Nova in 210 BC, a dispute broke out between *legionarii milites* and *classici milites*, each supporting rivals for a mural crown (26.48.12). Thus a *miles* could either be *legionarius* or *classicus*, suggesting that when referring to the Republican period the latter was a descriptive term for citizens who fought on ships.

367 Note the early imperial epitaph *CIL* III 4753: *Ambidrabo f(ilio) / equiti auxiliario / a(nno) XX h(ic) s(itus) est*; cf. Saddington (1982) 56. For literary examples see Cic. *Fam*. 10.32.5; Livy 40.40.12; Gell. *NA*. 7.17.3.

368 *Classici* appears in imperial literature, used generically for *classis* members e.g. Tac. *Hist*. 3.50: *ad has copias e classicis Ravennatibus, legionariam militiam poscentibus, optimus quisque adsciti*; cf. Tac. *Hist*. 2.17; Vell. *Pat*. 2.121.1. Note also *classiarius* e.g. Tac. *Ann*. 14.8: *Obarito centurione classicario*; cf. Suet. *Otho* 8.2; Vesp. 8.3.

369 Append. 14, 16, 23, 28, 41.

370 Append. 12, 18.

371 Append. 39.
Neronian period.\textsuperscript{372} Our \textit{classis} epitaphs are very difficult to date more precisely than our broad pre- and post-Flavian groups.\textsuperscript{373} However, like the \textit{custodes}, one wonders whether service length was given only in epitaphs from the Neronian or perhaps Claudian periods.\textsuperscript{374} If correct, this habit could have developed alongside the increasing importance of service length from the mid-first century in determining when one could receive \textit{civitas} and \textit{conubium}. This last point can perhaps explain the greater military character of later epitaphs, and we could again potentially credit such developments to formalisation.

Thus normal \textit{classis} servicemen, if calling themselves anything, used the term \textit{milites} and by the later first century AD produced epitaphs much like those of the legions and \textit{auxilia}. These two points do not, however, demonstrate that there was only one actual category of servicemen in the \textit{classes}. Inscriptions can be deceptive: real status could be concealed on purpose or because standard models of expression were used, especially by those unfamiliar with the epigraphic habit. If we compared the imperial \textit{classes} to other Mediterranean fleets we would expect to find rowers, sailors and possibly marines.

So where are these men? The almost total absence of genuine \textit{nautae} (sailors with technical skills) is explicable: very few probably served in the imperial \textit{classes}, because oared warships relied primarily on their rowers, not sails, for power.\textsuperscript{375} There is second or early third century AD evidence for specialists concerned with sailing technicalities: from Misenum we know of two \textit{velarii}, who perhaps saw to the furling

\begin{footnotesize}
372 \textit{CIL} VI 8806 (= \textit{ILS} 1727): Nobilis / miles Impera(toris) / Neronis Aug(usti) / corp(oris) cust(os)... milit(atit) an(nos) II ...; 8808: Phoebus / Neronis Claud(i) / Caesaris Aug(usti) / corp(oris) cust(os)... milit(atit) an(nos) VIII.

373 See above pp. 38-44.

374 In contrast with the praetorians, where service length was mentioned in 88\% of the forty reasonably complete first century epitaphs collected by Clauss (1973b) 92-5.

375 Already noted by Wickert (1949-50) 123.
\end{footnotesize}
and unfurling of sails. But this restricted group is not comparable to the “normal” servicemen. For this reason in particular, the application by Starr of the term ‘sailor’ to members of the imperial classes is wholly inappropriate.

The absence of remiges can be explained variously. Possibly, rowers were of such a low status or paid so badly that they could not afford stone funerary monuments. However, this hypothesis lacks evidence. Alternatively, remiges were ashamed of their rank because of the apparently negative way in which Romans viewed maritime service. Therefore they misleadingly claimed the higher status of milites. This argument appears to rest on prejudices to service at sea found in modern Western discourse, and is undermined by references to ships and classes in epitaphs, unsuitable for men wanting to conceal maritime service.

The simplest interpretation is that classis servicemen called themselves milites because that is what they were. Scholars have only suggested that the classis milites were otherwise because they have approached them as being sailors or rowers, and contrasted them with marines. No one, to my knowledge, has ever questioned the use of miles to describe an auxiliary. If we accept that the classes were, like the cohortes and alae, intrinsically linked to what we call the Roman army, we should not be surprised at the use of miles by classis servicemen. This conclusion may also support the position of Starr and Reddé that there was only one group of servicemen in the classes. At this stage however, one cannot pronounce with certainty on the point.

---

376 CIL X 3499 (= ILS 2878); CIL X 3500 (= ILS 2879); cf. Reddé (1986) 537 for further specialists.
378 Robiou (1872) 154, but this view can persist in recent scholarship: e.g. Le Bohec (1996) 319. Even when scholars attribute military characteristics to the classes, they are inclined to write snidely about remiges calling themselves milites e.g. Starr (1960) 58: they ‘jealously claimed their lawful title of soldiers.’
379 Attitudes discussed by e.g. Rediker (1993) 10-14, 166, 226-7; Taylor (1993) 43.
380 Ulpian (Dig. 37.13.1) may upset the applecart: item nauarchos et trierarchos classium iure militari posse testari nulla dubitatio est. in classibus omnes remiges et nautae milites sunt. item vigiles milites sunt et iure militari eos testari posse nulla dubitatio est. Scholars (e.g. Wickert (1949-50) 122; cf. Starr
Greek documentary evidence supports the overall argument. There are a few examples of deceased *classis* servicemen termed as στρατιώται, associating them with the *milités* conventionally considered soldiers.⁸¹ Not confined to funerary monuments, this usage appears in Egyptian private documents such as a second century *ostracon* from Mons Claudianus detailing a debt to a member of the Alexandrian *classis*, and a late first or early second century papyrus recording a hayloft sale.⁸² Therefore, we could reasonably consider the adoption of the terminology not purely as a second century funerary epigraphic habit designed to obscure the nature of *classis* service, but a wider phenomenon revealing how their members were conceptualised.

### 5.2 *Classis* service in literature

In contrast to epigraphy, literary sources can indicate that *classis* lower ranks included *remigés* (rowers), *nautae* (sailors) and *milités* (soldiers/marines), or some term referring to a combat group. Such examples are very rare, perhaps because ancient authors had so few opportunities to describe *classes* in combat in our period. However, we must be cautious in generalising from individual passages because writers could focus on unrepresentative circumstances, and use terminology without precision. To demonstrate the latter, I shall examine descriptions of the encounter

---

⁸¹ (1960) 57 have viewed this as showing that the *classes* contained true *remigés* and *nautae*, but that these were generally considered as *milités*. More correctly, de la Berge (1886) 162 (note also Sander (1957) 353) simply used the passage to show that servicemen were able to make military wills, which is all that it says. The rules that applied to *milités* more widely applied to *remigés*, despite their official generic title (see below pp. 99-101).


⁸⁸ Mons Claudianus III 541; *BGU* II 455 I.8; cf. *BGU* III 741 (= *FIRA* III 119 = *M.Chr.* 244) II.6-7.
between Galba and former classis servicemen outside Rome in AD 68, and the presentation of the classes by Vegetius. I shall then offer examples supporting the hypothesis of one group of servicemen because of the demonstrable capacity of classis servicemen to carry out tasks both on land and water.

Rarely are all three groups mentioned together in imperial literature, as when Tacitus describes betrayal in the classis Germanica in AD 69 during the uprising of Civilis: eadem etiam <in> navibus perfidia: pars remigum e Batavis tamquam imperitia officia nautarum propugnatorumque impediebant.\textsuperscript{383} Saddington pointed to this passage as evidence for marines, and Reddé has considered it as possibly suggesting that the classes of the first century AD had separate naval and military sections, though noted that the description is quite vague.\textsuperscript{384}

Crucially, we cannot assume that this passage is representative. We are confronted with a provincial classis, embedded in different circumstances from its Italian counterparts. The fluvial frontiers of the empire were more unstable than its centre. Although purely conjectural, special groups of soldiers travelling with classis vessels may therefore have been more common on the Rhine and Danube.

The propugnatores mentioned by Tacitus could be explained thus: as a special contingent, perhaps legionaries or auxiliaries, embarked in response to the particular difficulties of the uprising.\textsuperscript{385} As another instance, Dio describes Trajan embarking legions and archers during his Parthian campaign.\textsuperscript{386} Therefore, the

\textsuperscript{383} Tac. Hist. 4.16, perhaps the only good example. There are some cases e.g. Tac. Ann. 2.23 where milites and nautae are mentioned, but here Tacitus describes the classis constructed by Germanicus to transport his legions, not permanent classis servicemen; cf. Tac. Hist. 2.35, 43; Plut. Otho 10; Philo De spec. leg. 1.121 (highly rhetorical).
\textsuperscript{385} This applies to several of the references in n.383; cf. Saddington (2009) 132.
\textsuperscript{386} Cass. Dio 68.26.1: ἀλλ’ ἦν πολλὴ τῷ Τραϊανῷ καὶ τῶν νεῶν καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν περιουσία, αἱ μὲν ἐζεύγνυντο πολλῷ τάχει, αἱ δὲ πρὸ ἐκείνων ἰδιακόμησιον ὀπλίτας τε καὶ τοξότας φέροντα...
passage does not offer conclusive evidence for standard manpower divisions in the Italian classes.

More frequently, only one group is mentioned. Pliny described Gaius Caligula travelling from Astura to Antium accompanied by a classis.\textsuperscript{387} The crew of his quinquereme were described as remiges (\textit{cum e tota classe quinqueremis sola non proficeret...quod se revocaret quadringentorumque remigum obsequio contra se intercederet}).

As a second example, Tacitus recounted how Vitellian forces massacred milites trium Liburnicarum.\textsuperscript{388} Elsewhere in the same text, L. Vitellius threatened to destroy Tarracina, after members of the classis Misenensis, which had revolted from his brother, along with some gladiators, had captured it and did not dare to leave. These are termed remiges: clausis illic gladiatoribus remigibusque, qui non egredi moenia neque pericum in aperto audebant.\textsuperscript{389} It is impossible to know if our sources were being specific, but the discussion to come would suggest otherwise.

Many more examples of this imprecision will reappear throughout the thesis. A good case-study for the difficulties of using literature for investigating classis division of labour is the entrance of Galba into Rome in AD 68 when he was greeted at the Mulvian Bridge by a crowd of classis Misenensis members, which he duly attacked. They had been gathered in Rome by Nero to be transformed into the legio I Adiutrix, but this had not been legally finalised at his death, hence demands made to Galba for an aquila and signa.\textsuperscript{390} Suetonius described them as classiarii, quos Nero

\textsuperscript{387} Plin. \textit{NH} 32.4; \textit{cf.} below p. 270.
\textsuperscript{388} Tac. \textit{Hist}. 3.14.
\textsuperscript{389} Ibid. 3.76.
\textsuperscript{390} Diplomata \textit{(CIL} XVI 7-9\textit{)} show that Galba eventually consented, allowing us to reconcile those accounts which connect Nero to the legion with Dio (55.24.2), who claims that Galba formed it; \textit{cf.} below pp. 219-23. This identification of these men is generally followed e.g. Mommsen in \textit{CIL} III (1873), p. 2014; Ritterling in \textit{RE} XII (1925), \textit{s.v. legio I Adiutrix}, 1381-2; Parker (1928) 100; Starr
ex remigibus iustos milites fecerat.\textsuperscript{391} It is hard to pick out what distinguished a classiarius from a remex.\textsuperscript{392} Plutarch calls them a crowd of rowers: ἐνετύγχανεν ἀκοσμίᾳ καὶ θορύβῳ τὸν ἔρετον τὴν ὄδον προκατεχόντων καὶ περικεχυμένων πανταχόθεν.\textsuperscript{393} Cassius Dio ignored their maritime associations: ώς δ’ ἐπλησίασε τῇ πόλει, ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ οἱ δορυφόροι τοῦ Νέρωνος...\textsuperscript{394} Tacitus refers to the subsequent attack on these men by Galba thus: trucidatis tot milibus inermium militum.\textsuperscript{395} Thus, the same group was termed classiarii, remiges, ἔρεται, δορυφόροι and milites.

Before continuing, we must consider the Suetonian notion that the servicemen had been transformed from remiges to iusti milites. This could imply that classis members were not really regarded as milites at all, but to obtain that status had to become legionaries, or at the very least serve on land. However, I shall argue that this phrase does not distinguish between milites and “not-milites”, but only shows that legionaries were regarded as a “truer” or superior sort of miles.

\textsuperscript{391} Suet. Galba 12.2.
\textsuperscript{392} For classiarius and classicus, see above pp. 86-7.
\textsuperscript{393} Plut. Galb. 15.3-4.
\textsuperscript{394} Cass. Dio 64.3.1.
\textsuperscript{395} Tac. Hist. 1.6.
Commentators have had little to say on the phrase.\textsuperscript{396} Suetonius himself does not use it elsewhere. However, the biographer states that Vitellius, in response to the Flavian threat, held a levy in Rome, promising to volunteers not only \textit{missio post victoriam} but also \textit{veteranorum iustaeque militiae commoda}.\textsuperscript{397} \textit{Iusta militia} has been interpreted as regular service for a set number of years, and here the service terms were probably those of legionaries because citizens in Rome were levied.\textsuperscript{398} But it does not follow that \textit{iusta militia} always had to be performed by legionaries, nor that auxiliary or \textit{classis} service was not \textit{militia}.

One example of \textit{iustus miles} outside Suetonius is useful to examine. Livy described how in 214 BC, the proconsul Ti. Gracchus commanded legions largely comprised of volunteer slaves.\textsuperscript{399} Having endured quietly for two years to earn their \textit{libertas}, they began to wonder whether they would ever serve in freedom (\textit{en unquam liberi militaturi essent}). In response, Gracchus wrote to the senate requesting they be rewarded, noting \textit{bona fortique opera eorum}, and that they lacked nothing towards the \textit{exemplum iusti militis} except \textit{libertas}. Thus, a \textit{iustus miles} should ideally be in a legion, and fight well as a free Roman citizen. The sense is the truest kind of soldier, who possessed particular characteristics, some demonstrable through service. While the slaves had not yet attained that status, it does not follow that they were not already considered \textit{milites}.

While acknowledging that this is a different author writing about a different set of historical circumstances, I suggest that we should take the Suetonian use of \textit{iustus miles} in a similar manner. Thus, Suetonius probably does not deny that the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{396} Mooney (1930) does not comment on it directly but at Suet. \textit{Vit.} 15.1 (p. 359) he suggested that \textit{iusti milites} means ‘regular soldiers’.
\item \textsuperscript{397} Suet. \textit{Vit.} 15.1.
\item \textsuperscript{398} Rolfe (1914) [1979] 271; Mooney (1930) 359; Shotter (1993) 185.
\item \textsuperscript{399} Livy 24.14.3-4.
\end{itemize}
servicemen were *milites* before, or that they did not perform *militia* because they had worked at sea, but that they had now attained the most desireable kind of *miles* status as legionaries.

To return to our main argument, the analysis of the encounter between the *classis* servicemen and Galba outside Rome demonstrates that ancient authors did not always employ precise terminology. That discussion considered different authors writing in different genres (broadly, history and biography) so variation is understandable, and precision not demanded. More striking is inconsistency within one text. The *Epitoma Rei Militaris* of Vegetius contains our fullest treatment of the members of the imperial *classes*. Its problems noted in the Introduction, this tract is an excellent demonstration of inconsistency and terminological blurring.\(^{400}\)

For instance, Vegetius could picture *remiges* and *milites* as different groups: *nauarchos...qui excepti ceteris nautarum officiis gubernatoribus atque remegibus et militibus exercendis...*\(^{401}\) However, he suggested that the opportune moment for an ambush at sea was when hostile sailors were weary from rowing (*si longo remigio fatigati sunt hostium nautae...*).\(^{402}\) Strictly, these *nautae* should be called *remiges*. Breaking down the crews, Vegetius stated that the *nauarchi* needed *diligentia*, *peritia* was desired amongst *gubernatores*, while *remiges* required *virtus*.\(^{403}\) Sailors and fighting men are absent from this analysis.\(^{404}\)

---

\(^{400}\) See above p. 30.

\(^{401}\) Veg. *Mil*. 4.32.2; cf. 4.37.6, 46.4.

\(^{402}\) Ibid. 4.45.2.

\(^{403}\) Ibid. 4.43.2.

\(^{404}\) Vegetius (*Mil*. 4.44) recommended that servicemen be heavily armed for dangerous naval warfare. Scholars have used this passage, albeit with some caution and alongside iconography, to show that at least some servicemen, probably military marines, were so equipped (e.g. Bollini (1968) 87; Reddé (1986) 523; cf. Chapot (1896) 198; Starr (1960) 58). However, given his general inaccuracy, we must be cautious with Vegetius’ statements on the equipment of *milites* on warships. Vegetius was writing at a time when sea battles were expected and such arms required. For the iconographical evidence on the equipment of servicemen see Bollini (1968) 86-96; cf. Mansuelli (1967). For the Athenian evidence see von Moock (1998) esp. nos. 241, 249, 486, 568. See now also Topalilov (2002). These indicate that
The above suggests that literature of different genres represents inconsistently and often inaccurately the division of labour in the imperial *classes*. Our conclusions must be limited because of the fairly small number relevant of examples. However, acknowledging this point, it seems reasonable to conclude that when an author writes of a *remex* or *classiarius*, they could mean the same thing. Hence, the *remiges* and *milites* of our Plinian and Tacitean examples could well be the same people. Consequently, we cannot easily treat these passages as evidence for separate groups of marines, rowers or sailors.

As a supplementary but vital point, literature could support the hypothesis of only one main group of *classis* servicemen, or at least suggest that all of the servicemen received broadly similar training, no matter their usual roles, by showing how easily they could be employed in non-maritime, “military” scenarios. The following, alongside other examples, does not provide proof, but cannot be easily dismissed. According to Tacitus, servicemen suppressed a nascent revolt near Brundisium in AD 24. Three biremes were in the area, and a *quaestor* employed their crews (*is disposita classiariorum copia coeptantem cum maxime coniurationem disiecit*). As we shall see later, these ships were operating in normal circumstances, so these *classiarii* were probably not legionaries or auxiliaries embarked for a special purpose, but regular servicemen.

---

*classis* servicemen could be portrayed in a similar fashion to other *milites* on a small number of funerary monuments (see e.g. Durry (1938) 208-11; Coulston (2000) 94-5). This idealised, standardised imagery suggests only that servicemen were conceptually like other *milites*; it does not provide certain evidence for equipment or for *classis* marines.

---

405 Above p. 92.

406 See Chapter Four for further examples.

407 Tac. Ann. 4.27; cf. below pp. 241-5.

408 See above p. 83 on ship size.
Moreover, we have seen that men were drafted from the *classis Misenensis* into what became the *legio I Adiutrix* by Nero.⁴⁰⁹ Similarly, members of the *classis Ravennas* formed the *legio II Adiutrix* in AD 69.⁴¹⁰ That a large group of men could be transferred from the *classes* to terrestrial combat service, and that that single group could be variously called *remiges, classiarii* and so on, suggests that all *classis* servicemen had broadly the same skills as trained *milites* from the legions and *auxilia*, even if legionaries were considered a better form of *milites*. We shall return to these and other instances of Italian *classis* servicemen performing tasks on land in Chapter Four.⁴¹¹

### 5.3 Diplomata, *milites* and *remiges*

Finally, we come to *classis diplomata*. First, I shall argue that the use of *militare* in these documents suggests that *classis* service was officially viewed as much like that in the legions or *auxilia*. I shall then discuss the variation in terminology used to describe servicemen, especially in the first century AD, arguing that this does not clearly show that there was a distinction between rowers and marines in the Italian *classes*. Indeed, the evidence could again allow only one main group. In the first century at least, this group appears to have been termed *remiges*, but by comparing this usage with some Egyptian public documents, I shall propose that these *remiges* should be considered as the equivalent of *pedites* and *equites*, and as a type of *miles*.

---

⁴⁰⁹ See above pp. 92-3.
⁴¹⁰ See below pp. 221-3.
⁴¹¹ See also above pp. 18-19 for land duties and the provincial *classes*.
From the earliest diploma of AD 52, the use of militare indicates that the activities of the servicemen were regarded as similar to those of other milites.\textsuperscript{412} This is true for all classis diplomata bar one.\textsuperscript{413} The generic terms used for the men who militaverunt are important. In the first century, diplomata were most commonly granted to veterani qui militaverunt.\textsuperscript{414} The individual to whom the document was given was typically classified as gregalis.\textsuperscript{415} In one provincial classis diploma, the recipient came ex remigibus.\textsuperscript{416}

Sometimes, remiges, trierarchi and nauarchi were used generically to describe all the members of the classis to whom privileges were given. This could be used to distinguish these servicemen from full veterans (ie. those who had served for twenty six years or more and received honesta missio). Thus a diploma of AD 71 for members of the classis Ravennas, discharged early for bravery in war, was granted to the nauarchi, trierarchi and remiges.\textsuperscript{417} As a comparandum, an AD 73 diploma for the provincial classis in Moesia was granted to those trierarchi and remiges still in service who had completed twenty six years, and to veterani with honesta missio.\textsuperscript{418} Harder to explain is the diploma of AD 52, granted to the trierarchi and remiges of the classis Misenensis, who had obtained honesta missio.\textsuperscript{419} Perhaps these men were

\textsuperscript{412} CIL XVI 1: trierarchis et remigibus qui militaverunt in classe quae est Miseni... See below pp. 104-7 on militia.

\textsuperscript{413} Exceptional is CIL XVI 60 (= AE 1927 3) of AD 114, awarded to ii qui navigaverunt in qua/driere Ope et [...] classe prætor[ia Misen(en)]si] (exterior II.6-7). This was arguably given to men who sailed with Trajan on his Parthian expedition (McClees (1926) 420; Starr (1960?) 81, 187; Pferdehirt (2002) 88). Navigare does not necessarily reveal anything about the category of men rewarded. It was used for precision, describing what the men did to obtain privileges.

\textsuperscript{414} CIL XVI 12-16, possibly 17, 24 (= AE 1927 96); AE 1997 1273. Also note the diplomata granted to men drafted into the legiones Adiutrices (CIL XVI 7-11; AE 2002 1733; AE 2006 1833). Unusual is AE 1997 1771, for beneficiarii qui militant in classe Ravennate... These men remained in service upon receipt of benefits.

\textsuperscript{415} For three centuriones see CIL XVI 12; AE 1997 1273; AE 2002 1771. For a tesserarius see AE 2004 1282.

\textsuperscript{416} CIL XVI 24.

\textsuperscript{417} AE 2002 1771; cf. AE 2004 1282, though this is restored.

\textsuperscript{418} AE 2006 1861.

\textsuperscript{419} CIL XVI 1.
actually discharged early, though nothing is said on the matter. Instead, the variation found in early diplomata could explain why veterani was not used. No matter the terms employed, their service was always characterised with the verb militare.

Milites are never mentioned in these diplomata, but we should ask whether veterani could have been used instead of milites, or whether gregalis refers to a miles, in both cases meaning specifically marines. In the diploma from AD 52, granted to trierarchi et remiges qui militaverunt..., the recipient was a gregalis. So a remex could be a gregalis. The provincial classis diploma which speaks of ex remigibus indicates that remiges were found amongst veterani. Therefore, in the first century AD a discharged classis serviceman could variously be designated a veteranus, remex or gregalis, but nothing suggests a group of marines lurking amongst this diversity.

Second century diplomata of the Italian classes achieved a greater level of standardisation. The generic ii qui militaverunt was commonly used of the recipients, again underlining that they performed militia. As for the term used for the particular recipient, ranking servicemen were always termed gregales.

Though absolute certainty is impossible, the combined material for the first and second centuries provides no convincing evidence for multiple groups of servicemen in the Italian classes, and could indicate that there was only one main group. Curiously, in the first century this group, possibly if rewarded while in service, appears to have been termed remiges. As noted earlier, Reddé considered this among his small dossier of evidence for a non-militarised naval element in the classes in the first century AD, and could challenge the argument that the servicemen were

---

420 E.g. AE 2005 1738 (December 25 AD 119); AE 2005 691 (February 18 AD 129). There are eighteen certain further examples. Three diplomata were granted to ii qui militant, men still serving (RMD III 142 (AD 100); CIL XVI 72 (= X 7854); RMM 21 (both AD 127)).

considered *milites*. But we could compare this to the usage of *pedites* and *equites*, undoubtedly *milites*, in auxiliary *diplomata*.

This point can be reinforced by considering some public documents from Egypt which refer to *classis* members generically as rowers. In a reply to a petition concerning the rights of discharged soldiers in AD 63, the prefect of Egypt stated: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὑμῶν εἴσιν ἐκ λεγιώνος [οὔετρα]νοί οἱ δὲ ἐξ εἰλό[ν, ο]ὲ ἐκ σπειρῶν, οἱ δὲ ἑκ τοῦ ἑρετικοῦ, [ὁστε μ]ὴ εἶναι τὸ αὐτὸ πάντων δείκαιον. We are presented with official categories: legions, “*alae*-men,” “cohort-men” and “rower-men.” Although there were differences of status between these groups, the “soldierly” functions of the first three were similar. They were considered as Roman army *milites*. “Rower-men” should be no different, despite the claim of Sander that the use of *remiges* shows that these men were not really *milites*.

As to why *classis* servicemen did not describe themselves as *remiges* in epitaphs if that was the official shorthand for them, at least in the first century AD, it is worth pointing out that men in the legions and cohorts did not describe themselves as “legion-men” or “cohort-men” in funerary epigraphy, but as *milites* from *x* legion or *y* cohort. Similarly, *classis* servicemen did not call themselves by their division title, “rower-men”, but *milites* from *x classis*. Consider again individual Greek *classis* servicemen, who called themselves στρατιώται, when the official shorthand was

---

422 See above p. 79.
423 Comparison suggested but not developed by Kienast (1966) 24.
424 *P. Fouad*. 1.21 Il.12-14 (= FIRA III 171a; cf. Daris (1964) no.101a); *cf. SB* V 8247 (= FIRA III 171b; cf. Daris (1964) 101b), the record of a previous interaction between the prefect and soldiers, where the prefect stated (Il.18-20): ἀλλὰ ἢ ἄροντι ἢ τῶν ἱεροτάτων ἢ ἄλλο ἢ τῶν χορταρίων, ἄλλο ἢ τῶν κοπρλατάν. See also *Gnomon* 55 (BGU V 1210) with below pp. 131-5: οἱ ἕκ [το]ῦ ἑρετικοῦ.
425 Sander (1957) 353.
ἐρετικοί, or “rower-men”. This appears a parallel for the suggested explanations for differences between Latin epitaphs and diplomata.

But why was remiges chosen for the classis servicemen? Most probably, it was the obvious term to describe trained servicemen who could row, especially as it referred to that part of a crew in the Republican period, when genuine marines were deployed. As pedites were milites who moved by foot, and equites by horse, remiges travelled by oar.

Overall, diplomata suggest that lower ranking members of the classes were viewed as one group performing work similar to other milites, with their manner of identification changing according to variation in diplomata contents, or with early discharge. Whether this perception reflects reality, and separate groups of rowers and marines with different skills regularly served alongside each other is hard to determine. However, there is no good evidence in the diplomata for these separate groups, and I am cautiously inclined to favour the one group hypothesis. Whatever the truth, in the first century at least, and when still in service, this group appears to have been designated remiges or ἐρετικοί. I have proposed that we should consider these terms as comparable to pedites and equites, or Greek equivalents, and that the official terminology specifies a type of miles, rather than a separate class of workman, or that the classes were regarded differently in this period than in the second century.

In summary, the combined documentary and literary evidence indicates that the main body of classis servicemen were regarded as milites of a particular type. Based on the evolution of classis epitaphs, one could posit that this was not always so, and that

426 See above p. 90.
427 See above p. 77 n.324.
servicemen were not initially regarded as performing militia. However, I have argued that the greater “military” character of later epitaphs should be understood as the product of formalisation, not militarisation. Distinguishing between different types of servicemen, and understanding precisely how they were regarded, is made very challenging by the terminological inconsistency of our limited literary evidence. However, there are a few suggestions that classis servicemen were regarded as milites, and I hope to have demonstrated that the concept of iusti milites is unproblematic. Finally, diplomata suggest that classis service was considered like that performed by other Roman milites, in the use of militare, and in the proposed relationship between the use of remiges, pedites and equites (or cohortes and alae).

It is perhaps impossible to decisively resolve the debate over the real division of labour in the classes because of the obstacles in distinguishing presentation or perception from reality. However, I am inclined to tentatively support Starr and Reddé, with the proviso that the members of the classis should be considered not as sailors/matelots, but as servicemen who could row in addition to their skills as milites. I have suggested that specialist nautae were probably few in number, while there is virtually no good evidence for distinct groups of rowers and marines permanently employed in the Italian classes. Conversely, some literary evidence attests the wholesale redeployment of classis servicemen to land tasks, implying their versatility. Moreover, circumstantial evidence, such as the nature of classis ships, and the relative ease with which servicemen could be trained to row, supports this case, though does not prove it.
5.4 Milites and militia

Three major consequences arise from the discussion. The first returns us to the lack of clear connection between origins and maritime experience. Scholars have often thought that maritime skill was sought in classis recruits. For example, de la Berge and Chapot, both claiming that maritime regions and islands provided most classis recruits, argued that Illyrians were recruited because of the talents demonstrated by their piratical habits.428 Starr interpreted recruitment from the eastern Mediterranean by suggesting that its inhabitants had desirable sailing skills.429 Such arguments have extended to explaining away inland recruitment. As we have seen, Kolendo argued that classis Bessi took their name from a tribe living around the Black Sea Danube estuary because he regarded recruitment from inland tribes as problematic.430

However, if classis milites were not primarily sailors, but servicemen expected to perform similar tasks to other milites, only with extra training for rowing, the supposed need for maritime skill becomes less important and recruitment from terrestrial regions less striking. Moreover, the Olympias trials suggest that new recruits could be trained relatively quickly in rowing essentials.431 We may restate the point that classis milites need not have been gens de mer.

Secondly, it has often been assumed that, regarding evidence for servicemen performing tasks not traditionally associated with navies, these were subsidiary operations, given to a war fleet without wars to fight.432 However, our assessment of

428 De la Berge (1886) 67-8, 158 and Chapot (1896) 42-8, 182; cf. Ferrero (1878) 45.
429 Starr (1960) 76-7, though he noted that seamanship was not always a ‘prerequisite’; Webster (1985) 166; Keppie (1996) 383-4 (though note Keppie (1984b) 187, suggesting that no sailing experience was necessary).
431 See above p. 82.
432 E.g. Courtois (1939) 25-6, 28-9; Starr (1960) 168, 179; Reddé (1986) 656.
the servicemen as *milites* demands a reconsideration of such tasks: perhaps they should be considered more typical of what the *classis* servicemen did.

This can be supported by final reflections on the status and functions of the Roman imperial *miles*. I have argued that *classis* servicemen were conceptualised as a type of *miles*. Of course, references to *iusti milites* demonstrate that not all *milites* were exactly the same. However, this conclusion does encourage us to reject distinctions between a naval class of people who were not *milites*, and land servicemen who were. We are simply dealing with various groups performing *militia*.

That *militia* included not only land tasks but also apparently rowing indicates its breadth. This has caused confusion in the past, as Chapot suggested when discussing the ‘l’opposition de sens flagrante entre *remigibus et militaverunt*’.433 Such an opposition seems to have informed Reddé when he discussed the use of *remiges* in first century documentation as implying *classes* less militarised than those of the second century.434

The flexibility of *militia* is suggested in a recent discussion by M. A. Speidel.435 Arguing that *militia* could have the sense of ‘service’ even in the first century AD, he notes, for instance, that Propertius and Horace referred to *militia Veneris*, and Cicero talked about *militia urbana*.436 While these rhetorical examples surely present love or politics as sharing the challenges of military activity, a point Speidel does not make clear, they are suggestive of a malleability of meaning.

For another example suggesting the wider applicability of the term *militia*, we can briefly consider the *Vigiles*, whom Starr described as ‘closely akin’ to the
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433 Chapot (1896) 171.
434 See above p. 79.
classes.\textsuperscript{437} Originally recruited from freedmen by Augustus in AD 6, they were primarily tasked with fighting fires.\textsuperscript{438} Reynolds thought that this duty, traditionally performed by public and private servile \textit{familiae}, was considered ‘servile’, hence the employment of \textit{liberti} by Augustus.\textsuperscript{439}

However, it is too simplistic to consider fire-fighting as purely servile. Claudius deployed \textit{cohortes urbaneae} for the task in Ostia and Puteoli.\textsuperscript{440} Furthermore, despite libertine origins, the \textit{Vigiles} possessed several characteristics making them comparable to \textit{milites} of the legions and \textit{auxilia}. Strabo explicitly notes their early “military” character, calling them a \textit{στρατιωτικῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθεριωτῶν}.\textsuperscript{441} Their arrangement into seven \textit{cohortes (itaque septem cohortes oportunis locis constituit)} implies such characteristics, though this language may not have been used in the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{442}

However, probably by the reign of Tiberius the \textit{Vigiles} had adopted many of the trappings of military units, including each cohort being placed under a tribune and with military centurions attached.\textsuperscript{443} They referred to themselves as \textit{milites} in their epitaphs, as demonstrated by the select examples of C. Iulius Sossianus, L. Musius October and Q. Iulius Galatus, \textit{milites} of the second, fourth and sixth cohorts

\footnotesize\textsuperscript{437} Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{2} 58; cf. Reynolds (1926) 23.
\textsuperscript{438} Str. 5.3.7; Suet. Aug. 30.1; Cass. Dio 55.26; \textit{Dig.} 1.15.1-3; cf. Reynolds (1926) 22-5; Sablayrolles (1996) 26-37.
\textsuperscript{439} Reynolds (1926) 23; \textit{familiae}: \textit{Dig.} 1.15.1.
\textsuperscript{440} Suet. Claud. 25.2: \textit{Puteolis et Ostiae singulas cohortes ad arcendos incendiorum casus collocavit}; cf. Meiggs (1973)\textsuperscript{3} 75.
\textsuperscript{441} Str. 5.3.7. Increasingly citizens were recruited: see Cass. Dio 55.26.5 and Sablayrolles (1996) 49-50.
\textsuperscript{442} \textit{Dig.} 1.15.3.pr. There is no particular reason to doubt Paul in claiming that the seven cohorts should be attributed to Augustus. However, Panciera (1978) argued (cf. Sablayrolles (1996) 32-3), on the basis of \textit{CIL} VI 282 (= \textit{ILS} 5615), that the \textit{Vigiles} could have originally been called the \textit{invigulantes pro vicinia}. If correct, we might posit further evolution, and question whether they were divided into seven \textit{cohortes} initially.
\textsuperscript{443} Sablayrolles (1996) 37-8; for a Tiberian tribune see \textit{CIL} XIV 3947; for a possible centurion see \textit{CIL} XI 6224 with Sablayrolles (1996) 579; cf. \textit{Dig.} 1.15.3.
respectively. And yet, Tacitus did not include them amongst the soldiers stationed in Rome under Tiberius.

In response to such evidence, Reynolds and Sablayrolles have characterised the *Vigiles* as being increasingly integrated alongside the other armed forces in Rome, while preserving a lower status, which seems sensible. The *Vigiles* appear to have been a group of mixed status and functions, organised like a “military” force and probably considered as *milites*, but whose origins and duties placed them somewhere between the military and servile categories.

The *classes* may not be a precise parallel, but the point that *militia* could include things potentially regarded as low status, including to modern eyes, makes the concept of a *classis miles* more comprehensible. It encourages us to view the Italian *classes* not as isolated institutions devoted to the sea, but as part of the manpower pool available to the Emperors for performing a wide range of tasks.

Moreover, this prompts some thoughts on the *classes* as military institutions. In the study mentioned above, Speidel has argued against the use of ‘militarisation’ to understand developments in Roman administration from the later second to the fourth centuries AD, whereby ‘civil’ officials came to be known as *milites*, and adopted features of military organisation. He points to the lack of separation between civil and military tasks even during the Republic, and notes the possibly wider sense of *militia* in the first and second centuries.

Similarly, perhaps the debate over the militarisation of the *classes*, and the views of Starr and Reddé that the *classes* were public, military institutions, neglect
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444 CIL VI 2964, 2780 (= ILS 2087), 2987 (= ILS 2169).
445 Tac. Ann. 4.5.
447 Speidel (2006); for militarisation see e.g. Hirschfeld (1905) 464-5; Jones (1949) 46; Rostovtzeff (1957) 448ff.; MacMullen (1963) 49-76; Phang (2008) 216-17.
the complex character of Roman militia and milites. While I accept that classis servicemen were milites, it does not follow that they were ‘soldiers’, or militarised, in a modern sense. This raises further significant questions about the perception of Roman imperial milites, even legionaries and auxilia, and perhaps about the use of “military” terminology to organise servile familiae.

6. Conclusion

Four major arguments have emerged. Firstly, that there existed a conceptual closeness of the Italian classes to the imperial house. We should regard the praetorian epithet probably bestowed towards the end of the first century AD in this context. Furthermore, imperial freedmen made up at least a notable proportion of the servicemen, especially in the first century AD. This appears to have reflected and perhaps set a precedent for the classes possessing an imperial character. This point is reinforced by those servicemen who described themselves as x Caesaris or Augusti, both in our earliest epitaphs and some later monuments. This point provides useful background for our discussion of the main bases of the classes in Chapter Three, and for some of the tasks they carried out on behalf of Emperors, which we shall consider in Chapter Four.

Secondly, I have argued that documentary evidence indicates that the Italian classes underwent formalisation in the first century AD. Arguably comparable to similar developments in the auxilia, this formalisation may be detected in the near universal taking of the tria nomina by peregrine servicemen upon enlistment, the adoption in around half of the epitaphs examined of a common means of origin expression with natio and an ethnic adjective, and use of terminology of militia in
classis epitaphs. The precise nature of this formalisation is very hard to elucidate, though its reflection in epitaphs could be linked to increased interest in the information found on diplomata, perhaps introduced under Claudius. While much remains uncertain, I prefer to understand the above developments as formalisation rather than the militarisation of previously servile institutions, for which there is little decent evidence.

Thirdly, an examination of the epitaphs and diplomata has suggested that there was little connection between classis recruitment and the gens de mer, with implications for the sorts of tasks classis servicemen were expected to carry out. I have also argued that the formulaic nature of origin statements in both media imposes serious restrictions on detailed recruitment studies. I have suggested, in particular regarding the Bessi and Pannonii, that servicemen may have been less interested in revealing their “real” origins, than in responding to Roman conceptions of the empire, and defining themselves in the specific context of classis service in Italy. I have adduced the Batavi as a possible parallel, though we have too little evidence concerning the formation of the classis “ethnic communities” to understand how they developed, or what servicemen may have been trying to say by claiming membership of them.

Finally, concerning the nature of classis service, I have argued that the servicemen regarded themselves and were regarded as milites, akin to the legionaries and auxilia and probably expected to perform similar tasks, including on land. While the point cannot be proven, I have suggested that the general presentation of the classis servicemen as one group of milites, especially in epitaphs and diplomata, may reflect reality. Fundamentally, we should regard the classes as one organisational category of the manpower pool available to the Emperor, on whose behalf the
servicemen could perform *militia*. That the servicemen could travel around in warships, and were trained to row, should not seduce us into recognising typical Mediterranean war fleets.
II. Recruitment and the Fayoum

1. Introduction

I have underlined how the epigraphy may limit detailed recruitment studies. However, we can be confident that a good number of classis servicemen came from Egypt, and we are furthermore fortunate in possessing several papyri which allow consideration of recruitment processes from that province.\footnote{See above p. 65 n.270 on Egyptians or Alexandrians in the classis Misenensis.}

Having briefly examined recruitment processes in the Roman army, and past classis scholarship, I shall concentrate on papyri from the Arsinoite nome, in the first instance analysing three second century AD letters written by two recruits to the classis Misenensis, Apion and Apollinarius. A range of additional documents attesting classis veterans and other milites in the Fayoum will be included in the study. I shall offer three main hypotheses on recruitment processes, hard to conclusively prove, but nonetheless worth exploring: first, that we are dealing with a system in which voluntary recruitment was a significant element. Secondly, that recruitment from Egypt took place, or at least peaked, at certain times of the year, affected by the sailing season. I shall also note the potential relationship between enlistment and commercial or other connections between Alexandria and Puteoli. Finally, that the presence of soldiers and veterans in recruitment regions could be critical in encouraging enlistment. This will suggest an inter-generational model of recruitment, relying partly on the free movement of veterans back to their place of origin.
Our perspective must be informed by a passage of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, suggesting that Roman authorities tried to control recruitment in some areas, and that Egyptians wanting to perform *militia* were restricted to the Italian *classes*. However, overall I shall suggest that by considering factors beyond the control of the Roman authorities, rather than concentrating simply on where *milites* came from, or the official, administrative interactions between recruits and recruitment authorities, we may be able to gain a deeper understanding of how and why people became *milites*.

This study will reiterate the contention that *classis* manpower was not exclusively drawn from maritime peoples. It will also have some implications for the Braudelian theory that the Mediterranean suffered from a shortage of maritime manpower in contrast with the North Sea and Atlantic.

The Fayoum papyri make the area a particularly attractive case-study for recruitment. However, the conclusions reached may not be applicable to other parts of the empire, certainly not at all times. On the one hand, recruitment from the Danubian provinces to the *classis Ravennas* may have relied heavily on regional economic interdependencies, with recruits following routes running from the Danubian region to the north Adriatic, especially to Aquileia.449 This could provide a parallel for the system which I shall propose here, but there is little evidence allowing the examination of specific case-studies.450

By way of contrast, in the second century AD there were several instances of emergency recruitment, especially in Thrace, where conscription was perhaps
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449 Below pp. 191-3.
450 See the Introduction p. 28 for the problems of using Danubian *diplomata* to suggest that veterans typically went home after discharge.
demanded.\textsuperscript{451} The precise processes that facilitated recruitment from say Cilicia, potentially an important region for \textit{classis} enlistment, are unknown.\textsuperscript{452} As a final example, local recruitment from the civilian and veteran populations near Misenum and Ravenna was perhaps significant, though the evidence is extremely limited. Only one second century epitaph explicitly identifies a native of the former as a \textit{classis} serviceman: \textit{...M(arci) Marii / Pudentis I(centurionis) / nat(ione) Misenensis...}.\textsuperscript{453}

2. Processes of recruitment in the legions and \textit{auxilia}

There are numerous studies of imperial Roman army recruitment dealing with a wide range of topics, including the origins of \textit{milites}, the development of local or regional recruitment across the imperial period, the typical ages of recruits, and the administrative steps taken when a soldier enlisted.\textsuperscript{454} Here I shall concentrate specifically on the debate over the prevalence of conscription. A letter from Trajan to Pliny identifies three types of recruit: \textit{voluntarii} (volunteers), \textit{lecti} (conscripts) and \textit{vicarii} (substitutes).\textsuperscript{455} Scholars have typically argued that the first were in the

\textsuperscript{451} Below e.g. pp. 223-9.
\textsuperscript{452} For Cilicians in the \textit{classes} see \textit{CIL} VI 3113, 3123, 3129; X 3372, 3377 (= \textit{ILS} 2839), 3402, 3424, 3443 (= \textit{ILS} 2899), 3454 (= \textit{ILS} 2861), 3558, 3604-5, possibly 3619, 3623, 3651, 3662, 3668; XI 110; XIV 3627 AE 1972 80.
\textsuperscript{453} \textit{CIL} X 3368; cf. Starr (1960) 69-70 and (1942) 316-17 for the use of \textit{verna} by \textit{classis} servicemen as an alternative for \textit{in castris} (\textit{CIL} X 3646, 3654; \textit{CIL} XI 59, 65, possibly 3736, from Lorium, where the fourth line is presented as [---]ir Misenas, for which Bormann commenting at \textit{CIL} XI 3736 noted that Garrucci suggested \textit{v}er(na) Misenas; cf. Starr (1942) 316 n.10).
\textsuperscript{454} See esp. Mommsen (1884), though with several of his conclusions now rejected; Forni (1953); Gilliam (1957); Davies (1969); Watson (1969) 31-53; Brunt (1974); Mann (1983); Le Bohec (1994) 68-102; Wesch-Klein (2007) 435-9. These consider the Roman army generally or the legions in particular. For the \textit{auxilia} see Cheesman (1914) 57-101; Kraft (1951); Holder (1980) 109-39; Saddington (1982) 140-1; Le Bohec (1994) 93-9; Gallet and Le Bohec (2007); Haynes (2013) 93-142.
\textsuperscript{455} \textit{Plin. Ep.} 10.30.
majority, with conscripts recruited to meet shortfalls, though Brunt and more recently Haynes have placed greater emphasis on conscription.\(^{456}\)

Arrius Menander, the Severan jurist, appears to provide direct evidence for the significance of voluntary recruitment when, in contrasting contemporary punishments for avoiding the *dilectus* with harsher Republican practices, he says: *plerumque voluntario milite numeri supplantur.*\(^{457}\) However, as Brunt correctly noted, we cannot crudely extrapolate from this to understand recruitment across the first two centuries of the empire.\(^{458}\)

Yet there are hints at the earlier contribution of volunteers to the armies. In AD 23 there was discussion over the possibility of Tiberius visiting the provinces:\(^{459}\)

> multitudinem veteranorum praetexebat imperator et dilectibus supplebendos exercitus: nam voluntarium militem deesse, ac si suppeditet, non eadem virtute ac modestia agere, quia plerumque inopes ac vagi sponte militiam sumant.

This may suggest that volunteers were the preferred recruitment group, and were expected to make up the majority of the forces, though also demonstrates that they were not always sufficient, and that conscription was still needed.\(^{460}\) Similar ideas emerge in a letter of Fronto to M. Aurelius, where he states: *sic in bello ubi opus sit legionem conscribere, non tantum voluntarios legimus sed etiam latentes militari aetate conquirimus.*\(^{461}\) Brunt used this to show that even at this date the Romans did


\(^{457}\) *Dig.* 49.16.4.10.

\(^{458}\) Brunt (1974) 91-2, 108-12; *cf.* Forni (1953) 29 with n.2; Watson (1969) 166 n.70.

\(^{459}\) *Tac.* Ann. 4.4; *cf.* Vell. Pat. 2.130.2.

\(^{460}\) Brunt (1974) 96 emphasises the *dilectus*; Phang (2008) 77, suggesting that Tacitus was interested in the "negative impact of voluntary recruitment"; *cf.* Furneaux (1896) 495; Forni (1953) 29 n.2.

\(^{461}\) Fronto *de Eloquentia* 1.2 (Naber p. 140 = Haines II p. 54).
not only rely on volunteers. Nonetheless, I suggest that volunteers are presumed to make up the majority, with others supplementing the force.

Further evidence includes Claudius Terentianus, mentioned below, who tried to enlist in the legions in Egypt but was apparently turned away. His story implies a voluntary system. Even when a dilectus was employed, those recruited could be volunteers. In describing the response of Vitellius to the Flavian threat, Suetonius states: *dilectum quoque ea condicione in urbe egit, ut voluntariis non modo missionem post victoriam, sed etiam veteranorum iustaeque militiae commoda polliceretur.*

Naturally, levies did involve conscription, especially in emergencies. Regarding the reaction to the Pannonian uprising of AD 6-9 Velleius reports: *habiti itaque dilectus, revocati undique et omnes veterani, viri feminaeque ex censu libertinum coactae dare militem.* Brunt is perhaps right to suggest that the dilectus normally involved some conscription. Complaints about the dilectus from provincials certainly suggest this. But these examples do not necessarily reveal usual practice, nor does any good evidence suggest that conscripts were a majority in our period. Therefore, I broadly follow the standard position, acknowledging the significance of conscription in particular circumstances.

The above highlights that we can be far from certain when discussing processes of Roman army recruitment; the situation is arguably worse for the classes. Lacking any evidence, Ferrero supposed that conscription was the norm, with
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463 See below pp. 125-6.
465 Vell. Pat. 2.111.1; cf. Suet. Aug. 25; Tib. 8; Calig. 43.
467 E.g. Tac. Agric. 15.3; Hist. 4.14; Ann. 4.46 with Brunt (1974) 204-5. Note also Aristid. Or. 26.75-8 on the apparent significance of levies, but as is frequently noted (e.g. Oliver (1953) 888, 892; Griffin (1991); Pernot (2008) 188) Aristides does not offer an accurate account of recruitment systems.
manpower increased by some volunteers. Chapot suggested that the process was much the same as for the legions, with a mixture of volunteers and conscripts. Starr, who had the benefit of working with our papyrus letters, took a similar view. We shall see that our evidence supports the contention that voluntary recruitment was not unusual, allowing broad, if wary, comparisons with the legions and auxilia.

3. Two Egyptians in search of a classis

The authors of our letters came from the Fayoum region of Egypt, roughly 130 miles south east of Alexandria. The area is located in a depression centred around Lake Moeris, connected to the Nile by the Bahr Yusuf, a natural channel. The Fayoum encompassed the Arsinoite nome, and contained around one hundred and fifty villages, as well as the nome metropolis, Arsinoe. Papyri imply that the Arsinoite was a rich source of milites, but we should establish whether the region was truly exceptional in this regard, and the degree to which we can generalise from it. Importantly, around one third of our papyri come from this area, making it appear disproportionately significant. A diploma from AD 86 shows that at least one member of the classis Alexandrina came from the Coptite nome. Although we cannot know how representative this document is, we can reasonably reject the notion that the Fayoum was wholly exceptional in providing recruits.

468 Ferrero (1878) 42.
469 Chapot (1896) 181-2; cf. de la Berge (1886) 158.
470 Starr (1960) 78-80.
472 See above pp. 29-30 on generalising from Egypt.
474 CIL XVI 32 (= III p.856) 1.20: C(aio) Gemello Croni f(iilio) Coptit(o)...
Yet it was not entirely typical in other respects. For instance, Strabo described its remarkable fertility.475

"ἐστι δ’ ὁ νομὸς οὗτος ἀξιολογῶτατος τῶν ἁπάντων κατά τε τὴν ὄψιν καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν· ἐλαιόφυτός τε γὰρ μόνοις μεγάλοις καὶ τελείοις δένδρεσι καὶ καλλικάρποις...οἵνον τε ὧκ ὄλιγον ἔκφερε σιτῶν τε καὶ ὀσπρια καὶ τὰ ἄλλα σπέρματα πάμπολλα.

This could have made the Fayoum especially desirable for settlement, the significance of which will become apparent. Therefore we can only warily extrapolate from this region to provide a recruitment model for Egypt, let alone the empire.

Nonetheless, its evidence should not be dismissed, as it sheds valuable light on otherwise obscure topics. The letters to be discussed have been published,

475 Str. 17.1.35. For studies of particular estates see Rathbone (1991); Schubert (2007).
translated and commented on elsewhere (often in discussion of epistolary practices), yet classis scholars have often used them sparingly. Starr treated them most thoroughly but only printed English translations and restricted himself to a fairly basic exposition of their contents.\footnote{Starr (1960) 78-81, 84-5; cf. Davies (1969) 224-5.} Other scholars have concentrated on nomenclature.\footnote{Wickert (1949-50) 111-12; Kienast (1966) 26-7; Reddé (1986) 526; cf. above p. 43.} However, there is more to discuss.

Apion wrote one letter to his father Epimachos in Philadelphia, a Fayoum village.\footnote{BGU II 423 (= C. Pap. Hengstl. 84 = Deissmann (1910) 168 = W.Chr. 480 = Sel. Pap. I 112). For translations, sometimes with commentary and images see e.g. Erman and Krebs (1899) 214-15; Deissmann (1910) 167-72; Campbell (1994) no.10. Winter (1933) 39-42 discusses all the letters. On the archaeology of Philadelphia see Viereck and Zucker (1926) and Viereck (1928); cf. Davoli (1998) 139-48 for criticism. Note BGU II 632 (= Erman and Krebs (1899) 215; Deissmann (1910) 172-5), written by an Antonius Maximus, the name taken by Apion. From its publication, this was linked to BGU II 423 (see also e.g. Starr (1960) 84-5; Wickert (1949-50) 112; Davies (1969) 224 n.96; Phang (2001) 226). While this document was from the Arsinoite, nothing connects the two letters in content besides the name, which itself was not uncommon.} He began with the hope that his father and all the members of his family were well. He reported that having survived danger at sea he had arrived at Misenum. There, he had received his viaticum of three aurei. He asked for his father to write a letter about his health and that of the rest of his family, and he praised the education given by Epimachos. Because of this, he hoped for quick advancement in the classis. He ended by sending greetings to his family. He had been assigned to his ship, the Athenonica, and had received the name Antonius Maximus. To the side of the main text are greetings from other men, possibly fellow enlists, to Epimachos. The reverse of the papyrus contains instructions for delivery:

\begin{center}
Απίων Ἐπιμάχῳ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ
κυρίῳ πλείστα χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν πάν-
tων εὖχομαι σε ὑγιαίνειν καὶ διὰ παντὸς
ἐρωμένον εὐτυχεῖν μετά τῆς ἀδελφῆς
5 μου καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ ἀδέλφου
μου, εὐχαριστῶ τῷ κυρίῳ Σεράπιδι
ὅτι μου κινδυνεύσαντος εἰς θάλασσαν
\end{center}
ἔσωσε εὐθέως, ὅτε εἰσῆλθον εἰς Μη-
σήνους, ἔλαβα βιάτικον παρὰ Καῖσαρος
10 χρυσοῦς τρεῖς καὶ καλῶς μοι ἔστιν.
ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν, κύριε μου πάτηρ,
χράφων μοι ἐπιστολίαν πρῶτον
μὲν περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας σου, δεύ-
τερον περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου,
15 τρὶς οὖν, ἵνα σου προσκυνήσω τὴν
χεραν, ὅτι με ἐπαίδευσας καλῶς,
καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἐλπίζω ταχὺ προκό-
Alan 170 n.13, translated with the sense of ‘to advance’ or ‘gain promotion’.
481 For the ship as a centuria, see above pp. 85-6.
482 It has sometimes been thought (e.g. Diessmann (1910) 170 n.13, translated with the sense of ‘to advance’ or ‘gain promotion’.
483 For the ship as a centuria, see above pp. 85-6.
484 It has sometimes been thought (e.g. Diessmann (1910) 170; Wilcken in W.Chr. (1912), p. 565; Hunt and Edgar in Sel. Pap. I (1932), p. 307; Winter (1933) 42) that the letter was sent to Alexandria, where the librarius of the cohors I Apamenorum forwarded it to Epimachos. This could be correct, but, as Alston (1995) 174 suggests, it seems more natural to understand the directions as indicating that the librarius was near Philadelphia: see below pp. 126-7.
his mother that he had arrived at Portus but had not yet reached Rome and did not know his unit. Apollinarius closed the letter by again enquiring about his family, asking for Taesis to send him a letter soon. The letter contains a postscript, saying that he had been assigned to Misenum:

Ἀπολλινάρις Ταησίῳ τῇ μητρὶ πολλὰ χαίρειν.
πρὸ παντὸς ἔρρωσό μοι ύγιαίνουσα
tὸ προσκύνημά σου ποιῶν παρὰ πά-
5 σι τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ Κυρήνης εὑρὸν
tὸν πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομενον ἀνάκκην ἔσχον σοι
dηλῶσαι περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας μου· καὶ σὺ μοι
tαχύτερον δήλωσον ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἄρρητος
σου καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀδέλφων μου. καὶ νῦν ἀπὸ
10 Πόρτου σοι δηλώ, οὕτω γὰρ ἄνεβην ἵνα Ἑρώτη
καὶ διετάγῃς. ἐπὰν διαταγῇς καὶ γνῶ ἵνα πούν
ἴμι εὐθεῶς σοι δηλώ, καὶ σὺ δὲ μὴ ἄκιν γράφῃς περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας σου καὶ
tῆς τῶν ἀδέλ-
φῶν μου. ἦν δὲ μὴ εὐρής τὸν ἔρχομενον
15 πρὸς ἐμὶ γράφῃς Σωκράτη καὶ αὐτὸς μοι
dιαπέμπεται. ἀσπάζομαι πολλὰ τὰ ἀδέλφια
καὶ Ἀπολινάριν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ καὶ Καλάλα
καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντες τοὺς σὲ φιλούντες,
ἀσπάζεται σὲ Άσκληπιάδης.
20 ἔρρωσό μοι ύγιαίνουσα.
ἴς Πόρτων παρεγεγέρας Παχὼν κε.
γείνουσκε ὅτι ἵνα Μεισηνοῦς διετάγῃς, ὑστερὸν γὰρ ἔπε-
γγον.

Verso
ἀπόδος ἵνα Καρανίδα X Ταησίῳ ἀπὸ Ἀπολιναρίου
X υἱοῦ.

A second letter was written slightly later. Apollinarius told his mother that he had gone to Rome and been assigned to Misenum but did not yet know his centuria. He

---


Ἀπολινάρις Ταήσι τῇ μητρεί καὶ κυρίᾳ πολλὰ χαίρειν. ἔγεισαίνειν κάγῳ αὐτὸς ἴσωσθαι καὶ τὸ προσκύνημά σου ποιῶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐνθάδε θεοῖς. γεινώσκειν σε θέλω, μήτηρ, ὅτι ἔρρωμένος ἐγενόμην εἰς Ῥώμην Παχών μην καὶ καὶ ἐκληρώθην εἰς Μισηνοῦς, οὐκοσ δὲ τὴν κετυρίαν μου ἔγνων· οὐ γὰρ ἀπελθάνειν εἰς Μισηνοῦς ὁτὲ σοι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην ἐγραφον. ἐρωτῶ σε, μήτηρ, σεαυτῇ πρὸςεχε, μηδὲν διὰ ταξίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ· ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰς καλὸν τόπον ἠλθὼν. καλὸς δὲ ποῖς γράψασα μοι ἐπιστολὴν περὶ τῆς σοτηρίας σου καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου καὶ τῶν σοῦ πάντων. καὶ γὼ εἴ τινα ἐὰν εὕρω γράφω σοι· οὐ μὴ ὀκνήσω σοι γράφιν. ἀσπάζομαι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς μου πολλὰ καὶ Ἀπολλινάριν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ καὶ Καραλᾶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ. ἀσπάζομαι Πτολεμαῖν καὶ Πτολεμαείδα καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς καὶ Ἡρακλῶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς. ἀσπάζομαι τοὺς φιλοῦντας σε πάντας κατ᾽ ὄνομα. ἔρρωσθαί σε εὐχομαι.

Based on letter forms and language, a second century date is normally assigned to the letter of Apion.\footnote{Winter (1933) 41. Schubert (2000) no.22.} The same mostly holds for the letters of Apollinarius, though Winter initially dated both to around AD 200, before revising that to early second

\footnote{E.g. P. Viereck in BGU II (1898), p. 84; Deissmann (1910\textsuperscript{1}) 167; Winter (1933) 41. Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 100 n.45 without explanation described it as early second century.}

\footnote{The sense here is fairly clear: Apollinarius was assigned to Misenum, perhaps by some central authority in Rome. However, κλήρος has the more specific sense of “obtain by lot” or “be assigned by lot” in the passive (e.g. [Arist]. Ath. Pol. 43.2; Polyb. 6.20.2; Plut. Pomp. 61.1). The word does not always suggest a literal drawing of lots but could imply an element of chance: possibly recruits were randomly assigned either to Misenum or Ravenna. Compare διετάγην (from διατάσσω) used in his previous letter (lines 11 and 22), before Apollinarius had experienced the process, meaning “to appoint” or “ordin”, lacking the idea of lot drawing.}
century.\textsuperscript{487} This imprecision means that we cannot know whether the practices revealed should be considered in a specific context, say the Antonine Plague. True, the letters do not imply extraordinary circumstances. But this leads to a general comment on usefulness: these letters are precious, but there are only three. We cannot be certain that they reflect general practice at all times, even in Egypt. Yet, as with points on dating, there is nothing in the letters which strongly indicates that they are unusual. Therefore, and with due caution, they could well reflect general recruitment practices, at least in the second century AD Fayoum.

3.1 A voluntary process

The letters contain no hint of compulsion and thus imply that enlistment, at least for these men, was voluntary. This point is perhaps underlined by Apollinarius commenting in the second letter (ll.10-11) that he had come to a fine place (\textit{ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰς καλὸν τόπον ἤλθον}). This correlates with the suggested systems of legionary and auxiliary recruitment. The concern with family evident in the letters indicates that neither man travelled to Italy with relatives.\textsuperscript{488} This reflects a particular type of migration discussed by Noy, where individuals travel for work but do not bring any dependants.\textsuperscript{489} That Apion and Apollinarius set out without their families suggests that they knew exactly what they wanted to do in Italy: join the \textit{classes}. This could imply that they willingly enrolled at a levy in Egypt, or that they departed

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{487} Winter (1927) 293, 243; Winter (1933) 39. See also e.g. H. C. Youtie and J. G. Winter (1951) in \textit{P. Mich. VIII} (1951), pp. 92, 94; Starr (1960) 100 n.46.
\textsuperscript{488} E.g. Apion letter ll. 2-6, 12-14, 18-20; Apollinarius letter 1 ll. 7-9, 16-18; letter 2 ll. 11-13, 14-20.
\end{flushright}
independently to enlist. Either way, nothing indicates that they went to Italy and by chance fell into classis service.

Apion and Apollinarius may not have volunteered alone. In the letter from Apion, others sent their greetings to Epimachos: ἀσπάζεται σε Σερήνος... καὶ Δ[... ]νᾶς ὁ τ[ου]. A man called Asclepiades did the same in the first letter from Apollinarius (l.19). From this, one could infer that groups of young men travelled together to enlist. While impossible to prove, this interpretation of the names seems more likely than these being men who Apion and Apollinarius had just met in Italy, and is perhaps suggested by the familiarity implied between the recruits and Epimachos. This hypothesis receives fragile support from suggested army practices. Watson, discussing a letter from AD 103 listing several new soldiers, commented that ‘[the recruit] would probably travel in a small party of recruits.’

3.2 The sailing season and the timing of enlistment

Assuming that this hypothesis is correct, there has been markedly little discussion of why these men travelled together. The departure of a reasonable number of young men from relatively small places like Philadelphia and Karanis simultaneously may imply designated recruitment periods. Forni and Gilliam have suggested that army recruitment took place throughout the year, partly because of the voluntary character

---

490 See below pp. 123-4 on this problem.
491 Thus Deissmann (1910) 171; Starr (1960) 79.
493 Population estimates for these villages are somewhat speculative, based on tax registers, the area of the village and general considerations about population in Egypt; see e.g. Rathbone (1990) and Bowman (2011) 335, suggesting figures of three thousand six hundred for Karanis and three thousand five hundred for Philadelpidia in the period AD 70 – 160.
of recruitment. I do not necessarily disagree, but it may be that recruitment peaked at particular times.

This could be supported by a petition, dated to 22 January AD 150, of twenty two legionary veterans to the governor of Judaea. They had initially enlisted in the classis Misenensis (cum militaverimus domine in classe Misenis) together before being transferred and wanted to return to Alexandria, their patria, at discharge (ē felicissimis temporibus sacramento absoluti sumus, et in patriam Alexandriam ad Aegypto iturī). The pattern of a group of men from the same place joining the classes at the same time is therefore broadly repeated, though we cannot be precise on when enlistment took place. Perhaps, as Winter suggested, a levy was held in Egypt at particular times, ideally looking for volunteers. None of the letters suggests one but, even if there was, we would still like to know when. While the evidence is limited and interpretations tentative, the dating of the Apollinarius letters (1.21; 2.6) to Παχὼν (May) could point to spring or early summer.

This putative recruitment period need not have been established institutionally. Sailing from Egypt to Italy in normal circumstances would only have been practical from the spring to the autumn, as Vegetius suggested when limiting the sailing season to between 10 March and 11 November: ex die igitur iii Id. Nov. usque in diem vi Id. Mart. maria clauduntur. Therefore, these men may have set out

---

494 Forni (1953) 23; Gilliam (1957) 208.
495 PSI IX 1026 (= CIL XVI p. 146 no.13 = CPL 117 = Smallwood (1966) no.330 = ChLA XXV 784). The latter contains the most thorough bibliography; see also Campbell (1994) no.329. For a recent discussion summarising correct readings see Thomas (2003) 201-4. See below pp. 224ff. for further discussion.
496 PSI IX 1026 ll.6-7.
497 Winter (1933) 42.
together not to arrive at a particular date, but because they could only depart in a certain period. Even if my hypothesis that the letters reveal collective enlistment is incorrect, the sailing season must have had some influence over when recruitment from Egypt could take place.

Connected with the sailing season was the departure date of grain ships travelling from Alexandria to Italy. Based partly on a Senecan letter discussed later, and a late second century AD epistle by a certain Eirenaios who travelled with the Alexandrian grain ships, Rickman argued that, while grain ships were not bound to travel at precisely the same time, the majority, respecting the seasons, probably left Alexandria in the spring or early summer.\footnote{Rickman (1980) 130-1. For Seneca see below p. 169. For Eirenaios see Sel. Pap. I 113.} The rough concordance between this timing and our putative \textit{classis} recruitment period raises interesting questions about the relationship between the grain supply and the \textit{classes}, especially the \textit{classis Misenensis}. It is possible that by basing the \textit{classis Misenensis} near to Puteoli, one of the major reception points for Egyptian grain, the Romans hoped to tap into a supply of manpower from those travelling between Alexandria and Italy. Moreover, Puteoli was an information hub, and one could envisage that news concerning the \textit{classis} and its benefits travelled back to Egypt.\footnote{For Puteoli and communications, see below pp. 166-9.}

Cause and effect are hard to distinguish, and we shall see that there are many potential reasons for the deployment of a \textit{classis} at Misenum, but these regional interdependencies may have facilitated recruitment to an extent all but invisible in our sources. If I am right, and I stress how limited the direct evidence is, such rhythms of migration could have established annual recruitment times, a vital insight into how
background conditions, with little human “management”, may have supported the workings of empire.

3.3. Recruitment, soldiers and veterans

I shall now argue that there is some evidence indicating that this recruitment process may have been underpinned by soldiers and veterans dwelling in the Fayoum, who would have been able to spread information about the benefits of service. These would have included, at least by the later first century AD, eventual rewards of *civitas* and *conubium*, but one should consider stable pay.501

Such connections may also have helped recruits enter the *classes*. Some relevant evidence is found in the letters from Claudius Terentianus to Claudius Tiberianus, called the *pater* of the former.502 These papyri, thought to date to the first half of the second century AD, were found in a house at Karanis in the Fayoum. In one letter to Tiberianus, Terentianus described his enlistment in the *classis Augusta Alexandrina*.503 He states *per eos me probavi in classe *ne tiḥ[i] paream a *spe āmar[a] parpa[tum] yagari quasi fugīvom.*504 In editing the papyrus, Youtie and Winter suggested that *per eos* refers to two men also enrolled in the *classis*, Kalabel and Deipistus, mentioned on lines 12-13.505 They suggested that these individuals had vouched for Terentianus, when an earlier attempt to enrol as a legionary had failed.

501 *Classis* pay is normally regarded as equivalent to that of the *auxilia*: Starr (1960) 81; Watson (1969) 101-2; Reddé (1986) 557-9; *cf.* Sander (1957) 365-7. M. A. Speidel (1992), having analysed all known evidence, argued that this was set at nine hundred sesterces per year after Domitian.


504 Strassi (2008) 14 no. 1 ll.16-17.

thanks to an insufficient letter of recommendation from a man named Marcellus.\textsuperscript{506} This Marcellus appears to be described as a \emph{collega} of Tiberianus at the end of the letter, and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{507} Tiberianus himself was a soldier, called a \emph{speculator} in one letter and a \emph{veteranus} in another.\textsuperscript{508} It would be unsurprising if his \emph{collega} Marcellus had also served in the army.

This is suggestive of how knowing people already in service, or those who had experienced it, could play a part in enlistment. Of course, we should not overstate the importance of this dynamic. In a later letter, expressing his wish to transfer to a cohort, Terentianus acknowledged that \emph{epistulae commendaticiae} were not enough \textit{(nihil valunt)}, and that money would be needed \textit{(hic a[ut]em sene aer[e ni]hil fiet)}.\textsuperscript{509} Thus, connections and commendations did not guarantee that one would be accepted as a \textit{miles}, but they were regarded as helpful.

Turning back to the letters of Apion and Apollinarius, it must be admitted that soldiers are little mentioned. Yet we should consider the directions for delivery on the Apion letter: it was to be given to the \emph{librarius} of the \emph{cohors I Apamenorum}. This \emph{librarius} was arguably based somewhere near Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{510} In general, we are poorly informed about the deployment patterns of \emph{auxilia} in Egypt.\textsuperscript{511} Particular cohorts had a base camp, but troops from different units were dispersed across large

\textsuperscript{506} P. Mich. VIII (1951), 21-2, based on ll.14-16: \textit{[n]ec ob [haec] Marcel[li]um [o]di qu[on]i[a]m nihil mihi pro dis fuerunt nisi verba null[i]us con[c]epi o[diu]m; see also Davies (1973) 21-2; Strassi (2008) 121. For the possible role of such letters, see e.g. Davies (1969) 216-17; Watson (1969) 37-8; Le Bohec (1994) 73-4; Alston (1999) 182-3; cf. Phang (2007) 288, noting that the role of such letters has been idealised. The argument that these were common relies heavily on examples from the correspondence of Cicero and Pliny: one might question whether they were representative.


\textsuperscript{509} Strassi (2008) 19 no.2 (= P. Mich. VIII 468 = Daris (1964) no.7) ll.38-40. See also Davies (1973) 24-5.

\textsuperscript{510} See above p. 118 n.482.

\textsuperscript{511} Alston (1995) 22-38; Maxfield (2000); for the army in Egypt, Lesquier (1918) remains important. For a recent overview and further bibliography, see Haensch (2012).
geographical areas. Alston proposed that we may be able to locate the *cohors I Apamenorum* at the Wadi Hammamat in the Eastern Desert and possibly Nikopolis near Alexandria, but neither suggestion seems especially secure.  

We cannot prove that the cohort or subdivisions of it were based in those locations for any length of time. However, the letter of Apion implies that there were some serving soldiers in or around Philadelphia for reasonable stretches. Surely Apion would not have directed the letter through this man if he thought that his presence was only brief and temporary? Further evidence emerges in the στρατιώται who appear in some of the documents in the archive of Nemesion, a collector of the capitation tax in Philadelphia in the 40s and 50s AD. For example, an Antinous son of Leonidas, στρατιώτης ἐκ σπείρης, was charged by a Servilius with bringing Nemesion some items.

Therefore, there were some serving soldiers around Philadelphia. This village was not exceptional in the Fayoum, as shown by evidence from Karanis, home of Apollinarius. We know for instance of M. Anthestius Gemellus, a στρατιώτης of the *cohors III Ituraeorum* (AD 92) and a legionary called C. Iulius Agrippianus (AD 147-8). These men need not have been stationed in the area permanently; the reasonably frequent presence of soldiers is enough to support my arguments.

Moreover, a relatively large number of Roman veterans seemingly settled in the Fayoum, especially its north-east. Examples include M. Lucretius Clemens, a

---

513 *CPL* 310 (second century AD) from the Wadi Hammamat. This *ostracon* is fragmentary to the point that it is impossible to pronounce on its nature; *P. Mich* VII 446 (= *CPL* 226): a will or codicil of unknown provenance from the late second century AD; *P. Oxy.* XII 1511: scraps of a military account dated to before AD 247. The latter two mention the cohort alongside legionaries, which may indicate its presence at Nicopolis because it served as a legionary base, but this is wholly conjectural; cf. Alston (1995) 174.
514 *P. Graux* II 10 II.6-7. For further examples and discussion see Hanson (1989) 435-6.
veteran of the *cohors I Thracum* who was registered there in the 130s.\textsuperscript{517} Alston provides a list of forty-five veterans settled at Karanis, including C. Domitius Clemens (AD 131), M. Valerius Chairemonianus (AD 148) and L. Vespasianus Gemellus (AD 150).\textsuperscript{518}

Some were *classis* veterans. Their presence could have provided a network of contacts for those local youths who decided to enlist. Not every Egyptian serviceman returned from Italy, as the epigraphy underlines. But a reasonable number appear to have done so. For reasons of space, I shall not adduce all possible evidence for *classis* veterans in the Arsinoite, but shall cover the best.\textsuperscript{519}

This includes a wax tablet found in the Arsinoite and dated to AD 150/1, recording the sale of a slave girl for six hundred and twenty-five *denarii* to a *miles* of the *classis praetoria Ravennas*, Titus Memmius Montanus.\textsuperscript{520} This was presumably taken by Memmius back to his home in Egypt after discharge. A papyrus contract of 22 May AD 166 records a slave purchase in Seleucia Pieria by C. Fabullius Macer, *optio* of the *classis Misenensis*, from another serviceman, Q. Iulius Priscus, for two hundred *denarii* plus the sales tax.\textsuperscript{521} This too was found in the Fayoum, arguably carried there by Fabullius.

A few testamentary documents better indicate that *classis* veterans lived and owned property in the Arsinoite. The will of C. Longinus Castor, made in Karanis and written in AD 189, left unspecified inheritables to certain heirs, in particular to

---

\textsuperscript{517} *P. Diog.* 4-5; see Schubert (2007) 55-69 for his family.

\textsuperscript{518} CPL 220; BGU I 300; *P. Athen.* 27; Alston (1995) 124-5.

\textsuperscript{519} Largely excluding, for instance, hypothetical servicemen whose identity is suggested by nomenclature or associations with other servicemen: see e.g. below n.519 for Longinus; cf. Alston (1995) 126-37.

\textsuperscript{520} CPL 193 (= AE 1922 135 = FIRA III.134); cf. Eger (1921); Söllner (2001). For a full bibliography see Martin Ferreira (2007) 109-10. The tablet is the fifth “page” of a triptych *tabula*, on which see Meyer (2004) esp. 125-215. The transaction was carried out in the κάστρα κλάσσης πραιτώρια Ῥαβεννατοῦ (ll.10-11). This does not necessarily mean Ravenna: there could have been any number of such castra, including that at Rome; cf. Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 82.

\textsuperscript{521} *ChLA* III 200 (= *P. Lond.* II 229 = CPL 120 = FIRA III 132 = AE 1896 21).
his slaves Marcella and Cleopatra, both freed in the will. He also left some property to Sarapias, daughter of Cleopatra. This included five arourae of arable land near Karanis (καταλήπω ἀρούρας στικᾶς πέντε, ἂς ἔχω περὶ κόμην Κάρανίδα ἐν τόπῳ λεγομένῳ Στρούθῳ), a third part of a palm-grove (τρίτον μέρος φοινικόνως) and two thirds of his house, a third of which he had purchased (ὅμοιως τρίτον μέρος οἰκίας μου καὶ τρίτον μέρος ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς οἰκίας, ὃ ἕγόρασα πρῶτον παρὰ Πραπεθεύτος μητρὸς Θασεύτος). The last bequest may indicate that Longinus added property to that which he inherited, the latter providing motivations for returning to the region.

A second example is a papyrus petition from the Arsinoite by Aitete Phrontis to the δικαιοδότης C. Caecilius Salvianus, dated 1 April AD 176. The former reported that C. Fabullius Macer, a veteran of the classis Misenensis, had made C. Longinus Castor his heir. Macer had stipulated that Longinus was to give two thousand drachma and a cloak to Aitete. However, Longinus had not given Aitete her due (l.8: ἐλήγατον μοι μὲχρι τοῦτου οὐ βούλεται ἀποδιδόναι), hence the petition. While here we can say little on the property of Fabullius, his presence in the Fayoum, and relationships with people there, suggests a settled veteran, perhaps one who returned home after discharge.

Servicemen of the classis Alexandrina were also recruited from this region and returned there at discharge. Although caveats about inferring too much from the

---


523 Pestman (1990) no. 50 ll. 18-22.

524 BGU I 327 (= FIRA III 65 = M.Chr. 61).

525 Possibly the same C. Longinus Castor as named in the will. That they both came from the Arsinoite nome supports this. The date of the petition would make identifying one Castor with the other attractive (for dating, see Phang (2001) 222 n.105). Yet the name is not unusual, and classis servicemen were not imaginative when selecting Roman names.

526 See Phang (2001) 221-3 for a discussion of why this may have happened.
practices of this provincial *classis* apply, the following may suggest that people associated with *classes* were found in considerable numbers in the Fayoum.

One difficult papyrus found at Karanis records a transaction to do with a dowry in the second half of the second century.\(^{527}\) It mentions a *miles classis Aug(ustae) Alexandrinae*, C. Valerius Gemellus, and a Demetria with whom he had some kind of relationship.\(^{528}\) Another papyrus records the sale by L. Longinus Fabullus, of the *classis Alexandrina*, of his μητρική χωρτοθήκη (mother’s hayloft) to a legionary.\(^{529}\) This hayloft was located at Nestou Epoikios, somewhere in the north east of the Fayoum. As with Longinus Castor, the chance of inheriting property may explain why some veterans migrated home.\(^{530}\)

Other papyri show relationships between servicemen of the *classis Alexandrina* and the Fayoum.\(^{531}\) Alongside these, a *diploma* of AD 79 was awarded to *M. Papirius M. f. Arsen(oitus)*, of that *classis*.\(^{532}\) While he came from the Arsinoite nome originally, we do not know if he returned. In his 1926 publication in *JHS* 16 (pp. 95-103), A. H. Smith suggested that the document probably came from the Fayoum because of its contents. Yet it was purchased in Cairo, so Papirius could have relocated.

\(^{527}\) *ChLA* V 295 (= *P. Mich*. VII 442 = *CPL* 210 = *FIRA* III 20).

\(^{528}\) This document has been variously viewed as a marriage contract, a statement of betrothal, a statement of divorce and, most popularly, a receipt acknowledging the return of a dowry after the annulment of a marriage. For bibliography see Bruckner and Marichal in *ChLA* V (1975), p. 36; cf. Phang (2001) 47-9 for a few more recent alternatives.

\(^{529}\) *BGU* II 455. Dated to before AD 133 based on the presence of the *legio XXII Deiotariana* in Egypt, which disappeared and may have been destroyed in the Bar Kokhba war: see Daris (2000). The final line [κ]υρίου ο υε could indicate a Vespasianic date.

\(^{530}\) See above pp. 128-9.

\(^{531}\) See e.g. *BGU* III 709 (with Palme (1994) and Nachtergaele (2002)) from Karanis and dating to the reign of Antoninus Pius, which records the *cessio* of a plot of land by Q. Gellius Valens, a *classiarius*, and his sister Gellia Didyme to Volusius Sabinianus, another serviceman. See also *BGU* III 741 (= *FIRA* III 119 = *M. Chr*. 244).

\(^{532}\) *CIL* XVI 24 (= *AE* 1927 96).
Finally, an *epikrisis* document, dated to sometime after April 26 AD 148, explicitly states that veterans from the *classis Syriaca* (οὐετρανοὶ...καὶ ἐν κλάσῃ Συρ[α]κ) were registered in the Arsinoite.\(^{533}\)

In sum, servicemen of the *classes Misenensis, Ravennas, Alexandrina* and *Syriaca*, alongside members of the Roman army, came from the Arsinoite, had property there and settled there in retirement. Their numbers were perhaps not inconsiderable, though we possess too little evidence to establish absolute figures or their proportion in the Arsinoite population. Based on tax rolls from AD 145-6 and 171-4, Alston estimated that the Roman element of the population of second century AD Karanis was 14%, but this figure must be approached with extreme caution regarding the second century as a whole, let alone our entire period.\(^{534}\) Whatever the precise proportions, the Arsinoite recruits who departed to join the Italian *classes* would surely have been somewhat influenced in their decision by these soldiers and veterans. Even if many were not *classis* veterans specifically, they would have been able to provide information, advice, and possibly connections helping enlistment. I am tempted to propose that, as one set of veterans returned to the Arsinoite to retire, members of the following generation would set out to replace them.

3.4 The *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*

I have so far argued that there was a considerable degree of freedom in the recruitment process in the Arsinoite. However, the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* may dispel that view. Our Antonine version of this text, originating under Augustus,

\(^{533}\) *BGU* I 265 (=W.Chr. 459) II.4-5; cf. *BGU* I 113 (=W.Chr. 458), of similar date, though of unknown provenance, mentioning οὐετρανοὶ στρατευσάμενοι...ἐν κλάσαις δυσὶ Μεσηνάτη καὶ Συριακῇ.

\(^{534}\) Alston (1995) 121.
appears to have provided judicial guidance to representatives of the *Idios Logos*, a department responsible for the confiscation, sale and administration of certain types of property and priesthoods, and which had some oversight of inheritance and status disputes.\textsuperscript{535}

One passage has been understood as barring native Egyptian *laoi* from the legions and most *classes*, possibly even the *auxilia*:\textsuperscript{536}

\[ ἕάν Αἰγύπτιος λαθὼν στρατεύσηται ἐν λεγώνι, ἀπολθεὶς εἰς τὸ Αἰγύπτιον τάγμα \textsuperscript{537} ἀποκαθίσταται. Ὁμόλογος δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἔρετκροῦ ἄτροχθέντες ἀποκαθίστανται πλὴν μόνων τῶν ἐκ Μησινῶν τῶν τόι. \]

A broadly uncontroversial interpretation is that any Egyptian who surreptitiously joined a legion or provincial *classis* (the commonly presumed meaning of *οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἔρετκροῦ* would not receive citizenship at discharge, but would be returned to the *laoi*. This was not the case for those who joined the *classis Misenensis*, who were by implication allowed citizenship.\textsuperscript{538}

\[^{535}\text{See Swarney (1970) 41-126 for the functions of the *Idios Logos* from the Julio-Claudians to the Antonines, based on a carefully study of relevant papyri; cf. Str. 17.1.12. On the *Gnomon* (BGU V 1210), see Uxkull-Gyllenband (1934); Johnson (1936) 711-17; Riccobono (1950).}\]

\[^{536}\text{Gnomon 55. For discussion of this passage see Riccobono (1950) 190-5 (with excellent bibliography); cf. Uxkull-Gyllenband (1934) 45-6; Starr (1960) 77 and 99 n.37-8; Forni (1953) 104-5. For the unresolved problems of Egyptian status division under the Empire see Bowman and Rathbone (1992); Jördens (1999) and (2012).}\]

\[^{537}\text{Lesquier (1918) 197-8 mentioned this problematic word in the context of the ἐπίκρισις, suggesting that here it meant “class” or “ethnic group”. He compared it to τάγμα τοῦ γυμνασίου (citing in particular P. Oxy. IX 1202 I.18, dated to AD 217 and P. Oxy. X 1252 I.24 of the end of the third century AD, though the latter refers to gymnasiarchs. The gymnasial class were a privileged group comprising members of the Greek populations of *nome metropoleis*; see e.g. Bowman and Rathbone (1992) e.g. 114, 119; Vandorpe (2012) 263-4; cf. Van Minnen (2002)); cf. Carcopino (1922) 106, equating τάγμα with γένος (found in *Gnomon* 35, 39, 46, 57). Lesquier is perhaps correct, though his points of comparison are limited, and it is odd that the word appears only here in the *Gnomon*, whereas elsewhere γένος is used for a similar idea. Perhaps it is important that τάγμα can have military connotations (the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* 2.33.1579 translates τάγμα as *legio*).}\]

\[^{538}\text{Starr (1960) 77 thought that the *classis Ravennas* was to be understood here too, but I am not convinced. Egyptians certainly entered that *classis* e.g. *CIL* XI 29: Δ(is) M(anibus) / Sexti Arri / Romani / medic(i) / dupl(i)carii n(ationes) / Aegypti(ius)... cf. *CIL* VI 3159. Perhaps Egyptian recruits to the *classis Ravennas* were rare enough that it did not require a mention.}\]
join the armed forces, the *classis Misenensis* could technically have been the only option.

Yet several problems restrict the value of this text. For example, the notion that native Egyptians were banned from the provincial *classes* is hard to explain, especially if they could enlist in *auxilia*. Although some scholars believe that the latter was not allowed, others disagree. The evidence is meagre either way. *Gnomon* 56 refers to soldiers (οἱ στρατευ[όμενοι]) who faced fines if they claimed Roman citizenship without proper discharge (νομίνη ἀπόλυσις). In contrast, Chapter 55 refers specifically to men who served [ἐ]ν λεγ[ῶν]. Taken together, the sections may imply that *laoi* could serve in non-legionary forces, gaining Roman citizenship if properly discharged. This would leave the provincial *classes* in an anomalous position.

Carcopino proposed that οἱ ἐκ [τοῦ] ἑρετικοῦ concerns specifically the *classis Alexandrina*. Following Lesquier, he suggested that that *classis* and the legions worked together in policing the Nile. Thus, he theorised that they recruited from the same source and their members were similarly dismissed. Lesquier suggested that, regarding local recruitment to the legions in Egypt, soldiers were ideally drawn from the privileged Alexandrians or the illegitimate sons of legionaries, granted citizenship on enlistment. This argument is primarily based on a first century AD inscribed list of sixty two members of the *legio III Cyrenaica*, which counts seven Alexandrians among the thirteen Egyptians, and another catalogue of AD 194, listing forty six

---

539 For exclusion: e.g. Lesquier (1918) 224; Reinach (1920-1) 141-2; against: e.g. Carcopino (1922) 216-19; Delia (1991) 38-9; Bowman (1996) 687.
legionaries recruited in AD 168, which mentions thirty Egyptians, the majority *ex castris*, alongside four Alexandrians.\footnote{CIL III 6672 (with 14147 = ILS 2483); CIL III 6580 (with 12045 = ILS 2304 = AE 1947 112 = Kayser (1994) no. 105)}

It would then follow that the *classis Alexandrina* recruited primarily from Alexandrians, with *laoi* excluded. This argument is undermined by the presence of non-Alexandrians in the *classis*, as *diplomata* show.\footnote{See above p. 115.} Moreover, given our earlier discussion of claims to Alexandrian identity in Italy, one must wonder whether these legionaries were being wholly accurate about their backgrounds: it is not impossible that they were from *nome metropoleis*, or were even originally *laoi*.\footnote{See above p. 65 n.270.} Naturally, we must be wary about revelations concerning legionary, and by extension *classis*, recruitment, provided by but two inscriptions, however lengthy.\footnote{Note Devijer (1974) 458 on AE 1969-70 633 (= 1955 238), a list of one hundred and thirty six veterans of the *legio II Traiana Fortis* discharged in AD 157, of whom only one was an Egyptian.}

Therefore, the solution of Carcopino should probably be considered as unproven. A further problem surfaces. *Gnomon* 55 could imply that Egyptians were sneaking into the Misenum *classis* and therefore were not legally allowed to join, but that for some reason allowance was made if they succeeded in getting enlisted. Perhaps we could consider this a clarification to local officials, unaware of some special status which the *classis Misenensis* held. In support we can adduce Swarney, who noted that its fairly narrow contents suggest that the *Gnomon* was not a ‘full manual of procedure’, but a guide for dealing with unusual cases.\footnote{Swarney (1970) 120.} A possible explanation, but far from secure.

Thus the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* may reveal that enlistment options for Egyptian *laoi* were very restricted, and that they were funneled into the *classis*
Misenensis. Yet difficulties of interpretation deny us certainty. Furthermore, it is impossible to determine how strictly such conditions were enforced.

4. Conclusion

The recruitment system which I have proposed for classis servicemen from the second century AD Fayoum contains several elements beyond the influence of the Roman authorities. This stands somewhat outside most recruitment studies, which emphasise the interactions between recruits and Roman authorities at the point of enlistment, and the administrative concerns of the latter.

Firstly, the direct, if limited, evidence provided by Apion and Apollinarius suggests that classis recruitment from the Arsinoite involved a voluntary element. Their letters contain no inkling of conscription. Modern interpretations of wider recruitment practices render this unsurprising, as volunteers appear to have formed a good number of army recruits, though precise ratios cannot be determined.

I suggest that the letters, alongside other evidence, indicate that groups of men could enlist together, possibly because of a standard early summer recruitment time, or at least a period in which most enlistment happened. I have proposed that this hypothetical time was determined by the sailing season. Even if I am not correct in my conjecture that the letters provide evidence for groups enlisting jointly, it should probably be conceded that the sailing season placed restrictions on when it was practical for Egyptian recruits to join the Italian classes. Moreover, I have proposed that regional interdependencies and the role of Puteoli as a communications hub may have played some part in this system.
Soldiers and veterans in the Arsinoite, for which there is considerable papyrological evidence, could have encouraged the enlistment of these men into the Roman armed forces. It is certainly plausible that the return of the discharged to the Fayoum, men who were now Roman citizens with veteran privileges, could have by their presence suggested a career to those younger than them. Egyptian recruits may have been given little option over joining the Italian classes, but the evidence of the Gnomon, and the degree to which its regulations were enforced, are too opaque to make too much of that document.

These conclusions must be set alongside the limitations of my argument. We are working with a fairly small set of documents, the critical letters impossible to date precisely. It can only be assumed that we are dealing with business as usual in the Fayoum, let alone the rest of the empire, when we have little good comparable material from other regions to work with. Many of my arguments do not rest on explicit references in the evidence, but on reasonable hypotheses based on their contents and context. The validity of these hypotheses can be disputed. Nonetheless, I believe that on some points, such as the influence which seasons had on enlistment, are fairly secure.

As noted in the Introduction, Mediterranean fleets often experienced manpower problems.547 Fernand Braudel, in comparing these fleets with those of the Atlantic and North Sea, argued that the Mediterranean was not especially productive, and there were not that many fish. Therefore, there were relatively few fishermen and few sailors, since recruitment often involved entering ports and rounding up available

---

547 Above p. 17.
Sailors naturally gravitated to the countries which offered the best pay and conditions, though even those suffered manpower problems.  

In fact, the Mediterranean waters are more productive, at least on a microregional analysis, than Braudel allowed, which should alter our thinking on this manpower problem. Rather than there being a shortage of sailors per se, states were simply incapable of mobilising them. The achievement of the Romans was seemingly their ability to facilitate manpower mobilisation, whether for the classes or other imperial services. But, as argued in Chapter One, when considering the imperial classes we are not dealing with gens de mer.

Recruitment from the Arsinoite nome clarifies that maritime manpower was not exclusively sought: manpower of any type would do. A combination of this attitude, the nature and roles of the classes as a division of manpower expected to perform general militia, and conditions peculiar to the Roman empire facilitating movement towards Misenum and Ravenna, in the former case visible in the connections between Alexandria and Puteoli discussed here, perhaps helped the Romans to overcome a common problem. In these conditions we may perceive imperial organics, the day-to-day movements of people and regional interdependencies that contributed to the functioning of the empire, to which we shall return in Chapter Four.

---

549 Ibid. 139, 146.  
III. The Italian classes and their imperial ports

1. Introduction

By departing from the standard concentration on the “naval base”, this chapter will argue that the main ports of the Italian classes at Misenum and Ravenna were closely associated with imperial property, and may even have been established on imperial estates. Relatedly, I shall contend that they were situated within regions of imperial activity, especially leisure/consumption, display and production, and which otherwise appear to have been of import to Emperors across our period. This will shape our understanding of the roles of the classis manpower pool, especially in Italy. While military activity can certainly be considered the province of the classes, their situation encouraged their use in militia of other kinds, often to the immediate benefit of the Emperor.

I shall begin with the traditional approach to Misenum and Ravenna in classis scholarship, which normally treats them as “naval bases” and concentrates on the ports in isolation from their regional context, or pays the latter only passing attention. I shall suggest that the “naval base” is an unsatisfactory model because of difficulties of definition, and because neither compares easily with known “naval bases” of the Classical or Hellenistic Mediterranean, especially Athens and Carthage.

Instead, I shall consider other shared features of the sites, concentrating on proximity to imperial property. To demonstrate how this may affect our perception of Roman “naval bases”, I shall start not with Misenum and Ravenna, but with Pliny the Younger and his letter about Centumcellae. The Trajanic harbour at Centumcellae has often been considered to house a classis detachment, and I shall review the epigraphic
evidence. However, I shall also emphasise the features of the nearby imperial villa as described by Pliny. Centumcellae is not the model on which I am basing my interpretation of Misenum and Ravenna. Rather, Pliny lucidly unveils the different activities and characteristics associated with an imperial estate, and one at or near to which classis servicemen were based.

Moving on, I shall examine Misenum and Ravenna in turn. To provide proper background, I shall firstly discuss their geography and history as ports, also considering the degree to which these can be regarded as explanations for the selection of the sites as classis bases. In the case of Ravenna, literary evidence may suggest its particular strategic significance, though this may have only developed with the deployment of the classis. We shall see that these topics provide only a partial understanding or characterisation of the bases.

I shall then consider literary, documentary and archaeological evidence for imperial property at or near to Misenum and Ravenna, and in the regions of the sinus Baianus and the north Adriatic. Locally, this may suggest a direct association between imperial property and the classis bases, and I shall offer evidence for property ownership by Julius Caesar or Octavian predating the formation of the classes, and potentially influencing their deployment.

Evidence for imperial leisure, display and production associated with these properties and in their regions will then be considered, to formulate a picture of the environment in which the Italian classis were based and partly operated. Near Misenum, I shall examine the luxury villae of Baiae and the commercial hub of Puteoli. Around Ravenna, Aquileia, Altinum and some Histrian estates will receive particular attention. From this, I shall suggest that the sinus Baianus and the north
Adriatic are more alike than one might think, and that this should influence our understanding of local activities of the Italian classes.

2. The problem of the “naval base”

The standard view holds that the Italian classes operated from two main ports, Misenum and Ravenna, with strategic stationes around the Mediterranean, some identified through finds of classis funerary monuments.\(^{551}\) Most were situated at commercial harbours also catering to military vessels. The relationship between the classes and their ports, and the sort of ports that they visited, would therefore have been largely unremarkable in the context of Mediterranean naval history.

But Misenum and Ravenna have been presented as reserved for the classes, described as “naval bases”, “military harbours” or some equivalent.\(^{552}\) In determining whether this characterisation is appropriate, we must consider the “naval base”. Reddé discussed the difficulties of identifying or defining the Roman imperial ‘port militaire’.\(^{553}\) Should it be a base reserved for war vessels, their personnel, equipment and so on, or any port with which warships have contact?\(^{554}\) Reddé suggested that only Portus Iulius and Misenum could be considered in the first group, while we cannot be certain whether military facilities at Ravenna were shared by commercial vessels.\(^{555}\)

\(^{551}\) For this model, concentrating on the Italian coasts and nearby islands, see e.g. Fiebiger (1894) 319-28 and in RE III (1899), s.v. classis, 2638; Chapot (1896) 66-86; Starr (1960\(^2\)) 13-24; Reddé (1986) 177-223.

\(^{552}\) Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 175, 177; Starr (1960\(^2\)) 13, 21; Bollini (1968) 44; Blackman (1982) 189; Webster (1985\(^2\)) 158; Reddé (1986) 150; Rankov (2013) 48.


\(^{554}\) Ibid. 145; cf. the definition of naval base in the OED\(^3\) (2003), (http://www.oed.com; last viewed 16/06/2014): ‘a base for naval operations; esp. a securely held seaport from which naval operations can be carried out; a naval shore establishment’.

\(^{555}\) See below pp. 183-5 on Ravenna.
Our oblique sources render even Portus Iulius problematic.\p{141} Therefore, on the formulation of Reddé, we are left with Misenum as a ‘port militaire’, and with no kind of typology for a Roman “naval base”.\p{556} Indeed, Le Bohec has gone as far to suggest that there was ‘no model for a military port’ in the empire.\p{558} It will emerge that this may go too far.

Unlike the Roman imperial period, “naval bases” have been identified for the Classical and Hellenistic Mediterranean. In the absence of explicit literary evidence, these are commonly recognised through shipshed remains.\p{559} Shipsheds have been found in commercial harbours, thus fitting the pattern whereby varied ship-types shared facilities.\p{560} Nineteenth century accounts recorded remains suggesting that Cantharus, the main commercial harbour of the Athenian Piraeus, had shipsheds running along its southern shore.\p{561} Ninety four are attested in a series of inscriptions dating between 330/29 BC and 323/2 BC.\p{562} Although we can say little on the
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556 Below p. 155 n. 634.
557 On the absence of a typology, see Reddé (1986) 150-3; contra Bollini (1968) 44-6, who identified a typology based on Misenum, Ravenna, Portus Iulius and Forum Iulii.
558 Le Bohec (1994) 164.
560 Reddé (1986) 148-50. See 148 n.6 for a discussion of the absence of Latin and Greek terms to distinguish commercial and military harbours. Baika (2013b) 212-13 has recently suggested that κλειστός λιμήν, found in some Greek coastal descriptions up to Strabo, specifically means ‘a fortified naval harbour protected by the city circuit’. This is contra Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 65-74, 108 (followed by Reddé (1986) 153), who argued that it described any fortified harbour, and Blackman (1982) 194, who understood it as a harbour closed by a chain. Baika’s hypothesis is difficult to wholly accept, because the layout, development and even location of many examples are conjectural. For instance, Ps. Sicylax 67 mentions three harbours at Thasos, one κλειστός. This has been connected with the so-called military harbour of the city. However, the harbour layout and the presence of shipsheds are disputed: see Blackman and Rankov eds. (2013), s.v. Thasos, 542-3. The solution of Lehmann-Hartleben remains preferable.
561 Remains recognised on the south eastern shore and shown on a map published in Curtius (1842), reproduced in Blackman and Rankov eds. (2013) 426 and mentioned by Ulrichs (1843) 672; cf. Graser (1872) 58, 61. See also Blackman and Rankov eds. (2013) 437.
562 IG II 1627 ll. 404-5, 1628 ll. 558-9, 1629 ll. 1035-6, 1631 ll. 255-6.
development or longevity of this naval space, it offers a fair example of the suggested arrangement.\(^{563}\)

However, literary evidence combined with substantial shipshed remains indicates that, at some settlements, military vessels were probably provided with separate facilities, incorporated within urban fortifications. Rhodes demonstrates Greek familiarity with harbours reserved for military use. Strabo described Rhodian concealed harbours, with punishments prescribed for unauthorised entry (τῶν δὲ ναυστάθμων τινὰ καὶ κρυπτὰ ἢ καὶ ἀπόρρητα τοῖς πολλοῖς, τῶ δὲ κατοπτεύσαντι ἢ παρελθόντι εἴσο θάνατος ὁριστὸ ἢ ζημία).\(^{564}\) The Mandraki harbour has been identified as one on the basis of two shipshed complexes on its south side.\(^{565}\)

The description of the late third or probably second century BC Carthaginian military harbour by Appian also privileges security.\(^{566}\) Carthage possessed two harbours, sharing one entrance. Commercial vessels used the southern rectangular harbour. The military harbour to the north was circular, with an island at its centre, and both the island and encircling harbour were set around with large quays (κρηπῖσι μεγάλαις ἢ τε νῆσος καὶ ὁ λιμὴν διείληπτο) on which stood shipsheds (νεώρια), enough for two hundred and twenty ships. On the island was the σκηνή of the ναύαρχος, who monitored everything coming from the sea (τὰ ἐκ πελάγους πάντα ἐφορᾷ). Merchant ships could not see into the military dockyards as they approached, and were provided with a route to the city which avoided them.\(^{567}\)


\(^{564}\) Str. 14.2.5; cf. Polyb. 5.88-9; Polyenaus Strat. 5.17; Aristid. Or. 24.53; 24.3-4.


\(^{566}\) App. Pun. 96; cf. 127.

\(^{567}\) App. Pun. 96: οὐ μὴν οὖδὲ τοῖς ἐπιπλεύσασιν ἐμπόροις εὐθὺς ἢν τὰ νεώρια σύνοπτα· τεῖχος τε γὰρ αὐτοῖς διπλῶν περικέπτο καὶ πόλια, αἳ τοὺς ἐμπόρους ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου λιμένος ἢ τὴν πόλιν ἐσέφερον, οὐ διαρχομένους τὰ νεώρια.
The essentials of this description have been confirmed by excavations at a section of its northern edge and on the island, where thirty shipsheds have been identified.\textsuperscript{568} One hundred and forty sheds are thought to have surrounded the harbour waters. Henry Hurst has acknowledged that this is but a theoretical reconstruction, yet its broad outlines make considerable progress towards understanding the harbour.\textsuperscript{569}

As a final example, the smaller harbours of the Piraeus at Zea and Munychia were probably primarily naval.\textsuperscript{570} The inscriptions mentioned above reveal that in the latter half of the fourth century BC Zea possessed one hundred and ninety six sheds, and Munychia eighty two.\textsuperscript{571} Archaeology suggests that sheds ringed virtually the whole of both harbours.\textsuperscript{572} Three or possibly four construction phases have been roughly identified, ranging from the early fifth century to after the mid-fourth century BC.\textsuperscript{573}

There are also examples of small naval stations distant from the cities which created them, recognised through shipshed remains or slipways, sometimes associated with coastal fortifications.\textsuperscript{574} One is the Rhodian base near Loryma.\textsuperscript{575} This small city lay at a strategic position within a bay in the Carian Chersonese, opposite Rhodes. Six or twelve shipsheds have been identified on a beach to the west of the acropolis. These have been associated with a fort, \textit{Loryma III}, on the tip of the peninsula at the western entrance to the bay and dated to the first half of the third century BC by

\textsuperscript{569} Hurst (1994) 39.
\textsuperscript{570} For overview and bibliography see Blackman and Rankov (2013), s.v. \textit{Piraeus}, 420-88.
\textsuperscript{571} See above p. 141.
\textsuperscript{572} See most recently Lovén et al. (2007); Lovén and Nielsen (2009); Lovén (2011); Lovén and Schaldemose (2011).
\textsuperscript{573} Blackman and Rankov eds. (2013) 476.
\textsuperscript{574} Blackman (2003) 84-5; Baika (2013a) discusses all examples.
inscriptions and pottery. Appian described Loryma as Ῥοδίων τι φρούριον ἐν τῇ περαιά; Rhodian possession of the fort is confirmed by epigraphy.

The above suggests that shipshed complexes, monumental at the largest ports, and a concern for security characterised Classical and Hellenistic “naval bases”. However, it is difficult to apply this model to Misenum and Ravenna. There is no evidence for shipsheds at either site. Indeed, although literary evidence confirms that the Romans built shipsheds, nowhere have any been securely identified. Nor are fortifications clearly attested.

Perhaps these structures have simply not survived. However, the best known large naval bases, at Athens and Carthage, are not ideal models for the imperial period. Their scale is unusual: only two other harbours are attested to have been able to hold over two hundred ships. Diodorus implies that, under Dionysius I, Syracuse possessed room for at least three hundred and ten ships (ὑπὸδομεῖ δὲ καὶ νεωσοίκους...ἐκατόν ἐξήκοντα...καὶ τοὺς προὐπάρχοντας ἐθεράπευεν, ὄντας ἐκατὸν πεντήκοντα), and according to Strabo Cyzicus had space for two hundred (ὁ Κύζικος...ἐχει...λιμένας δύο κλειστοὺς καὶ νεωσοίκους πλείους τὸν διακοσίων). Neither has been confirmed by archaeology.

Hurst has insightfully posited that the size and scale of the Carthaginian harbour derived from a ‘siege mentality’ responding to the circumstances leading up

576 Held (2009) esp. 124-6; cf. Pimouguet (1994) 244-5; McNicoll (1997) 175-8; Pimouguet-Pédarros (2000) 380-3. Held (2002) 293 argued that the shipshed installation must have been Rhodian and of Early Hellenistic date because Loryma could not have maintained a sizeable fleet. While quite possible, the remains of the shipsheds have not been properly excavated.

577 App. B Civ. 4.72. For the first commander of the fort see SEG 53 1238.


to the Third Punic War.\textsuperscript{582} On Athens, he notes that the grandest phase of the Piraeus shipsheds was begun just before Athens lost political independence.\textsuperscript{583} It would appear that such monumental complexes were therefore unusual, perhaps designed for show, and the product of difficult circumstances, unlike the peaceful conditions of the imperial Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{584}

It is therefore difficult to consider Misenum and Ravenna simply as “naval bases” because of difficulties of definition, while comparing them to naval installations of the Classical and Hellenistic Mediterranean does not get us very far, partly due to lack of evidence, and partly because our best comparanda may themselves be exceptional. Thus, I propose to set the “naval base” aside, considering instead attested shared features of the major classis ports. This is not to deny that the ports were broadly like “naval bases”; rather, different angles of research may shed more light than continuously speculating over where their shipsheds were.

To this end, I shall explore more fully the local and regional contexts of Misenum and Ravenna. These contexts have not been completely ignored in previous scholarship. For instance, Starr recognised that Misenum was near the ‘great ports of western Italy’, including Puteoli: we shall discuss the potential significance of this below.\textsuperscript{585} Similarly, we shall see that scholarship, concentrating on the classis Ravennas as a war fleet, has fairly consistently observed the regional strategic value of Ravenna.\textsuperscript{586} However, my particular interest will be in the association of the classis ports with concentrations of imperial property. Following from this, I shall argue that these bases should not be considered purely through the prism of military history.

\textsuperscript{582} Hurst (1994) 47.
\textsuperscript{583} Hurst (2010) 30.
\textsuperscript{584} Hurst (2010) argues that larger fleets would have been constructed only for specific circumstances, and that temporary wooden shipsheds were built on a large scale for such times.
\textsuperscript{586} See below p. 178.
because of the range of imperial activities undertaken around the ports, some of which were demonstrably supported by the classes.

Some association between the Italian classes and imperial estates has been mooted before. Kienast suggested that the series of imperial villae maritimae on the Tyrrenian coast of Italy, and imperial travel between them, led to the formation of a strong bond between the Emperor and the classis Misenensis. But he did not consider whether there could have been a more fundamental link between these villae and classis activity, nor whether the same was true for the classis Ravennas.

The connection is more explicitly noted when evidence for servicemen has been found inland. For instance, three second century epitaphs belonging to members of both Italian classes have been found at Tivoli, and their presence should arguably be associated with the villa Hadriana. The second or early third century epitaphs of two classis Germanica servicemen have also been recorded. Reddé argued that supporting imperial communications determined their presence at the villa, a proposition which will gain circumstantial support in Chapter Four.

The same may apply to three epitaphs found near the Fucine Lake. Mommsen linked these to the mock naval battle held there by Claudius in AD 52 to celebrate its draining. Yet only one of the epitaphs can be dated to that period.

587 Kienast (1966) 48-9; similarly Chapot (1896) 54; D’Arms (1970) 95.
588 CIL XIV 3627 (= Inscr. It. IV 1.160), 3630 (= Inscr. It. IV 1.167); AE 1996 517.
589 AE 1899 97; AE 2006 394.
591 Note also Pais (1884) no.496, an epitaph erected by a tr(ierarchus) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) and RMD III 142 (= AE 1989 315) with AE 1999 703, a classis diploma of AD 100, both from Voghenza. One could tentatively associate these with imperial holdings in the Po valley: see below pp. 186-7.
593 Append. 18.
Based on their form and contents, the others are probably later.\footnote{CIL IX 3891: C(aio) Iulio Ce/leri mil(it)i cla(ssis) / praetor(iae) Raven(natis) / [(centuria) Seleni Sev[e]ri / mil(itavit) a(nnos) XXIX / vix(it) an(nos) L / her(es) posuit / L(lucius) Valerius Ve/recundus / b(e)ni m(erenti) de se; AE 1991 568 (= CIL IX 3993): D(is) M(anibus) [s(acrum)] / C(aio) Ve[lo]nio Vict[ori] / mil(it)i [ex c]las(se) pr[ae]toria / Raven(nate) / M(arcus) Herenniu[s] / Apelles amico / b(e)ni m(erenti) / p(osuit).} I am tempted to suggest that they could hint at a long term association between the \textit{classes} and putative imperial property, though evidence for the latter is scarce.\footnote{Segenni (2007) 128, noting imperial construction works and a handful of inscriptions attesting imperial slaves or freedmen.}

Not all epigraphy attesting \textit{classis} servicemen found inland can be easily associated with imperial holdings. A \textit{miles} of the \textit{classis praetoria Ravennas} erected a monument to his wife at Recina in Picenum, probably in the second century AD.\footnote{CIL IX 5749 (= VI 3153 = AE 1990 302): D(is) M(anibus) / Dasiae / Verae / M(arcus) Demetrius Epictetus / mil(es) cla(ssis) / praetoriae Ravennatis / coniugi / [---].} A \textit{diploma} of AD 129 for the Corsican \textit{miles} \textit{M(arcus) Numisius Saionis f(ilius) Nomasius} was found at Cremona.\footnote{CIL XVI 74 (= III p. 875 = V 4091).} A Capuan epitaph mentions two men who served on different triremes, though could be connected to Misenum or Campanian imperial property.\footnote{AE 1980 226: D(is) M(anibus) / bene merent(e)sic / Carnutius Maxi/mus ex III Marte fe/c(i)/ Lappio Secund(oo) fratri suo ex III Athenune/ice(sic). Panciera (1960) 31 guessed a third century AD date, but the late second century would be acceptable.} Nonetheless, this is a rather meagre subset of a small sample, and that one can connect inland finds with imperial property should be kept in mind.\footnote{Furthermore, note CIL IX 1631, from Beneventum: [---] ex III / Diomed(e) / in fr(onte) p(edes) XII in / agr(o) p(edes) [---].}

Given this phenomenon, it is surprising that similar links have not generally been drawn between \textit{classis} bases and coastal estates, though concentrating on the “naval base” may have obscured this interesting association.
3. Centumcellae: imperial estate and imperial port

Before considering the main *classis* bases, let us briefly examine Centumcellae, a harbour near an imperial villa where the differing functions and mixed character of the estate can be brought into focus. A letter from summer AD 107 depicts its construction, written when Pliny had been called to a *consilium* of the Emperor at the nearby villa. I shall leave aside this well-known description, concentrating on other parts of the text.

We know of eighteen *classis* epitaphs found just to the north of the harbour at Prato del Turco. The majority of these epitaphs require little commentary: they display standard features of *classis* funerary epigraphy from the second and early third centuries AD. This date range is expected: a *classis* detachment is unlikely to have predated the harbour.

The epitaphs arguably point to lengthy deployment periods at Centumcellae and a permanent detachment, as usually suggested. While most of the deceased were *milites*, an *optio*, a *suboptio* and possibly a centurion are known, implying a full
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600 In general see Hülsen in *RE* III (1899), s.v. *Centum Cellae*, 1934; Bastianelli (1954); Caruso (1991); Correnti (1990); Quilici (1993); Mauro (2012) 260-1.
602 *CIL* XI 3522-4, 3525 (= *ILS* 7583), 3526-30, 3531 (= *ILS* 2859), 3531a, 3532-6, 7584; *NSA* (1940), 195, reported by Bastianelli; cf. Torelli (1982) 112. For the *classes* and Centumcellae see Fiebig (1894) 327-8; Chapot (1896) 78-9; Starr (1960) 18, 23; Kienast (1966) 48-9; Reddé (1986) 197-201.
603 Exceptional is *CIL* XI 3526: *D*(is) *M*(anibus) / *C*(aio) *Caecilio* *Valenti* *milit(itii) cl(assis) praetoriae) / *Mis*ennsis *milit(avit) ann(os) VIII / vix(it) ann(is) XXXI / *C(aius) Lucilius* *V(a)lens* / corpor(is) custos / fec(it) ben(e) merenti). Because of the *custos corporis*, Reddé (1986) 526 argued that this inscription was Flavian, indicating a *classis* presence at Centumcellae in the first century AD. However, Bellen (1981) 69-71 suggested that *corpor* was a misreading for *armor*: there are thirteen certain examples of *armorum custodes* in my sample of *classis* epigraphy (e.g. *CIL* X 3397, 3401; XI 54, 66). I am inclined to follow this suggestion: the inscription was perhaps not especially carefully carved (hence *V(a)lens*) which could lead to a misreading. Moreover, *custodes corporis* normally took their *tria nomina* from Emperors, not done here. The inscription can then be dated to the second century AD.
604 See above n. 602 for *classis* bibliography.
detachment. Some formed relationships at the port, indicating their long-term presence. One monument was erected by C. Iulius Sabinus and Artoria, coniunx of the deceased miles, M. Helvius Maximus. C. Iulius Sabinianus buried his pater, C. Iulius Saturninus, a classis serviceman. None of the deceased were explicitly described as veterani, though Helvius died at the age of 70; one could conjecture that he had obtained honesta missio and settled in his service area.

These epitaphs led Hülsen to posit military functions for the harbour, at least in its origins. To support this, Bastianelli pointed out that Vigiles were found there too, though only two second or early third century epitaphs are known. With the military theme in mind, Starr thought that the role of the Centumcellae classis servicemen was to police the Tyrrhenian. He attributed secondary functions to them, including guarding commerce, transporting the Emperor and officials, and acting as couriers along the via Aurelia. Reddé made much less of the military aspect of Centumcellae, portraying it as a relay port and emphasising communications.

Now, Pliny provides the only direct statement on a possible purpose of the harbour: eritque vel maxime salutaris nam per longissimum spatium litus importuosum hoc receptaculo utetur. This does not necessarily explain why Trajan built it, only what Pliny considered would be the consequences of its construction. It

---


606 CIL XI 3531a: D(is) M(anibus) / M(arco) Helvio / Maximo / cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Rav(entianae) / vix(it) anni / LXX / fec(it) C(aius) Iulius / Sabinus et / Artoria / Euplia con(iugi) bene / m(erenti).

607 CIL XI 3532: D(is) M(anibus) / G(aio) Iulio Saturnino / xestis / cl(assis) / pr(aetoriae) / Misenae / vix(it) / annis / LIII / G(aius) Iulius / Sabinianus / patri bene / m(erenti) / p(osuit).

608 CIL XI 3531a.

609 Hülsen in RE III (1899), s.v. Centum Cellae, 1934.

610 CIL XI 3520 (= ILS 2168), 3521; Bastianelli (1954) 19.

611 Starr (1960) 18.


may hint at its possible eventual role in sheltering grain ships and supporting the *annona*, as discussed in Chapter Four.  

Chapter One argued that *classis milites* should not be understood purely from a traditional “military” perspective: if correct, their presence need not be regarded as indicative of military activity. Moreover, concentrating on any military aspects of early Centumcellae does not fully take into account the connection between the harbour and the imperial estate. The letter of Pliny brings out the close relationship between the villa and its adjacent coastline (*imminet litori*) and the surrounding pleasantness: the villa was *pulcherrima*, located in *viridissimi agri*.  

Pliny described a series of judicial cases heard by Trajan: that of Claudio Aristion, *princeps Ephesiorum*, an adultery charge against Gallitta, wife of a *tribunus militum*, and an investigation into the will of a Iulius Tiro. This combined evidence implicitly connects imperial residence and activity in a charming location to the new harbour. These are points not made explicit in many studies of Centumcellae, which, aside from military matters, concentrate on harbour commerce and urban development. But its ideological and practical functions as an imperial construction must not be forgotten.  

Thus, Centumcellae provides us with an early second century example of a harbour at which members of the Italian *classes* were based. It was associated with an imperial estate, a place of pleasure and politics, as Pliny reveals. Where we encounter other *classis* harbours in similar positions, we should be mindful of the mixed usage

---

614 See below pp. 282-3.  
615 Plin. *Ep.* 6.31.15. The villa has not been securely identified, but a site at Belvedere, under a mile inland, is commonly suggested e.g. Bastianelli (1954) 15, 60-1; Caruso (1991) 51; cf. Lafon (2001) 349 RM. 6. 8.  
616 Plin *Ep.* 6.31.3-12.  
618 Note later imperial visits to Centumcellae: Fronto *ad M. Aurelium* 3.20 (Naber p. 56 = Haines p. 172); 5.59 (Naber p. 92 = Haines p. 52); SHA *Comm.* 1.9.
of such property, and be wary of concentrating on them purely from military or strategic perspectives. 619

4. Misenum

Let us now turn to Misenum and its surroundings. 620 I shall begin with its natural advantages and history as a port as attested in literature, both sometimes viewed as significant in its selection as a classis port. While influential, I shall suggest that these only offer partial explanations and an insufficient understanding of the base.

Moving to imperial property, I shall consider the presence of villae maritimae around the port, attested in archaeology and literature, some of which were in imperial possession. We shall see that there is direct evidence for Julius Caesar possessing property locally, thus before the base was established, and which was probably inherited by Octavian. This may have influenced the decision to locate a classis there.

The presence of imperial villae maritimae encourages divergence from the traditional approach to Misenum as a “naval base”, because of the varied characteristics of those estates. To emphasise the point, the inquiry will be expanded to cover evidence for imperial property ownership in the adjacent sinus Baianus. This

619 Compare Ancona, a municipal harbour reconstructed by Trajan (recorded by an inscription on a triumphal arch: CIL IX 5894 (= ILS 298); cf Moretti (1945) 52-5; Sebastiani (1996) 35, at which there is no evidence for imperial property or the Italian classes: see Fiebig (1894) 336; Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 198-9, 243; Starr (1960) 23; Moretti (1945); Reddé (1986) 218-20; Sebastiani (1996).

620 For Misenum in general, see Mommsen in CIL X (1883), pp.317-8; Beloch (1890) 190-202; Fiebig (1894) 290-2; Chapot (1896) 66-8; Philipp in RE XV (1932), s.v. Misenum, 2043-8; Starr (1960) 13-17; Bollini (1968) 49-54; Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1974) 114-64; Castagnoli (1977) 70-1; De Franciscis in BTCGI IV (1985), 428-33; Reddé (1986) 186-97. For the underwater archaeology of Baiae and the work of Fraia, Lombardo and Scognamiglio, see bibliography in D’Arms (2003) 232-3.
will highlight the association of *villae maritimae* and imperial activity in the region with leisure and even decadence, especially in the first century AD.

![Map of Misenum and its region](source: Google Maps)

Yet, it would be incautious to be misled by literary sources sometimes hostile to Julio-Claudian *principes* into thinking that the *sinus Baianus* was defined purely by luxury, and I shall examine evidence for production locally, and for commerce and communications at nearby Puteoli. This suggests a complicated region, valuable to the imperial house, where the *classis* at Misenum was able to support imperial activity.\(^{621}\)

---

\(^{621}\) One could expand this inquiry to the whole Bay of Naples and its Campanian hinterland, including Capua, which retained some importance into the early imperial period (Frederiksen (1984) 285-318). However, I shall concentrate on Baiae because of its juxtaposition to Misenum, and on Puteoli because it became the chief regional city in our period, and in its social and commercial relationships with the area can be seen as its representative.
4.1 Geography and history

Introducing Misenum, Starr overviewed the disadvantages of other locations for a Roman classis base. Forum Iulii was in Gaul, Brundisium was too far from Rome, Ostia and Portus Iulius were physically unsuitable, Naples and Puteoli were jammed with commercial shipping. This summary underlines how many factors must have contributed to determining the location and character of the classis installation.

When considering the advantages of Misenum, scholarship often invokes its natural qualities. It is sheltered from south and west winds, with a deep outer harbour connected to an inner bay, now lago Miseno. Most harbour sites on the western coast of Italy were at river mouths, such as Ostia, or coastal lagoons, which the Cumaeans probably exploited. Neither is ideal for a permanent installation, certainly not without engineering, so if directed primarily by nature, and considering the drawbacks for other sites, the Romans had little option but to establish their western classis port at Misenum. And yet the port at Ravenna was quite probably in a lagoon, with Ancona arguably the better north Adriatic harbour. Rejection of the latter implies that imperial priorities extended beyond geographical convenience.

Its real or imagined past may have been influential. Historically, Misenum had been in Cumaean territory. Livy wrote of Hannibal laying waste to the land of Cumae down to Misenum in 214 BC (pervastato agro Cumano usque ad Miseni promunturium). Dionysius of Halicarnassus commented that among the benefits

---

622 Starr (1960) 14.
623 E.g. Chapot (1896) 66-7; Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 176-7; Philipp in RE XV (1932), s.v. Misenum, 2044; Starr (1960) 14-15; Bollini (1968) 49-51.
624 On Ravenna see below pp. 174-5.; Ancona as a fine harbour: Hülsen in RE I (1894), s.v. Ancona, 2114; Moretti (1945) 44; Susini (1967a) 367.
625 For the territory of Cumae see Frederiksen (1984) 32-4, 43.
626 Livy 24.13.6.
available to Cumae were the good harbours around Misenum (κατέχουσα τῆς Καμπανῶν πεδιάδος τήν πολυκαρποτάτην καὶ λιμένων κρατοῦσα τόν περί Μισηνὸν ἐπικαρποτάτων). Here, the toponym refers to physical features: the promontory, or the hill, Monte Miseno, which rises abruptly at its tip. This usage persisted into the imperial period, as Strabo records: πλησίον δὲ τῆς Κύμης τὸ Μισηνὸν ἀκρωτήριον.

While there is no evidence for a formal community at Misenum before the classis was deployed there, Josephus shows that by the later first century AD the πόλις Misenum had arisen (Μισηνοὺς ἑτέραν πόλιν ἐπιθαλάσσιον), by then separated from Cumae and perhaps raised to municipal status.

Despite Dionysius, who may be anachronistic, we cannot automatically identify the harbours of Republican Cumae with those of the classis Misenensis. Paget argued that the archaic Cumaean harbours, now unrecognisable due to coastline changes, were closer to the city. However, and while I am not as certain as Chapot, it would be surprising if the Cumaeans and visiting ships had not exploited the excellent promontory harbour before the first century AD. Therefore, there may have been precedent for a port at Misenum, but nothing decisively shows that the

---

627 Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7.3.2; cf. 12.1.9. Note 5.51.3, where the name is applied to the harbour.
628 Str. 5.4.5 (note also 1.2.18; 5.4.6); cf. Tac. Ann. 6.50; mutatisque saepius locis tandem apud promunturium Miseni consedit in villa cui L. Lucullus quondam dominus; 14.4; Virg. Aen. 6. 231-5; Plin. NH 3.61.
629 Jos. AJ 19.5; cf. Oros. 5.12.9. Contra Beloch (1890’) 190; Starr (1960’) 16, 27 n.17; Maiuri (1958’) 93-4; Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 24 who suggested that Augustus founded a colonia and Mommsen (1878) 109 and in CIL X (1883), p.317; Philipp in RE XV (1932), s.v. Misenum, 2047; Frederiksen (1984) 43 (cf. Keppie (1984a) 80) who attributed a colonia to Claudius. A colonia is unattested before the later second or third century AD (see CIL X 3674 (= ILS 6335) and 3678 (= ILS 5689)). Honorary inscriptions on statue bases from the sacellum of the Augustales at Misenum (Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 137-9; de Franciscis (1991); Guadagno (1994); D’Arms (2000); Miniero (2000)) attest a municipium by AD 102, when one inscription (AE 1993 468 (= 1994 426b) ll.25-6) mentions a fine to be paid ad rem publicam / municipum Misenensium; cf. AE 1993 472 (= 1996 424a) (AD 112); AE 2000 344 (AD 148-9); CIL X 1881 (= ILS 6328) (AD 165). On the assignment of the third to Misenum see Parma (1994) 35-6; D’Arms (2000) 130; Zevi (2000a) 55 (who erroneously dates it to AD 169). Given that no community at Misenum is mentioned before Josephus, I suggest that the municipium was created in the second half of the first century AD, with a colonia formed towards the end of the second century at the earliest.
631 Chapot (1896) 66.
imperial classis was placed there because of this, or gives much insight as to its earlier character.

Perhaps more influential to its selection was the exploitation of the area as a gathering and training point for the fleet under Agrippa for use against Sextus Pompeius in 36 BC.\textsuperscript{632} Scholars have occasionally argued that Misenum was chosen as a replacement for the so-called Portus Iulius, formed from the Lucrine and Lake Avernus, because of its similarity to that installation (i.e. having an outer and inner bay).\textsuperscript{633} But it is unclear whether the two can be so closely paralleled, with the Portus Iulius not fully understood.\textsuperscript{634} On a basic physical point, Purcell noted that the comparison of the relatively deep outer bay at Misenum with the shallow Lucrine is tenuous.\textsuperscript{635} Thus the view of Misenum as a replacement is not well supported. Nonetheless, there were major naval preparations locally; possibly the promontory harbours were used, or at least noticed, encouraging later exploitation.

\textsuperscript{632} Vell. Pat. 2.79.1-2; Str. 5.4.5; Suet. Aug. 16.1; App. B Civ. 5.97; Cass. Dio 48.49.4 - 51; 49.1.1; Flor. 12.18.5-6.
\textsuperscript{633} See above p. 7 n.28 for references.
\textsuperscript{634} The standard account (see e.g. Beloch (1890) 169-70; Pagano, Reddé and Roddaz (1982); Roddaz (1984) 95-114; Reddé (1986) 164-71; cf. Camodeca (1994) 112-13) views Portus Iulius as a military harbour created when Agrippa linked the deep Avernus and the marshy Lucrine lakes. Therefore, it could have been a model for Misenum. However, the source tradition on the harbour is neither clear nor aligned. Only Suetonius (Aug. 16.1) refers to it by name. He states that ships were built before the harbour (cf. App. B Civ. 5.92; Cass. Dio 48.49.1), whereas Velleius Paterculus (2.72.2) says that the fleet was built within it. Appian does not mention the harbour at all (see Gowing (1992) 195 n.39).
Some sources were confused about basic relevant topography. For instance, Dio (48.50.2) mixed up Avernus and the Lucrine, calling the former marshy. He claimed (48.50.3) that Agrippa made both excellent harbours, whereas Strabo (Str. 5.4.6) thought that the Lucrine was unsuitable for mooring ships. Strabo (5.4.6) indicated that some authorities thought that Lucrine was actually the Acherusia, while Artemidorus identified it with Avernus. If our sources could not identify crucial physical features, they may not have known much about the location of the Agrippan project, or its purpose. Purcell (in Frederiksen (1984) 333-4) suggested that we should see the Agrippan works as facilitating the exploitation of timber resources. It is also possible that Avernus was utilised for training crews.
\textsuperscript{635} Frederiksen (1984) 334.
4.2 Imperial estates and the *sinus Baianus*

Geography and history were therefore potentially, though not exclusively, influential in the choice of the Misenum harbour as a station for what became the *classis Misenensis*, and certainly fundamental for understanding its character. However, the approach thus far neglects a significant feature of the Misenum region: its luxury *villae maritimae*. The harbour itself was overlooked by a large villa above the Grotta della Dragonara, at the top of the Miseno promontory, as Starr mentioned in passing.636 This has usually been identified with the villa of Marius, which Lucullus bought, and where Tiberius sojourned and later died in AD 37.637 Thus the villa passed into imperial hands, perhaps even during the Augustan period. Maiuro has recently noted that its location may have influenced the installation of the *classis* but does little to pursue this idea.638

The identification, based on literary sources, is a reasonable hypothesis, if not absolutely certain. Pliny described it simply as a villa *in Misenensi*.639 Phaedus pictured the villa of Tiberius (*Misenensem villam venisset suam*) as looking towards Sicily and the Tyrrenian (*quae monte summo imposita... prospectat Siciliam et prospicit Tuscum mare*).640 Seneca noted that the villa was at a height (*summis iugis montium*).641 Tacitus described it as *apud promunturium Miseni*.642 Beloch admitted...
that much of this could apply to Monte Procida, but remains there are few.\footnote{Beloch (1890) 198.} Nothing clearly refutes the traditional interpretation, and I follow it with due caution.

Even if the identification of these ruins with the imperial villa is incorrect, we still possess clear evidence in Tacitus for a property on the promunturium Miseni. Thus, the most significant classis base on the western coast of Italy was established adjacent to property potentially in imperial possession under Augustus. Additionally, there is rather good evidence for prior property ownership locally by Octavian. Tacitus records that Agrippina the Younger was buried along the road to Misenum, near a villa of Julius Caesar \textit{(viam Miseni propter et villam Caesaris dictatoris quae subiectos sinus editissima prospectat)}.\footnote{Tac. \textit{Ann.} 14.9; note Cic. \textit{Att.} 11.6.6.} His adopted son surely inherited this, and I am tempted to suggest that this could have had some direct influence on where the classis was installed.

We can also adduce the villa once belonging to the orator Hortensius at Bauli. Pliny described how Antonia, wife of Drusus and daughter of Antony and Octavia, adorned fish there: \textit{in eadem villa Antonia Drusi murenae, quam diligebat, inaures addidit}.\footnote{Plin. \textit{NH} 9.172; cf. Varro \textit{Rust.} 3.17.5.} D’Arms argued that, following the demise of the son of Hortensius after Philippi, the villa became the property of Antony or Octavian, and ultimately the latter.\footnote{D’Arms (1970) 68-9; contra Beloch (1890) 179 (followed by Hirschfeld (1902-3) 65), who suggests that the villa was owned by Drusus and passed to Agrippina the Younger. This is based on the belief of Beloch (1890) 201 that Bauli was north of Baiae, and Tac. \textit{Ann.} 14.5, which reveals that Agrippina owned a villa near the Lucrine. On Bauli Beloch followed Plin. \textit{NH} 3.61: \ldots Misenum, portus Baia rum, Bauli... but this is contradicted by e.g. Tac. \textit{Ann.} 14.4: complexu ducitque Baulos, id villae nomen est, quae promunturium Misenum inter et Baianum lacum flexo mari adliitur; cf. Varro \textit{Rust.} 3.17.5; Plin. \textit{NH} 9.127. More recent studies have located Bauli at m. Bacoli, south of Baiae (see e.g. Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 21-3 for discussion of the problem and bibliography; see also Di Fraia, Lombardo and Scognamiglio (1985-6) 290-2). This makes the hypothesis of Beloch on the subsequent ownership of the \textit{villa Hortensiana} harder to sustain.} While this proposal lacks absolutely conclusive evidence, the probable confiscation of the property of an enemy of the triumvirs makes it very attractive. If
correct, it would provide further evidence for very early imperial interest in the area around Misenum.

The above encourages us to rethink the nature of the “naval base” at Misenum, considering the varied characteristics of imperial *villa maritima* as identified when discussing Centumcellae. This should have implications for how we view any tasks undertaken by the *classis Misenensis*, especially around Campania.

In particular, the resort character of nearby Baiae, and its luxury *villa maritima*, prompt reconsideration with pleasure and luxury in mind. I shall examine evidence, especially in literature, for imperial property in the wider *sinus Baianus*, alongside its connections with opulence, and use this to reinterpret the *classis* base. I shall set out some direct evidence for imperial leisure or display activities in the region, hinting at its importance to the imperial house. However, we should not view the region purely through the prism of luxury, as evidence for the productive capacities of such *villa maritima*, and the commerce and communications of nearby Puteoli, will demonstrate. Such an approach was encouraged by D’Arms, who advocated seeing the *villa* of Augustus in the Bay of Naples within the context of economic, military, social and cultural developments.\(^647\)

We shall begin with evidence for imperial property in the region, which followed a Republican tradition of ownership from around the mid-second century BC.\(^648\) Imperial visits to the *sinus Baianus* are well documented in literature, especially for the Julio-Claudian period, and have received much attention in work on


imperial property or the Bay of Naples. Therefore, the following is not comprehensive, but offers several important examples. Sometimes we hear directly of Emperors or their families residing at imperial estates, while elsewhere we must resort to inference. Some evidence has been presented, but a further sample will reinforce the point.

Augustus responded negatively to L. Vinicius calling on his daughter Julia at Baiae (quidem coetu adeo prohibuit, ut L. Vinicio...scripserit quondam parum modeste fecisse eum, quod filiam suam Baias salutatum venisset), from which we can assume a residence. We have seen that Tiberius died at Misenum. Furthermore, his presence in Campania from AD 27 until his death, especially at Capri, was infamous, as Tacitus described: quanto intentus olim publicas ad curas tanto occultiores in luxus et malum otium resolutus. In recording a meeting at Baiae in AD 38 between Gaius Caligula, Herod, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea and Fortunatus, freedman of Herod Agrippa, Josephus mentioned the opulently decorated ‘royal houses’ there (βασίλειοί τε εἰσιν οἰκήσεις αὐτόθι πολυτελέσι κεχρημέναι κατασκευαίς) and the attempts of each Emperor to outdo his predecessor (φιλοτιμηθέντος τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων ἑκάστου τοὺς προγεγονότας ὑπερβάλλεσθαι). This brings to mind both the luxury of the sinus Baianus, and how Emperors exploited the area to display their own wealth and power.

---

650 See above pp. 156-7.
651 Suet. Aug. 64.2.
652 Above p. 156.
653 Tac. Ann. 4.67; cf. 6.1; Suet. Tib. 40-4; M. Aur. Med. 12.27.
654 Jos. AJ 18.249.
A bronze inscription found near Tridentum containing an edict of Claudius shows that the Emperor was at a praetorium in Baiae in AD 46.\(^{655}\)

M(arco) Iunio Silano Q(uinto) Sulpicio Camerino co(n)s(ulibus)
Idibus Mart(i)i Bai(i)i in praetorio edictum
Ti(beri) Claudi Caesaris Augusti Germanici propositum fuit id...

This praetorium was arguably the heart of an imperial estate but, despite speculation, its whereabouts are unknown, and it seems a fruitless endeavour to connect it with any archaeological remains, however imposing they may be.\(^{656}\)

Domitia, the aunt of Nero, owned land there, on which the Emperor built ἡβητήρια after her possibly hastened death in AD 59.\(^{657}\)

καὶ ἔσπευσέ γε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι διά τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς τὰ ἐν ταῖς Βαίαις καὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥαβεννίδι ὄντα, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡβητήρια εὐθὺς μεγαλοπρεπὴ κατεσκεύασεν, ἀ καὶ δεῦρο ἄνθει.

Although these cannot be identified, we should also note that Nero was generally fond of spending time in the area (Nero multo apud Puteolos et Misenum maris usu

---


\(^{656}\) Beloch (1905\(^2\)) 185: possibly identified with villa Caesaris which he located to the west of the castle at Baiae, but there is no evidence (see Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 19 n.107). Maiuri (1958\(^3\)) 85 placed Caesar’s villa and praetorium on the castle hill. De Franciscis (1967) located it at the vast thermal complex of Baiae; see also D’Arms (1970) 109; Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 19 n.112; Mauiro (2012) 280 but see below note. Camodeca (2007) 151 located it at the nymphaeum in the water off the Punta Epitaffio, following B. Andrea in Baia. Il ninfeo imperiale sommerso di Punta Epitaffio, Napoli, (1983), pp. 67-71, suggesting that a statue group found in the excavation pertains to the family of Claudius. But the identification of the statues, some of them very fragmentary, is extremely tenuous.

\(^{657}\) Cass. Dio 61.17.2; Tac. Ann. 13.21. The ἡβητήρια could be private luxury ‘gymnasia’ (as rendered by Carey (1925) p. 73), but that Nero also built them at Ravenna perhaps indicates they were training grounds or leisure facilities for classis servicemen. The Suda and Hesychius suggest that ἡβητήριον can mean “banqueting hall” (ἐστιατήριον) or “training ground” (παιδευτήριον); cf. Plut. Pomp. 40.5; 53.1. De Angelis d’Ossat (1977) 238-43 speculatively identified parts of the large thermal complex at Baiae with the ἡβητήρια; cf. Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1974) 63-9.
In the second century, Hadrian died at Baiae (apud ipsas Baias periit), and was supposedly buried at the villa Ciceroniana Puteolis, perhaps implying, as Hirschfeld suggested, that the estate had become imperial property.\footnote{\textit{Tac. Ann.} 15.51; cf. 15.52 for the \textit{villa Pisonis}, where Nero was accustomed to spend time; Suet. \textit{Ner.} 27.3.}

Much of this evidence, and that discussed below pertaining to imperial activity, relates to the Julio-Claudian period. This is partly due to the nature and interests of our literary sources: as is well known, we are better equipped with full and reasonably reliable historical or biographical narratives for the Julio-Claudians than for the Flavian period and later, with these sources particularly interested in the salacious activities of the early imperial household.

The reduction of attested imperial residence may also partly reflect reality: later Emperors could favour residence elsewhere, for instance Vespasian at Reate, Domitian at Alba and Hadrian at Tibur, though the third did die at Baiae. But that does not demonstrate that imperial interest or property ownership there declined entirely.\footnote{\textit{D’Arms} (1970) 109 emphasises continuity.} The \textit{Historia Augusta} says of Alexander Severus,\footnote{\textit{SHA Alex. Sev.} 26.9; cf. Amm. Marc. 28.4.19. Note Ostrow (1979) for the \textit{palatium}.}

\begin{quote}
\textit{...in matrem Mamaeam unice pius fuit, ita ut... in Baiano palatium cum stagno, quod Mamaeae nomine hodieque censetur. fecit et alia in Baiano opera magnifica in honorem adfinium suorum et stagna stupenda admisso mari.}
\end{quote}

\footnote{\textit{SHA Hadr.} 25.6-7; Malalas \textit{Chron.} 11.20; cf. \textit{SHA Ant. Pius} 7.11 and Hirschfeld (1902-3) 65. \textit{D’Arms} (1970) 106 with n.154 (cf. Maiuro (2012) 280) suggests that the burial was invented, citing \textit{SHA Ant. Pius} 5.1 and \textit{Marc.} 6.1 for his burial in Rome. Possibly the property was imperial anyway.}

\footnote{\textit{D’Arms} (1970) 109 with n.154 (cf. Maiuro (2012) 280) suggests that the burial was invented, citing \textit{SHA Ant. Pius} 5.1 and \textit{Marc.} 6.1 for his burial in Rome. Possibly the property was imperial anyway.}
Belief in this investment may be encouraged by an unquantified collection of lead pipes found at Baiae stamped with the name of Alexander.\textsuperscript{662} Consequently, Emperors still maintained estates around Baiae in the third century AD, or at least could be imagined as doing so. Thus, some of the essential features of the area would have persisted throughout our period, with consequences for the \textit{classis Misenensis}.

The evidence indicates that the \textit{classis Misenensis} was based in a region of high status and imperial property ownership. Campania, and in the Late Republican and imperial periods Baiae in particular, were closely associated with debauched leisure and luxury.\textsuperscript{663} The notorious reputation of Baiae could be exploited in Republican politics. It is clear from the 56 BC speech of Cicero in defence of M. Cælius Rufus that to impugn his character the prosecution had accused Cælius of spending time there.\textsuperscript{664} Cicero responded by alluding to Clodia visiting the resort.\textsuperscript{665}

This topos persisted into the Augustan period and the first century AD, with the dubious temptations of Baiae and its surrounds a recurring theme in poetry, as a small sample demonstrates. Propertius devoted one poem to persuading Cynthia to leave Baiae, saying: \textit{tu modo quam primum corruptas desere Baias}.\textsuperscript{666} Ovid may refer to this corruption when he comments on its waters, playing on the reputation of the healing waters of Baiae: \textit{non haec, ut fama est, unda salubris erat}.\textsuperscript{667} Writing about \textit{casta Laevina}, Martial said of her trip to Baiae: \textit{coniuge Penelope venit, abit Helene}.\textsuperscript{668}

\textsuperscript{662} De Franciscis (1967) 215; noted by D’Arms (1970) 107 n.164; \textit{cf. AE} 1997 308, a pipe found in dredging operations in the waters at Baia in 1923-24: \textit{Imperatoris} \textit{Marcii Severi Alexandri Aug(usti)}. For pipes and ownership see below p. 286 with n.1211.
\textsuperscript{664} Cic. \textit{Cael.} 27: \textit{tibi autem, Balbe... qui Baias viderit}; 35: \textit{accusatores quidem libidines, amores, adulteria, Baias, actas...}
\textsuperscript{666} Prop. 1.11.27.
\textsuperscript{667} Ov. \textit{Ars Am.} 1.258.
\textsuperscript{668} Mart. 1.62.6.
One letter by Seneca listed all the negative associations Baiae held for his construction of the wise man.\(^{669}\) Describing some of its worst aspects, he says:\(^{670}\)

\[\text{videre ebrios per litora errantes et comessationes navigantium et symphoniarum cantibus strepentes lacus et alia quae velut soluta legibus luxuria non tantum peccat sed publicat, quid necesse est?}\]

Thus, Baiae was a place to avoid, because *illum sibi celebrandum luxuria desumpsit.*\(^{671}\)

We can offer some evidence for Julio-Claudian Emperors partaking of this luxury, already hinted at in some examples above, or consider how their actions in the *sinus Baianus* or wider Bay of Naples could have been interpreted through this notoreity.\(^{672}\) A striking if familiar instance is the construction by Gaius Caligula of a bridge of boats from Puteoli to Baiae/Bauli/Misenum in AD 39.\(^{673}\) The real motivations for the bridge and following processions are much debated, but only that they were considered pieces of extravagant imperial display matters here.\(^{674}\)

Suetonius essentially highlighted the glorious novelty of the display (*novum praterna atque inauditum genus spectaculi*), as the Emperor rode over the bridge on a

---

\(^{669}\) Sen. *Ep.* 5.51; cf. 5.55.7.
\(^{672}\) For a full collection of the sources for imperial activity in the Bay of Naples, see D’Arms (1970) 73-115.
\(^{674}\) Balsdon (1934) 50-4; D’Arms (1970) 90-2; Purcell in Frederiksen (1984) 336 have emphasised the presence of Parthian hostages including Darius, son of the Parthian king (Suet. *Calig.* 19.2; Cass. *Dio* 59.17.5) to suggest that the event was a declaration of Roman power over the East, or a ‘surrogate triumph’ (Hurley (1993) 74) celebrating the submission of Artabanus to L. Vitellius in AD 37. This is encouraged by comparisons by Seneca (*Brev. Vit.* 18.5), Suetonius (*Calig.* 19.3) and Dio (59.17.11) to Xerxes bridging the Hellespont. Barrett (1989) 212 presents it as a simple display of autocratic power. Kleijwegt (1994) suggests that the event was intended to cement the bonds of Gaius with his soldiers, and to demonstrate these bonds to the Senate. Malloch (2001) understands the event as an example of *Alexander imitatio* (specifically his return from India) to suggest the military victories awaiting Gaius (cf. Edmondson (1992) 164). While this interpretation neatly explains parts of the account of Cassius Dio, it is striking that no source gives this as an object. For other conjectures see Wardle (1994) 194-6. The Gaius literary tradition is so difficult that the event seems impossible to rationalise.
horse and then chariot, armed with sword and shield, bedecked in a gold chlamys and accompanied by friends and soldiers.\textsuperscript{675} However, other sources emphasised the madness or megalomania of Gaius. Seneca described his behaviour as \textit{furiosi et externi et infelicitur superbi regis imitatio}, probably alluding to Xerxes and his bridge over the Hellespont.\textsuperscript{676} Josephus introduced the bridge as one of the all but insane deeds of the Emperor: καὶ τάλλα ἔπρασσεν μανίας οὐδὲν ἀπολελειμμένα.\textsuperscript{677}

Dio claimed that dissatisfaction with a normal triumph spurred Gaius to his adventure (Γάιος δὲ ἐκείνης μὲν τῆς πομπῆς οὐδὲν προετίμησεν).\textsuperscript{678} In the particular context of the leisure of the \textit{sinus Baianus}, we should note the feast after the return from Puteoli.\textsuperscript{679}

καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς τε ἐπὶ τῆς γεφύρας ὡσπερ ἐν νήσῳ τινί, καὶ ἑκεῖνοι ἐν ἐτέροις πλοίοις περιορμοῦντες, τὸ τε λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τὴν νύκτα πᾶσαν εἰστιάθησαν... ἐμπληθεὶς δὲ καὶ ὑπερκορὴς καὶ σίτου καὶ μέθης γενόμενος συχνὸς μὲν τῶν ἑταίρων ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν ὑπερπλεύσας κατέδυσεν, ὥστε καὶ ἀπολέσθαι τινάς... οἱ γὰρ πλείους καὶ πλείους μεθύοντες ἐσώθησαν.

The dining and drunkenness described here seems to fit well with the topos of morally dubious Baiae. Thus, while any criticism levelled at Gaius for this extravagance can be largely regarded as part of a tradition hostile to him, one suspects that the particular setting could have contributed to seeing the celebrations as particularly debased.

\textsuperscript{675} Suet. \textit{Calig.} 19.1.

\textsuperscript{676} Sen. \textit{Brev. Vit.} 18.5. Uniquely Malloch (2001) 208-9 (\textit{contra} e.g. Barrett (1989) 212; Edmondson (1992) 166; Wardle (1994) 193) thinks that Alexander could be the allusion, but given the explicit comment by Suetonius (\textit{Calig.} 19.3) that many believed (\textit{scio plerosque existimasse}) in the comparison with Xerxes (cf. Cass. Dio 59.17.11), I am tempted to follow the standard view.

\textsuperscript{677} Jos. \textit{AJ} 19.5.

\textsuperscript{678} Cass. Dio 59.17.1.

I have mentioned that Nero enjoyed the region; he also murdered his mother there.\textsuperscript{680} We hear of a grand Neronian project to link Avernus to the Tiber and to build a pool from Misenum to Avernus.\textsuperscript{681} We shall see that both schemes were considered follies, and the latter is portrayed by Suetonius as devoted to leisure, despite potential practical uses.\textsuperscript{682} Dio records that Nero also put on games at Puetoli for Tiridates, king of Armenia, in AD 66, noting that Patrobius, an imperial freedman, ensured they were a very grand and expensive affair (καὶ τοσαύτη γε τῇ λαμπρότητι καὶ τῇ δαπάνῃ ἐχρήσατο).\textsuperscript{683}

The above suggests that the \textit{sinus Baianus} could be exploited as a place for imperial leisure and display, at least by the Julio-Claudians.\textsuperscript{684} We should be careful not to overplay the hostile topos of degeneracy. A different literary tradition surfaced at the end of the first century AD, if not earlier, which envisioned Baiae as a place of simple loveliness and hot baths.\textsuperscript{685} For instance, Juvenal wrote: \textit{ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni / secessus.}\textsuperscript{686} On the pleasant bathing environment, Martial could say: \textit{dum nos blanda tenent lasciui stagna Lucrini / et quae pumiceis fontibus antra calent.}\textsuperscript{687} However, even this changed perspective underlines that this was regarded as a region of leisure and consumption: we must take this into account when considering the nature of the base at Misenum, and the possible uses to which the \textit{classis Misenensis} could be put.

\textsuperscript{680} Tac. \textit{Ann.} 14.1-12; Suet. \textit{Ner.} 34.1-4; Cass. Dio 61.12-15; see below pp. 170-1.
\textsuperscript{681} Plin. \textit{NH} 14.61; Stat. \textit{Silv.} 4.3.7-8; Tac. \textit{Ann.} 15.42; Suet. \textit{Ner.} 31.3.
\textsuperscript{682} See below pp. 239, 278-9.
\textsuperscript{683} Cass. Dio 63.3.1.
\textsuperscript{684} See above pp. 160-1.
\textsuperscript{685} Lafon (2001) 257-9. He suggests that overuse of the topos could have killed it, or perhaps the favour shown to the area by successive Emperors improved its reputation. Both proposals seem reasonable.
\textsuperscript{686} Juv. 3.4-5.
\textsuperscript{687} Mart. 4.57.1-2; cf. 11.80.2. See also e.g. Stat. \textit{Silv.} 3.5.96; Plut. \textit{Mar.} 34.1-2. These themes were found earlier e.g. Hor. \textit{Epist.} 1.1.83; Str. 5.4.5.
4.3 Production, Puteoli and communications

The *sinus Baianus* was not devoted wholly to luxury, and we should view its maritime estates and Misenum against a background more richly textured. Consider arguments made, by among others, D’Arms, Lafon and Marzano, that, despite literary traditions, *villae maritimae* were not solely devoted to consumption and idleness but had economic functions, and that Baiae had productive capacities.\(^{688}\) The direct archaeological evidence for production at or near Baiae is not abundant: a couple of *piscinae* have been tentatively identified by Borirello and D’Ambrosio by the water near the theatre at Miseno, but I would not make too much of this.\(^{689}\) However, we could put this in the context of the fish kept at the former villa of Hortensius mentioned above, partly for display purposes, but perhaps partly for true production.\(^{690}\)

There are few explicit literary references, probably because of the topos of the luxurious resort. Yet, looking back to the Republican period, Sergius Orata was supposedly the first to exploit the Lucrine for oyster production, which Pliny notes was done *nec gulae causa sed avaritia*.\(^{691}\) Martial praised the productive *villa Baiana* of Faustinus, contrasting it with the *famis munda* of suburban *villae*.\(^{692}\) The precise nature of the property is unclear, though there are references to fishing (*tremulave*

---


\(^{689}\) Borriello and D’Ambrosio (1979) 141-2, cf. 111.

\(^{690}\) On *piscinae at villae maritimae* see Marzano (2007) 46-63; cf. Lafon (2001) 164-79. Higginbotham (1997) argued that *piscinae* were primarily a form of elite ostentation, but Marzano demonstrates their probable commercial uses.

\(^{691}\) Val. Max. 9.1.1; Plin. *NH* 9.168-9. For oysters and Baiae or the Lucrine see e.g. Mart. 3.60.3; 13.82; Juv. 4.141; 11.49.

\(^{692}\) Mart. 3.58.
yet this poem may over-praise the estate, perhaps playing on the traditional association of Baiae with luxury.\textsuperscript{694}

Generally, the idea that seawards villae could be desireable because of their potential produce is suggested by the oft-cited story of C. Canius, an eques who bought a villa near Syracuse because he was presented with a huge number of fishermen using the waters in front of it.\textsuperscript{695} Nor should we fixate on the sea: coastal properties in the sinus Baianus could potentially have exploited the fertile slopes rising from the shore, as any traveller to the region will observe is possible. North Adriatic examples will provide comparative evidence for the productive potential of villae maritimae.\textsuperscript{696}

The potential production taking place at some of the villae of the sinus Baianus must be placed alongside Puteoli, a hub of commerce and communication, with which both the harbour at Misenum the estates at Baiae probably interacted.\textsuperscript{697} Puteoli lay just over three miles NNE of Misenum. An emporium of great significance during the Late Republican period, it continued in this role well into the Empire.\textsuperscript{698} There is copious evidence for its commercial role. For instance, Cicero commented on the merchants of Puteoli (\textit{mercatores, homines locupletes atque honesti}) whose \textit{socii, liberti} and \textit{conliberti} had supposedly been disrupted in their business by Verres.\textsuperscript{699} Diodorus Siculus discussed how iron from Elba was purchased by merchants and taken to Puteoli and other emporia (ἐμποροὶ καὶ μεταβαλλόμενοι

\textsuperscript{693} Ibid. 3.58.27.
\textsuperscript{695} Cic. Off. 3.58-9; cf. Cic. Verr. 2.5.46.
\textsuperscript{696} See below pp. 198-207.
\textsuperscript{697} For evidence, see D’Arms (1981) 80-1.
\textsuperscript{698} Mommsen in \textit{CIL} X (1883) pp.182-90; Dubois (1907); Frederiksen in \textit{RE} XXIII.2 (1959), s.v. 
\textsuperscript{699} Cic. Verr. 2.5.154.
κομίζουσιν εἰς τε Δικαιάρχειαν καὶ εἰς τάλλα ἐμπόρια) for working and trade.\(^{700}\)

Strabo described Puteoli as the greatest emporium (ἡ δὲ πόλις ἐμπόριον γεγένηται μέγιστον).\(^{701}\)

Around forty inscriptions from Puteoli indicate commercial or productive activity.\(^{702}\) Well-known is the inscription of AD 174 mentioning the members of the Tyrian statio at Puteoli, demonstrating the wide-ranging trade networks into which the city was integrated.\(^{703}\) Individual merchants, businessmen and craftsmen are recorded, for instance the second century M. Claudius Trypho, negotiator vascularius argentarius.\(^{704}\) Other examples include M. Antonius Trophimus, a negotiator sagarius and P. Caulius Coeranus, negotiator ferrariarum et vinariarum.\(^{705}\)

The excellent harbour of Puteoli, a gateway to Italy, saw much human traffic. When he returned to Rome from his Sicilian quaestorship, Cicero stopped off at Puteoli.\(^{706}\) In the In Flaccum, Philo stated that Herod Agrippa was advised by Gaius to sail to Alexandria. He went down to Puteoli, saw Alexandrian ships there, and sailed off on one (καταβὰς δ' εἰς Δικαιάρχειαν καὶ ναὸς ὑφόρμους Ἀλεξανδρίδας ἐιδὸν εὐτρεπεῖς πρὸς ἀναγωγήν, ἐπιβὰς μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων, εὐπλοία χρησάμενος).\(^{707}\) Later, the creation of the Eusebeia at Puteoli by Antoninus Pius brought visitors from

\(^{700}\) Diod. Sic. 5.13.2.
\(^{701}\) Str. 5.4.6. See the bibliography in D’Arms (2003) 242-3. Note also the pozzalana of Puetoili (Str. 5.4.6; Vitr. 2.6.1; Sen. Q Nat. 3.20.3; Cass. Dio 48.51.3-4) used in harbour construction (Brandon et al. (2005) 25; cf. Oleson and Branton (1992) 58-60; Gianfrotta (1996) 74-5 on Sebastos) and production of the pigments caeruleum (Vitr. 7.11.1; Plin. NH 33.161-2) and purpurissum (Plin. NH 35.45).
\(^{702}\) Out of around two thousand inscriptions (excluding instrumenta and Christian texts) last examined on the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss/Slaby (http://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epi_en.php) on 27/05/2014.
\(^{703}\) IG XIV 830; cf. D’Arms (1974).
\(^{704}\) AE 1996 416.
\(^{705}\) CIL X 1872, 1931 (= ILS 7535).
\(^{706}\) Cic. Planc. 65.
\(^{707}\) Philo In Flacc. 27.
the Greek cities of the Panhellenion, as an honorary inscription erected by delegates from Kibyra in Asia Minor shows.\textsuperscript{708}

This is but a small sample of presumably thousands of travellers. Anticipating our later discussion on communications, we should note that this coming and going brought a vital commodity: information.\textsuperscript{709} Cicero alluded to this when mentioning a rumour current in Puteoli that Ptolemy was on the throne of Egypt in 55 BC \textit{(Puteolis magnus est rumor Ptolomaeum esse in regno)}.\textsuperscript{710} Seneca provides important evidence when describing the arrival of the grain fleet at Puteoli. People ran down to the harbour to hear “the news”, Seneca suggesting that information travelled with the grain ships:\textsuperscript{711}

\begin{quote}
\textit{in hoc omnium discursu properantium ad litus magnam ex pigritia mea sensi voluptatem, quod epistulas meorum accepturus non properavi scire quis illic esset rerum mearum status, quid adferrent: olim iam nec perit quicquam mihi nec adquiritur.}
\end{quote}

The \textit{Alexandrinae naves} which travelled before the fleet were known as \textit{tabellariae} (messenger boats).\textsuperscript{712} Kolb has argued that these were not public post-carrying ships, but were called this only because they “announced” the arrival of the fleet.\textsuperscript{713} While she is surely right on the first point, it is possible that they had an informal role in carrying private correspondence, as Seneca could imply. In any case, news travelled with these ships, and we shall see later that even rumours brought by merchants could have significant impacts on behaviour in Rome.

\textsuperscript{708} SEG 53 1090 (= \textit{IG} XIV 829 = SEG 44 823 = \textit{AE} 2006 315). For bibliography on the festival, see Frederiksen (1984) 348 n.171.
\textsuperscript{709} See below pp. 245-53.
\textsuperscript{710} Cic. \textit{Att.} 4.10.1; cf. 16.14.1.
\textsuperscript{711} Sen. \textit{Ep.} 9.77.3.
\textsuperscript{712} \textit{Ibid.} 9.77.1.
\textsuperscript{713} Kolb (2000) 201. As previously suggested by Reddé (1986) 400; contra Hirschfeld (1905) 202-3. Rickman (1980) 130 suggests they could be convoy vessels, but how official? Rougé (1966) 266 without evidence posits some connection with the \textit{classis Alexandrina}.  
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4.4 Classis milites in the Bay of Naples

A picture emerges of a sector of the Bay of Naples in which spaces of pleasure and consumption were at the very least linked to those of commerce and production, and into which the classis Misenensis was inserted. There is no good evidence for a distinct military sector at Misenum, and indeed such a sector seems difficult to posit given the presence of villae maritimae around the harbour itself. That is not to say that the classis did not add any military flavour to the area, but that it seems hard to strongly mark off this aspect from the other human activities. I therefore suggest that we should consider the classis port not simply as a “naval base”, but a site supporting imperial activity of different kinds in the region. Our literary sources emphasise luxurious consumption and display, but production and imperial interest in communications passing through Puteoli should not be ignored.

The next chapter investigates the last topic. But we should here note the small amount of further literary evidence for classis manpower being deployed in the Bay of Naples. Suetonius records that servicemen at Capri waited to smash up the bodies of those thrown down by Tiberius.\(^{714}\)

\[\text{carnificinae eius ostenditur locus Capreis, unde dammato post longa et exquisita tormenta praecipitari coram se in mare iubebat, excipiente classiariorum manu et contis atque remis elidente cadavera, ne cui residui spiritus quicquam inesset.}\]

In the light of arguments made in Chapter One, it is notable that these classiarii seem to have been equipped with oars. Sticking with violence, alongside the freedman and praefectus classis Misenensis Anicetus at the murder of Agrippina were Herculeius, a

\(^{714}\) Suet. Tib. 62.2.
trierarchus and Obaritus, a centurio classiarius. More vaguely, Dio stated that Nero sent Anicetus with some nautae (εὐθος μετὰ τῶν ναυτῶν ἀπέστειλε). We can reasonably assume that these were classis servicemen. More speculatively, while merchant vessels were used by Gaius for his bridge of boats, classis milites may have aided its construction.

These examples may derive from the hostile tradition generated for the Julio-Claudians, and could select the most distasteful duties entrusted to servicemen. Their typical activities may have been more mundane. Pliny allows us to glimpse a task entrusted to the Claudian praefectus classis Misenensis Ti. Iulius Optatus. He was instructed to distribute a type of wrasse (scarus), normally found in the Carpathian Sea, inter Ostiensem et Campaniae oram. Any scari caught had to be thrown back for a period of five years, but Pliny implies that fishing was allowed afterwards (admovitque sibi gula sapores piscibus satis et novum incolam mari dedit). Such activity should probably not be construed as an attempt to establish commercial fishing grounds, but could be connected with luxury fish rearing at villae maritimae, thus suggesting how classis activity could have supported the productive character of the Campanian villae maritimae.

The examples given so far are few, though more will appear in the following chapter. At this stage, I would emphasise the very presence of classis members at the service of Emperors. They were a readily available manpower source of milites available to perform militia in and around the area of Misenum.

---

5. Ravenna

Let us now turn to Ravenna. I shall again begin with traditional approaches to the classis base, examining its natural and strategic setting and settlement history based on literary and documentary evidence. This will provide much needed context, but again will yield only a partial understanding of the base. Alongside this, I shall adduce literary evidence suggesting that Julius Caesar, and hence Octavian, may have owned property at Ravenna before the installation of the classis Ravennas.

I shall then discuss further evidence for imperial property, and its possible association with the classis. In contrast with Misenum, we do not know precisely where the classis port was located, nor is the archaeological evidence for villae maritimae in the territory of Ravenna especially good. Thus we cannot reasonably show that the port was physically overlooked by imperial property.

However, there is good evidence for Ravennate imperial property, especially the regio Ravennatum, and I shall consider epitaphs, inscribed glassware, bricks and tiles mentioning or in some way associated with it. This will suggest that a productive imperial property was located within the region. To further suggest emerging similarities with Misenum, I shall consider Aquileia as a communications hub as a parallel for Puteoli.

I shall then argue that imperial property around Ravenna was not simply productive, but also had resort characteristics by considering literary evidence for imperial residence around the city. This analysis will include a regional element, examining especially Aquileia, to suggest that, as with the sinus Baianus, we are dealing with a classis base in a region in which there were residential and
hypothetically luxurious imperial properties. Previous studies have rarely imposed this regional perspective on the Ravenna classis base, concentrating on the city, or perhaps collecting scattered Adriatic epigraphy in attempts to identify classis stationes.\textsuperscript{719}

That the north Adriatic can be considered a luxurious region will be further suggested by discussion of Altinum and archaeological evidence for luxury Histrian villae maritimae, which can reasonably be integrated within this discussion because of links of the peninsula to north eastern Italy.

\textbf{Fig. 3 Ravenna and the North Adriatic (source: Google Maps)}

A major limitation to this discussion, to an even greater degree than for Misenum, is the absence of literary references to classis activity in the north Adriatic. Therefore, we must rely on sensible hypotheses for the presence of classis servicemen, as

\textsuperscript{719} E.g. Fiebiger (1894) 334-7; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 23; Reddé (1986) 213-26.
suggested by epigraphy, at particular places. As such, this section aims to explore the human environment of Ravenna and its region to suggest the sort of activities that the classis could have supported, rather than definitively stating what they did. That they could have performed militia to the benefit of the Emperor and appropriate to the conditions of the north Adriatic is surely a reasonable proposition, when such activity is attested for the classis Misenensis.

5.1 Natural and strategic advantages

We shall begin with the natural qualities of Ravenna and its history as a port and community, to analyse their potential role in its selection as a classis base. Scholars have argued that the lagoons and marshes around Ravenna provided space for a harbour reserved for the classis, while also ensuring that the city was relatively easy to defend, as Procopius would later comment: οὐκ εὑέφοδος δὲ οὔτε ναυσίν οὔτε πεζῶν στρατῷ φαίνεται οὔσα.\(^{721}\)

Ravenna was not the best natural harbour on the eastern coast of Italy, with the superior site at Ancona signalled.\(^{722}\) This contrasts with the fine harbour at Misenum, and indicates that the Romans were not looking for one type of harbour for

\(^{720}\) Very much following scholarship traditions. For Ravenna and its classis, see esp. Fiebiger (1894) 282-90; Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 177-8; Starr (1960\(^2\)) 21-3 and Reddé (1986) 177-86, who catalogues further bibliography, and more recently Bollini (1990); Giacomini (1990); Boschetti (2001); Mauro ed. (2005). For Ravenna in general see Bormann in CIL XI (1888), pp. 1-6; Rosenberg in RE II.1A (1920), s.v. Ravenna, 300-5; Deichmann (1969) and (1989); Susini ed. (1990); Manzelli (2000); Mauro ed. (2001); Cirelli (2008). See also Augenti (2012), concentrating on Classe and Late Antiquity but including further bibliography; cf. Augenti (2010) 43-50; Augenti (2011). Earlier scholarship is compromised by our now better understanding of landscape change in the Po delta, though many older generalisations hold true. For the geology of Ravenna, see Manzelli (2000) 31-8; cf. Uggeri (1975) for the Po delta. I shall not discuss the layout of the city: we have an idea of the main waterways and street layout and there are reasonable hypotheses on the forum location, but little else is certain (Cirelli (2008) 19-50; cf. Deichmann (1989) 24-32).

\(^{721}\) Procop. de Bell. 5.1.16; Fiebiger (1894) 288; Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 177; Starr (1960\(^2\)) 22; Reddé (1986) 177-81, 489. For the marshes see Str. 5.1.7; Plin. NH 3.119ff.

\(^{722}\) See above p. 153.
their *classis* bases, a diversity already noted by Reddé.\textsuperscript{723} But its strategic regional position with respect to travel across the top of the Adriatic perhaps overrode any disadvantages. Ravenna lay south of the main branch of the river Po, at one end of a system of rivers, lagoons and canals running to Altinum: *diductus in flumina et fossas inter Ravennam Altinumque per CXX*.\textsuperscript{724}

The use of these waterways, advantageous because of the protection they offered from the open sea, is suggested by the *Itinerarium Antonini*, thought to be based on a Severan original.\textsuperscript{725} A journey between Ravenna and Aquileia is described thus:\textsuperscript{726}

\begin{verbatim}
ab Arminio recto
itinere Ravenna m.p. XXIII,
inde navigatur
Septem Maria
Altinum usque,
inde Concordia m.p. XXXI
Aquileia m.p. XXXI.
\end{verbatim}

The use of *navigare* for the journey between Ravenna and Altinum implies regular boat travel. Moreover, Herodian described how horsemen, travelling between Aquileia and Ravenna with the head of Maximinus Thrax, sailed through the marshlands between Altinum and Ravenna: ὡς δὲ διέπλευσαν τὰς τε λίμνας καὶ τὰ τενάγη <τὰ> μεταξὸς Ἀλτίνου καὶ Ῥαβέννης.\textsuperscript{727} Later, the Emperor Pupienus

\textsuperscript{723} Reddé (1986) 150. Similarly Wickert (1949-50) 104.
\textsuperscript{725} Cuntz (1929); Dilke (1985) 125-8; Löhberg (2006).
\textsuperscript{726} Cuntz (1929) p.18 126.5-9.
\textsuperscript{727} Hdn. 8.6.5.
Maximus went from Ravenna to Aquileia through the lagoons known as the *Septem Maria*, mentioned in the *Itinerarium* and by Pliny.\(^\text{728}\)

Although there is no clear evidence for travel along this course in our period, its avoidance is hard to believe. As for the passage to Aquileia, Bosio rightly notes that the *Itinerarium* suggests a return to land after Altinum.\(^\text{729}\) This is supported by, for example, the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, which shows a route from Ariminum to Altinum via Ravenna, and one going further to Aquileia.\(^\text{730}\)

However, Bosio and others have suggested that inland waterways could have been used up to Aquileia, citing for instance Procopius on the similar lagoonal landscape found between there and Ravenna, and a letter of Cassiodorus which suggests that transport between Histria and Ravenna could follow watery channels.\(^\text{731}\)

Yet the total lack of evidence for such travel before the sixth century AD encourages greater caution, potentially indicating that a land route was previously preferred.

I have emphasised the possibilities offered by inland waterways because of the greater scope these would offer for *classis* activity, either in transport or control. Nonetheless, the *classes* were not tied to the water. The general significance of the route from Ravenna to Aquileia, and its relationship to the *classis*, may be suggested by the presence of servicemen at both ends, at least in the first half of the first century

---

\(^{728}\) Hdn. 8.7.1: Μάξιμος ἀπὸ τῆς Ραβέννης <άπ> ἀρας ἐπόστη Ἀκυλῆς, διαβὰς τὰ τενάγη, ἐ ὕπὸ τε Ἡριώναυον ποταμὸν πληροῦμεν καὶ τῶν περικεμένων ἠλόν ἐπά στόμασιν ἐς θάλασσαν ἐκελαίων· ἤθην ἀπὸν τῇ...φρουρῆ καλοῦσιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι Ἐπὶ πολέμη τῆς λίμνης ἐκείνης; cf. Plin. *NH* 3.119: *qua largius (Padus) vomit Septem Maria dictus facere.*

\(^{729}\) Bosio (1991) 243.

\(^{730}\) *Tab. Peut.* III.IV-V. Commonly referred to as the *via Popillia-Annia* because of milestones attesting a *via Annia* at Aquileia (*CIL* V 7992, 7992a (= *ILS* 5860)), and a sandstone distance marker from near Adria reading *P(ublius) Popillius C(ai) f(ilius) / co(n)s(ul) / LXXXI* (*CIL* I 2637 (= V 8007 = *ILS* 5807 = *ILLRP* 453)). There is much dispute over the route and date of the *via Annia* in particular: for a summary with major bibliography see Bosio (1991) 69-70. Note also Panciera (1957) 49-52; Wiseman (1970) 128-30; Chevallier (1976) 136-7.

\(^{731}\) Procop. *de Bell.* 5.1.19-23; Cassiod. *Var.* 12.24 e.g. *nam cum ventis saevientibus mare fuerit clausum, via sibi puditur per amoenissima flavorum.* For further discussion and evidence see Panciera (1957) 48 n.8; Uggeri (1975) 74 and (1987) 343-4; Bosio (1991) 243-8.
AD.\textsuperscript{732} Classis milites at Aquileia in the Augustan or Julio-Claudian period included a Daza Panetis f(ilius), the centurio Liccaeus Verzonis f(ilius) and two brothers, a trierarchus and a centurio.\textsuperscript{733} A funerary monument for a Sestia was set up by a tr(ierarchus) [d]e lib(urna) Aug(usta).\textsuperscript{734} A missicus ex classe, L. Decimius Scava, possibly settled there.\textsuperscript{735} Similarly, the veteranus ex classe Sex(tus) Baebius Bai f(ilius) may have stayed at Aquileia after service, erecting a dedication.\textsuperscript{736} The epitaph of L. Trebius Ruso comes from Aquileia.\textsuperscript{737} Possibly slightly later is that for the centurio M. Mevius Telephus.\textsuperscript{738} A very fragmentary inscription may commemorate a gubernator of a trireme.\textsuperscript{739}

We cannot know how long these men stayed at Aquileia, or precisely how many servicemen were present at a given time. But, as Panciera suggested in 1978, their range of ranks suggests a detachment, and possible local settlement by veterans could indicate lengthy stays.\textsuperscript{740}

A couple of epitaphs from along the route suggest at least the occasional presence of classis servicemen. A likely Julio-Claudian epitaph from Portus Liquentiae mentions two servicemen, Batola Dionis f(ilius) and Paius Verzonis f(ilius).\textsuperscript{741} C. Turellius Rufus was commemorated at Altinum by another classis miles,

\textsuperscript{732} Panciera (2006a), where the evidence is collected.
\textsuperscript{733} Append. 23-5.
\textsuperscript{734} Append. 11.
\textsuperscript{735} Append. 33.
\textsuperscript{736} \textit{InscrAqu} III 3490 (= \textit{CIL} V 774 = \textit{ILS} 3120; cf. \textit{AE} 1972 193): Domnab(us) / sacrum / Sex(tus) Baebius / Bai f(ilius) vet(eranus) ex classe / vestiarius / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).
\textsuperscript{737} Append. 39.
\textsuperscript{738} \textit{InscrAqu} II 2822 (= \textit{AE} 1972 199): M(arcius) Mevius / Praxiai f(ilius) Telephus / [(centurio) classicus] / [locus] q(uadratus) p(edum) XVI. Especially because of the early character of other classis epitaphs from Aquileia, one could place this inscription, either commemorating a veteran or a man who received citizenship for reasons unknown during service, among the pre-Flavian epitaphs; see Panciera (2006a) 1349-50.
\textsuperscript{739} \textit{InscrAqu} II 2824 (= \textit{CIL} V 960): --- signa --- / --- guber[nator]--- / [---de] III Croco[di]--- / [---]
\textsuperscript{740} Panciera (2006a) 1351; similarly but less clearly argued by Fiebiger (1894) 334; Kienast (1966) 128; Reddé (1986) 215; contra Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{23}.
\textsuperscript{741} Append. 15.
Q. Spedius Mercator, probably in the second century AD. Although the evidence is very limited, I am tempted to regard as particularly significant the presence of these men at the terminus of the inland waterways between Ravenna and Altinum. They could be connected with control of this route, or imperial movement along it.

Regardless of the explanation for the epitaphs at Portus Liquentia and Altinum, the classis servicemen at Ravenna and Aquileia suggest the potential for controlling a route of strategic significance, given its almost certain exploitation for military activity towards the north and east, especially in the early empire. Indeed, because of its position, Starr suggested that Ravenna would have been ‘an excellent supply base for war in the eastern hinterland of the Adriatic’, the installation of the classis a ‘preliminary step’ towards the Alpine and Danubian campaigns of Augustus. We shall see that Augustus placed himself at Ravenna and Aquileia during some of these.

The seizure of Ravenna in the civil wars of AD 69 and 193 indicates its later strategic significance as a gateway to Italy, though our sources emphasise control of

---

742 CIL V 8819: D(is) M(anibus) / C(aio) Turellio R(u) / III Venere n(atio)ne Sard(us) / v(isit) a(nnos) XLV m(ilitavit) a(nnos) XXV / Q(uintus) Spedius Mercator / ex ead(em) h(eres) b(ene) m(eren)ti p(osuit).


744 Starr (1960) 22; drawing on Fiebiger (1894) 282-3; broadly followed by Wickert (1949-50) 104; Reddé (1986) 350 and (2001) 43-7; Boschetti (2001) 225; Manzelli (2005) 39; Panciera (2006a) 1351. See Šašel (1975/6) for sources pertaining to these campaigns

745 See below pp. 194-5.
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the *classis.*\textsuperscript{746} We have already encountered and will see more of this evidence, but two statements of Tacitus are worth citing here. When Caecina abandoned the Vitellian cause, he pretended that he intended to address the *classis* at Ravenna (*ipse Ravennam devertit praetexto classem adloquendi*), suggesting that the *classis* was the object of any military interest in the city.\textsuperscript{747} Secondly, note an action of Antonius Primus and the Flavians, before they had heard of the defection of the *classis Ravennas* in AD 69: *relictum Altini praesidium adversus classis Ravennatis <conatus>.*\textsuperscript{748} This may again imply that the presence of the *classis* gave Ravenna its importance. The placement of a garrison at Altinum is particularly striking, given the discussed connections between the two cities. Overall, the interest in the *classis*, rather than Ravenna itself, may indicate that it was only with the introduction of the former that the latter realised its strategic import.

**5.2 A Republican naval base?**

This was so despite Ravenna being a true municipality before the creation of the *classis* base, in contrast with Misenum.\textsuperscript{749} In his defence of Balbus from 56 BC, Cicero shows that before the Social War it was a *civitas foederata*: *Cn. Pompeius pater rebus Italico bello maximis gestis P. Caesium...Ravennatem foederato ex populo nonne civitate donavit?*\textsuperscript{750} Whether its status changed following the war but prior to grants of citizenship by Caesar in 49 BC has been debated, though the

\textsuperscript{746} See below pp. 221-2, 229.  
\textsuperscript{747} Tac. *Hist.* 2.100.  
\textsuperscript{748} *Ibid.* 3.6.  
\textsuperscript{749} See above p. 154 with n.629.  
\textsuperscript{750} Cic. *Balb.* 50; cf. Susini (1967b) 363-4.
outcome matters little here.\textsuperscript{751} It had municipal status by the Augustan period, its status attested by multiple inscriptions dated, if none precisely, from the first to third centuries AD.\textsuperscript{752}

Yet little implies the strategic value or maritime role of this city before the triumviral period. Scholars have noted its pre-imperial use for ship construction, and relatedly its role in the timber trade.\textsuperscript{753} Some sources suggest that the Po valley was well-supplied with pine trees suitable for ship building.\textsuperscript{754} According to Pliny, Metrodorus of Scepsis claimed the Po (Padus) received its name from the Gallic word for pine trees: \textit{quoniam circa fontem arbor multa sit picea, quales Gallice vocentur padi.}\textsuperscript{755} A funerary inscription of the late first century BC commemorates P. Longidienus, \textit{faber navalis}.\textsuperscript{756} In 38 BC, Octavian brought warships from Ravenna to Puteoli and Brundisium in readiness for attacking Sextus Pompeius (ναὸς τε μακράς ἐκ Ῥαβέννης καὶ στρατὸν ἐκ τῆς Κελτικῆς καὶ παρασκευὴν ἄλλην ἐς τὸ)

\textsuperscript{751} For a summary see Luzzatto (1968) 298-300.

\textsuperscript{752} \textit{CIL} XI 19, 27, 43, 124, 126, 128, 129, 131, 352. I follow Luzzatto (1968) 290-2, who builds on arguments made by Susini and Degrassi, in rejecting the thesis of Bormann (\textit{CIL} XI (1888), p. 6; followed by Rosenberg in \textit{RE} II.1A (1920), s.v. Ravenna, 303; Starr (1960) 22; C. Heuke in Brill’s \textit{New Pauly} XII (2008), s.v. Ravenna, 418) that Ravenna technically qualified as a \textit{municipium} but lacked internal jurisdiction, and resembled a \textit{vicus}. This was based on the absence of evidence for municipal \textit{IIIi viri} at Ravenna. \textit{CIL} XI 863, a funerary monument from Mutina, mentions a \textit{IIIi vir aed(ilicia) pot(estate) et mag(is)ter mun(ipii) / Raven(natis)}. Based on this inscription and following Not. Dign. Oc. 42.7 (praefectus classis Ravennatium cum curis eiusdem civitatis), Bormann believed that the praefectus classis had authority over Ravenna, assisted by aediles and the \textit{magister municipii}. However, as Luzzatto notes, the fifth century \textit{Notitia} is no sure guide for earlier municipal arrangements. He also sensibly argues that the very idea of a \textit{municipium} carried with it notions of autonomy and internal jurisdiction. The \textit{magister municipii} is problematic, but alternatives of \textit{magister muneris} or \textit{munerum Ravennae} have been offered (see Luzzatto (1968) 297-8) for bibliography. For agreement see e.g. Susini (1990) 133-4; Manzelli (2000) 27. Possible veteran settlement at Ravenna is attested by Strabo (5.1.11), perhaps Caesarian or Triumviral (note Keppie (1983) 54), but despite Christie and Gibson (1988) 191-2; Susini (1988) and (1990) 133; Manzelli (2000) 26 nothing really suggests that Ravenna received colonial status.

\textsuperscript{753} For shipbuilding and the Ravennate economy, see Starr (1960) 22; Meiggs (1982) 354-5; Deichmann (1989) 239. Note the use of wood in Ravennate buildings: Str. 5.1.7; \zeta\i\lo\s\a\p\a\g\h\i\s \s\o\l\h; Vitr. 2.9.11: \textit{est autem maxime id considerare Ravennae, quod ibi omnia opera et publica et privata sub fundamentis eius crescent habeant palos}. See also Vitr. 2.9.14-16 for larch distribution.

\textsuperscript{754} See Meiggs (1982) 151, 354-5 for full details.


\textsuperscript{756} \textit{CIL} XI 139 (= ILS 7725 = \textit{AE} 1972 185).
He then had triremes built at Rome and Ravenna for the same purpose (τριήρεις δὲ ἑτέρας ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἐν Ῥαβέννῃ προσέτασσε γίγνεσθαι). Such ‘previous naval activity’ might, as Starr posited, have encouraged the choice of Ravenna as a base.

Otherwise little indicates that a “military port” existed at Republican Ravenna, despite claims to the contrary. Bollini has cited the description by Appian of Metellus Pius sailing round to Ravenna from the area of the river Aesis in 82 BC to seize territory in Cispadana for the Sullans: καὶ Μέτελλος ἐπὶ Ῥαβένναν περιπλέουσαν τὴν Οὐριτανὴν χώραν, πεδιάδα καὶ πυροφόρον οὐδένα, προκατελάμβανεν. However, given the lack of other evidence for the strategic significance of Republican Ravenna, I am inclined to follow Vattuone, who argued that Ravenna was used as a landing point because Ariminum, the really significant regional city at the time, was occupied by Marian forces.

One might note that Ravenna was the last place under the authority of Julius Caesar during his Gallic command (καὶ τῆς Καίσαρος ἀρχῆς τελευταία). This could indicate some strategic value, if only one dependant on the formulation of his provincia. But this does not demonstrate, as Reddé presumed, that Caesar ‘avait sans doute utilisé le port de Ravenne’.

Caesar did spend several periods there during his Gallic campaigns. In a letter to Lentulus Spinther from December 54 BC referring to events of 56 BC, Cicero

---

757 App. B Civ. 5.78.
758 Ibid. 5.80.
759 Starr (1960) 22.
762 Vattuone (1990) 58. For the occupation of Ariminum, see e.g. App. B Civ. 1.67, 87, cf. Mansuelli (1941) 25-6 on the strategic significance of Ariminum and below p. 252.
763 App. B Civ. 2.32.
764 Reddé (1986) 177.
stated that Pompey and Caesar met at Luca, with the latter already annoyed at Cicero: *Caesar, quippe qui etiam Ravennae Crassum ante vidisset ab eoque in me esset incensus.* Cicero himself appears to have visited Caesar at Ravenna in the winter of 53-2 BC, revealing that he had offered some help to ensure that Caesar would be allowed to stand for his second consulship. In 51 BC, Caelius mentioned to Cicero that T. Munatius Plancus Bursa, a supporter of Clodius driven into exile by Cicero, had gone to Ravenna and received gifts from Caesar (*Plancus quidem tuus Ravennae est et magno congiario donatus a Caesare*). Additionally, it is well known that Caesar waited in Ravenna during negotiations with the Senate before crossing the Rubicon. His repeated visits to Ravenna need not indicate military significance, but rather that the city was the sort of place that an ex-consul would spend his time, possibly indicating that it possessed resort characteristics.

It is even possible that Caesar resided there because he possessed Ravennate property. Suetonius mentioned that, when Caesar had stopped at Ravenna (*conventibusque peractis Ravennae substitit*) to wait for the senate to make its move, he was considering building a gladiator school there (*et formam, qua ludum gladiatorium erat aedificaturus, consideravit*). While we lack absolute confirmation, the residence of Caesar in Ravenna on several occasions could support this tantalising hint that he owned land there. Importantly, this property would have passed to Octavian. Although proof is impossible, we can cautiously hypothesise that the

---

765 Cic. *Fam.* 1.9.9.
766 Cic. *Att.* 7.1.4; *nam ut illi hoc liceret adiuvi, rogatus ab ipso Ravennae de Caelio tribuno pl. ab ipso autem?* with Shackleton Bailey (1968) 279; cf. Florus 1.45.2, where Caesar was at Ravenna holding a levy in early 52 BC.
767 Cic. *Fam.* 8.1.4; Bursa: *MRR* II 235.
768 Caes. *B Civ.* 1.5.2; Suet. *Iul.* 30-1; App. *B Civ.* 2.32-4; Oros. 6.15.2.
presence of Caesarian property locally could have had some influence on the installation of the *classis* at Ravenna.

In sum, Ravenna appears to have had some strategic value through its position at one end of a route to Altinum and Aquileia, the latter a launchpad for campaigns towards the Danube and Alps. Chapter Four will bring the *via Flaminia* into the debate, to further suggest the role of Ravenna in a significant regional communications network. However, it is not clear that the history of Ravenna did much to suggest the placement of a *classis* base there, either because this strategic value had previously been recognised or because it had prior significance as a military port.

### 5.3 Ravenna and imperial estates: the *regio Ravennatium*

While not denying the value of the above, or the natural advantages of Ravenna, we should look elsewhere to better understand the base of the *classis Ravennas*. Ortalli has implicitly connected imperial property interests in the Po delta to provisioning of Ravenna and its *classis*.\(^{770}\) Maiuro has loosely suggested that imperial holdings at Ravenna may have been connected with the port.\(^{771}\) Given the apparent consequence of imperial property around Misenum, we should explore whether the relationship between the *classis Ravennas* and imperial property was a substantial one, and how such property may affect our perception of the *classis* base.

---


Uncertainty over the location of the *classis* port provides serious obstacles. The only direct literary evidence comes from the sixth century AD *Getica* of Jordanes, apparently citing Dio.\footnote{Jord. *Get.* 29.150.}

\begin{verbatim}
a meridie item ipse Padus, quem Italiae soli fluviorum regem dicunt, cognomento Eridanus, ab Augusto imperatore latissima fossa demissus, qui septima sui alvei parte per mediam influit civitatem, ad ostia sua amoenissimum portum praebens, classem ducentarum quinquaginta navium Dione referente tutissima dudum credebatur recipere statione.
\end{verbatim}

However, it is not clear which port Jordanes refers to, nor can we ascertain whether significant changes took place between the Augustan period and, at the earliest, the third century AD.\footnote{Sources mention several ports from different eras: for details see Reddé (1986) 183-6; Cirelli (2008) 28-9.} Reddé noted that we do not know whether the number of ships mentioned includes only military vessels, or if a commercial harbour was under discussion.\footnote{Reddé (1986) 183.} Even if Jordanes did accurately describe the *classis* base, given our generally poor knowledge of the archaeology of first and second century AD Ravenna, it is very difficult to place the harbour in an urban context.

Nonetheless, the Augustan “naval base” has been hypothetically located to the south of Ravenna, at modern Classe.\footnote{Fiebiger (1894) 287-8; Rosenberg in *RE* IA (1914), s.v. *Ravenna*, 302; Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) 177-8; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 21; Wickert (1949-50) 105; Susini (1967a) 367; Bollini (1968) 34.} This, Starr suggested, was a lagoon port with a *castra*, connected by canal to Ravenna and the Po.\footnote{Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 21.} Reddé analysed archaeological evidence confirming port structures at the Fiumi Uniti to the north of Sant’Apollinare in Classe, alongside remains identified as the *castra*.\footnote{Reddé (1986) 179-82, including the most important bibliography on the port. For the *castra* see Lanciani in *NSA* (1881), 315.} He rightly expressed a great deal of scepticism, noting that excavations were conducted without regard to...
chronology, and that the *castra* may instead be a *horrea*. There was a port at Classe, but we do not know whether it operated in our period.

More recently, the Augustan port has been located to the south of the Porta Aurea, in an inner basin posited to the south west of Ravenna. Major restructuring and movement of port activity to the south are thought to have come with the end of the first century AD. However, this hypothesis has been criticised by Cirelli. It is based primarily on two shafts of 1.5m diameter sunk in 1968 and studied by Roncuzzi and Bermond Montanari, in which, below a grey clay deposit, material datable to up to the second half of the first century AD was found at depths of 5.7-7.5m. This included broken ceramics, bricks, plaster and other rubbish, and was interpreted as a fill, perhaps relating to port reorganisation. Combining this with some manual penetrometric surveys, whose value, according to Cirelli, ‘è più che discutibile’, a harbour basin of 650m in diameter was identified. This basin may have existed, though our constantly changing views on the landscape of Roman Ravenna advise caution. However, the evidence does not identify an Augustan military port.

Thus, in contrast with Misenum, it is impossible to directly connect the harbour area with any known *villae*, archaeological evidence for which around Ravenna, imperial or otherwise, is limited. The most significant *villa maritima* known, occupied from the Augustan period until the fourth century, lay just to the

north at Agosta.\textsuperscript{785} The modern name, apparently derived from the ancient toponym \textit{Augusta} of the \textit{Tabula Peutingeriana}, is sometimes connected with the fossa \textit{Augusta}.\textsuperscript{786} However, one wonders about the influence of imperial ownership.

To the west of other remains there, set over a large area, Uggeri described the remnants of large pillars for supporting a roof, perhaps for a wooden building, interpreted as a place for drying ceramics.\textsuperscript{787} Furnaces have not been excavated, but waste associated with brick or tile production is attested.\textsuperscript{788} A large but unquantified number of \textit{Pansiana} tiles dating from the Late Republic to the second century AD were found, the local production of which could indicate imperial ownership.\textsuperscript{789}

Inauspicious beginnings are countered by epigraphy suggesting a large regional imperial property, or collection of properties, in the Po delta, usually regarded as within the administrative orbit of Ravenna.\textsuperscript{790} Voghenza is frequently regarded as the administrative seat for one or multiple adjacent imperial estates.\textsuperscript{791} From there came perhaps the second or early third century AD epitaph naming Atilia Primitiva, \textit{coniunx} of \textit{Herma Augg(ustorum) verna}, who was \textit{disp(ensator) region(is)-...
Thus, a regio, a unit of patrimonial land encompassing several estates, which incorporated territory near Ravenna. Further evidence confirms the existence of this regio Ravennatium. A stamp on a glass balsamarium (type Is.82) from the early third century AD, found at the necropolis of Porta Palio near Verona, reads: *patrimoni [f(iscus)] rat(ionis) / reg(ionis) Raven(natium).* A second balsamarium from the same site was stamped: *vec(tigal) monopolium p(atrimoni) Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) M(arci) Antonini.* At the centre of the stamp was a monogram interpreted as *Rave(nna?).* Seven balsamaria of the second type, dating from the mid-second century AD to the early third, are also known from Ugozzolo near Parma, Adria and Milan. Thus, probably by the second century AD, there was a distinct imperial regio Ravennatium where these balsamaria and perhaps their contents were produced.

Tile and brick stamps of the first two centuries AD, made locally in imperial workshops, suggest that this regio, or at least sites around Ravenna, could have produced ceramics. These have been much discussed; just a couple of the most

---

792 CIL V 2385 (= ILS 1509); cf. SupIt 17 pp.142-4 for full bibliography.
793 On regiones see Schulten (1896) 41-4, 68-9; Bollini (2007); Maiuro (2012) 173-4. Much debated is whether this estate extended from Ravenna to Vercelli in Piedmont (Mommsen in CIL V (1877), p. 736; see recently Righini (1997 with bibliography) or was more localised, with an unknown Vercelli in the Po delta (beginning with Passeri, who published the inscription in 1765 in Monumenta Ferrariensa; modern proponents include Mansuelli (1967) 10-12, 150-1; Uggeri (1975) 78-9). For a history of the debate, see Visser Travagli (1985) 290-7; cf. Ortalli (2007) 341-2. New evidence is needed to resolve a controversy enduring over two and a half centuries.
795 AE 1994 712b.
797 For glass production around Ravenna, see Righini (2007) 325 n.28.
798 In general see Uggeri (1975) 135-54; Biordi (1993); Zaccaria ed. (1993); Righini ed. (1998); Righini (2007); Maiuro (2012) 334. There is still much uncertainty over the reading and purpose of Roman brick and tile stamps, with great variety across space and time, on which see e.g. Helen (1975); M. Steinby in RE Suppl. XV (1978), s.v. Ziegelstempel v. Rom, 1489-1531; Steinby (1982); Brodribb (1987) 117-25; Steinby (1993a), (1993b); Bruun (2005). It is generally thought that, when two names appear on stamps, one refers to the officinator, perhaps the overseer of production, and the other the dominus, who owned the workshop (figlina) or land on which the workshop was built (though one can also find the name of the figlina). But we cannot be too schematic, especially when much of our
important examples will be cited to provide further evidence for imperial property around Ravenna. The first are the *Pansiana* ceramics. Over four hundred and eleven tiles are known from the Cispadana region, most from around Ferrara (one hundred and eighty), Ariminum (one hundred and forty four) and Ravenna (fifty two). Twenty main stamp types have been identified, up to twelve naming Emperors. The earliest type, *Pansae Vibi*, exhibits four examples. C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus (cos.43 BC) is often regarded as the original owner, though no source states this explicitly.

The traditional interpretation asserts that the property was confiscated by the triumvirs, allowing us to posit ownership by Octavian. If correct, this could provide further evidence for Caesarian ownership around Ravenna before the installation of the *classis*. However, Righini has noted that this would be an extremely surprising act regarding Pansa, a Caesarian “hero” who was officially commemorated in Rome. Chilver mentioned another possible owner known from a funerary inscription from Bovegno in Lombardy, C. Vibius Pansa, an Augustan *legatus pro / [praetore] in Vindol(icis)*. If this speculation is correct, it would place the imperial takeover of the property rather later.

The problem is underlined by the absence of stamps clearly attesting Augustan ownership. Three examples of a type reading *Pans(iana) Cae(saris)*, found evidence comes from Rome and its surrounds, cautiously exploited as a basis for interpreting practices elsewhere.

800 Righini, Biordi, and Pellicioni Golinelli (1993) 42-5. Though others have been found elsewhere, including in Histria and Dalmatia: see Wilkes (1979); Matijašić (1983) 962.
802 For Vibius Pansa see *MRR* II pp. 334-6; for the suggestion see e.g. *Röm. Staatsr.* II.2 1007 n.1; Shatzman (1975) 437; Uggeri (1975) 62-3; Matijašić (1983) 962-3; Biordi (1993) 140; Righini (2007) 311-12.
804 *Inscr. It.* X 5.1133 (= *CIL* V 4910 = *ILS* 847 = *AE* 1979 297); Chilver (1941) 12, 176; cf. Uggeri (1975) 62 n. 34; Righini (1998) 49.
at Ariminum, were considered Augustan by Uggeri, but Matijašić grouped them with tiles produced under Gaius Caligula. Six tiles from Voghenza read Pansiana LAS, adventurously rendered Liviae Augustae s(altarii) by Pellicioni. Other types carry the name of each Emperor from Tiberius to Vespasian, excluding Otho and Vitellius, for instance Ti(beri) Pansiana, Ti(beri) Claud(i) Pans(i)ana and Vesp(asiani) Caes(aris) Pansi(an)a. Thus, while we can push back imperial ownership near Ravenna to the early first century AD, one cannot prove that the workshops were in imperial hands by the Augustan period.

The precise location of these workshops, or their relationship to the regio Ravennatium, has not been determined, but the large number of tiles found near Voghenza and Ariminum are regarded as possible evidence for production there. Yet, the wide diffusion of the tiles prevents definite localisation of production, and areas near the mouth of the Po cannot be ruled out. The important point for our purposes is that the workshops demonstrate imperial productive interests in the area of the north Adriatic classis base.

Our second major group comprises around two hundred and sixty stamped objects, virtually all bricks. Two hundred and ten come from Ravenna and Classe. All are stamped with the name of Emperors alone, from Hadrian to Alexander Severus. The majority come from the reigns of Antoninus Pius (one hundred and twenty one) and Hadrian (sixty three). This group has traditionally been directly connected with the Pansiana workshops, but Righini has expressed doubts, citing the

---

807 CIL V 8110, 12c; 8110, 19c; 8110, 28d-e; for a full catalogue see Righini, Biordi, and Pellicioni Golinelli (1993) 49-55.
gap between production groups, with *Pansiana* production seemingly stopping with the Flavians, different forms of stamps, different types of production (tiles versus bricks) and different distribution areas.\(^{810}\)

Again, certainty over where these were produced is unattainable, but the Agosta complex has been suggested because of the large number of stamps found there, and especially because of one waste object stamped with the name of Antoninus Pius.\(^{811}\) Whether that site also produced *Pansiana* material is unclear, though several first century tiles have been found there.\(^{812}\)

The above establishes the existence of imperial property around Ravenna, especially the *regio Ravennatium*, sets out some commodities imperial workshops produced and warily attempts to localise that production. There is no good evidence delineating the relationship of imperial holdings to municipal Ravenna or the unlocated *classis* base. The supposed *villa maritima* at Agosta, if under imperial ownership and producing stamped bricks, could indicate imperial interest in the coast near the mouth of the Po. But we can say little else.

Despite these limitations, the concentration of imperial property near Ravenna prompts comparison with Misenum. The attachment of the Ravenna *classis* base to Caesarian/imperial property remains a tantalising possibility, and we should at least consider the *classis Ravennas* as situated in an area of import to the Emperor.

\(^{812}\) As noted in the catalogue of Righini, Biodi and Pellicioni Golinelli (1993) 49 (one example of Type 2c), 50 (one of Type 3b), 52 (four of Type 11a, one of 11b, two of 11c, three of 11d, two of 11e), 54 (four of Type 16f, one of 16l) 55 (one of Type 18b).
5.4 ‘A second Puteoli’. Aquileia and communications

Thus far, the productive capacities of this property have been emphasised. Indeed, the Roman north Adriatic is commonly associated with production and commerce, perhaps because of the nature of the evidence for the region. As with Misenum, this should influence how we think about the nature and possible functions of the Ravenna classis base.

Within this context, we can note that Rostovtzeff once described Aquileia as a ‘second Puteoli’ because of its commercial and industrial success from the Augustan period. A brief digression on Aquileia is worthwhile, because its relationship to Ravenna may parallel Puteoli and Misenum. Strabo characterised the city as an emporium with a largely regional outlook.

Later, Herodian presented the second and third century city as a thriving commercial centre: ὡσπερ τι ἐμπόριον Ἰταλίας ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ προκειμένη. Because of its commercial vitality it was extremely populous, with a mixture of locals, visitors and commerce in the north Adriatic, see e.g. Rostovtzeff (1957) 71, 167, 610-11; Panciera (1972); Uggeri (1975) 127-54; Royal (2012) esp. 440-52.

Rostovtzeff (1957) 71. For a brief but useful overview with older bibliography see Rostovtzeff (1957) 548, 567 610-11; cf. Calderini (1930) 297-332; Panciera (1957); Chevallier (1990) 55-68. For recent papers documenting the history of Aquileia from the Late Republic to the third century AD see Rossi (2003); Buchi (2003); Strobel (2003); cf. in general Hülsen in RE II (1896), s.v. Aquileia, 318-21; Calderini (1930). For an overview of Aquileian archaeology with bibliography see Bertacchi (2003).
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merchants. Around fifty inscriptions attest commercial operations and tradespeople, such as the freedmen Q. Aebutius Scitus and P. Carfulenus Modestus, a nummularius and negotiator respectively, and L. Valerius Primus, negotiator margaritarius.

Of particular interest, given the apparent importance of Dalmatians and Pannonians in recruitment for the classis Ravennas, are the demonstrable links between Aquileia and the Danubian provinces, alluded to by Strabo. The geographer provides further evidence for the relationship between Aquileia and the Danube in describing how τὰ ἐκ τῆς Ἀκυληίας φορτία was conveyed from that city to Nauportus, the site of modern Vrhnika in Slovenia, and then ἐκεῖθεν δὲ τοῖς ποταμοῖς κατάγεται μέχρι τοῦ Ἰστροῦ καὶ τῶν ταῦτα χωρίων.

In a studying epigraphic evidence from the first to fourth centuries attesting these links, Zaccaria has recorded around twenty inscriptions from Aquileia, mostly referring to merchants or soldiers, either of Illyrian origin or whose home was found in the Danubian regions. A further hundred inscriptions may identify Aquileians in Illyricum, though Zaccaria admits that only twenty or so are definite examples, with a further twenty very probable. One must emphasise the limitations of this material: both the uncertainty over what the individual inscriptions do tell us, and the fairly small number of finds across many centuries. However, putting this alongside literary attestations of traffic through Aquileia, it seems reasonable to accept these

818 Hdn. 8.2.3: ἰδίου δήμου πολυάνθρωπος ἦν; 8.2.4: ἕνθεν πολύ τι πλῆθος ἐπεδήμει οὐ πολιτῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ ἔξων τε καὶ ἐμπόρων; cf. Chevallier (1990) 40-54 on population composition.
819 CIL V 8318 (= InscrAqu I 73); AE 1982 380; ILS 7603 (= InscrAqu I 718). Out of around four thousand inscriptions (excluding instrumenta and Christian texts) examined on the Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss/Slaby (http://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epi_en.php) on 25/05/2014. Aquileia also lay at one edge of the Publicum Portorii Illyrici, a large portorium district: see esp. De Laet (1949) 175-242; Panciera (1957) 63-73.
820 Str. 4.6.10.
822 Zaccaria (1985) 94.
inscriptions as hinting at the relationships existing between there and the Danubian provinces.

The above is significant because, as with Misenum, the classis Ravennas may be regarded as situated in a traffic and communications zone, with Aquileia a major hub.\textsuperscript{823} The distance between the two is much greater than for our Campanian subjects, but this may have been partly mitigated by the discussed routes between the cities.\textsuperscript{824} This has implications for the duties potentially entrusted to the classis Ravennas, as the next chapter discusses.

5.5 Leisure and display in the north Adriatic?

I have already argued for a reading of Misenum and the sinus Baianus that allows space for production and commerce, even if literary sources obscure this. Likewise, I shall now suggest that we can perceive a more complex Ravenna and north Adriatic, and that this should affect how we understand the classis base. In particular, I shall suggest that at least some of the estates of this region could have been places of leisure, consumption and display. This argument is harder to make than for the sinus Baianus, because of limited archaeology and because our literary sources were less interested in the region, not commonly associating it with Campanian-style luxury. Nonetheless, a more nuanced view may prove revealing.

Firstly, I shall consider literary references to imperial visits to Ravenna and the wider region, in particular Aquileia. While we are not explicitly told that an Emperor or member of their family stayed in a property they owned, this is not an

\textsuperscript{823} Described as a commercial ‘sistema’ by Brizzi (1978) 84.
\textsuperscript{824} See above pp. 174-6.
unreasonable assumption to make. Moreover, whether imperial owned or otherwise, it is surely likely that these properties would have been of a standard appropriate to their residents. Regarding Claudius, I shall consider an example of imperial display, from which further parallels with the Misenum area may be drawn.

Once more, the literary evidence mostly concerns Augustus or the Julio-Claudians. However, that our sources fail to show interest in later imperial visits does not disprove their happening. Nor should we conclude that imperial property ownership was reduced over time. Indeed, documentary evidence for the *regio Ravennatium* comes from after the first century. Therefore, we can reasonably suggest that some of the essentials of the region surrounding the *classis* base persisted.

To further support the contention of a luxurious region, if not clearly at Ravenna, the inquiry will be widened to cover Altinum and the estates of Histria, which had commercial and social ties to the Italian peninsula, including its north-east littoral. Some of these estates were centered around particularly splendid *villae maritimae*, the archaeological evidence for which will be examined.

Firstly, we should review the evidence for imperial residence. We observed that Caesar spent time in and quite possibly owned property at Ravenna.\textsuperscript{825} These appointments were surely suitable for a consular, though further precision is unattainable.

In the early empire, members of the imperial house sojourned at Ravenna to direct military campaigns to the north and east. According to Suetonius, Augustus stayed at Ravenna, among other cities, when overseeing expeditions:\textsuperscript{826}

\textsuperscript{825} See above pp. 181-2.
\textsuperscript{826} Suet. Aug. 20.
reliqua per legatos administravit, ut tamen quibusdam Pannonicis atque Germanicis aut interveniret aut non longe abesset, Ravennam vel Mediolanum vel Aquileiam usque ab urbe progrediens.

While Augustus may have stayed with a friend or local notable, given that imperial property is explicitly attested for the region, possibly even from the Augustan period if the traditional chronology of the *Pansiana* workshops is correct, it is surely likely that he would have used it.

In the same section, the biographer states that Augustus spent time at Aquileia.\(^\text{827}\) Elsewhere, Suetonius revealed that a child of Tiberius and Julia was born and died at that city (*fili...qui Aquileiae natus infans extinctus est*); presumably their presence was connected with one of the campaigns of Tiberius.\(^\text{828}\) Again, one can reasonably suggest that appropriate residences were used, even if their presence was connected to military activity. Centumcellae shows that Emperors conducted business, albeit political and judicial, in pleasant surroundings.\(^\text{829}\)

We should recall the presence of *classis* servicemen at Aquileia in the first half of the first century AD. These servicemen could have been associated with the campaigns of the period. However, I am tempted to follow Panciera, who suggested that they were in Aquileia primarily because of the Emperor or his family members.\(^\text{830}\) They could even have been connected with their residence at imperial property, if we accept a not infrequent connection between the deployment of *classis* 

\(^827\) See above note and Jos. *AJ* 16.91.
\(^828\) Suet. *Tib*. 7.3.
\(^829\) See above pp. 148-50.
\(^830\) Panciera (2006a) 1351.
servicemen in Italy and imperial estates. One caveat, albeit not refuting the hypothesis, is that other evidence for Aquileian imperial property is rather thin.831

The presence of Claudius is attested around Ravenna. Pliny records the remarkable celebration of his British triumph near the city:832

Augusta fossa Ravennam trahitur, ubi Padusa vocatur, quondam Messanicus appellatus. proximum inde ostium magnitudinem portus habet qui Vatreni dicitur, qua Claudius Caesar e Britannia triumphans praegrandi illa domo verius quam nave intravit Hadriam.

From there, he sailed around the coast of Italy to Rome.833 Claudius did not leave from Ravenna itself, but by the ancient, main branch of the Po to the north, probably where the modern Reno enters the sea.834 Perhaps coincidentally, this is not so far from the ruins at Agosta. Despite the distance from Ravenna, around 10 miles, and although it is not directly attested, I cautiously suggest that the Emperor spent some time in or around the city, perhaps at an imperial estate.

More compellingly, one is encouraged to compare this to the bridge of boats of Gaius, or the games put on for Tiridates by Nero at Puteoli, as imperial set pieces.835 This implies that the regions could potentially be viewed and used in a similar fashion by at least some Emperors, providing spectacular backdrops for imperial exploitation.

831 Crawford (1976) 67 does not record any evidence for property at Aquileia; Zaccaria (2007) has collected epigraphy attesting imperial slaves or freedmen in its territory, observing that around one fifth of the twenty inscriptions refer to the management of an estate. However, none explicitly show that this was in Aquileian territory; cf. Maiuro (2012) 337-40.
832 Plin. NH 3.119.
833 For the invasion and triumphal celebrations in Rome see Tac. Agr. 14.1; Suet. Claud. 17; Vesp. 4.1; Cass. Dio 60.19-23; Oros. 7.6.9-11; Eutr. 7.13. For a recent account see Osgood (2011) 84-105 and 281-2 for bibliography. For the “procession” of Claudius from Britain to Ravenna, see Fasolini (2006) 144-9.
834 Uggeri (1975) 37, 45, 49.
835 See above pp. 163-5.
We should set this display within the context of further Claudian activity at Ravenna. An inscription, once on the attic of the so-called Porta Aurea, a gate in the south-west portion of the city walls, recorded that Claudius was responsible for the work:836

Ti(berius) Claudius Drusi f(ilius) Caes- sar Aug(ustus) Germanicus
pont(ifex) max(imus) tr(ibunicia) pot(estate) II
co(n)s(ul) desig(natus) III imp(erator) III p(ater) p(atiae)
dedit.

The inscription indicates that the gate was erected in the second half of AD 42 or early AD 43.837 This would perhaps be too early to connect its construction to the triumphal departure from the Po, probably in late AD 43 or early 44. However, depending on the long-term planning of the invasion and processional return, the gate could be seen as part of a monumental landscape constructed for the Emperor to perform his eventual triumph in.

There are few other direct attestations of imperial visits to the region during our period. We have already mentioned the construction of ἡβητηρία by Nero, though this does not demonstrate his presence, only his property.838 Returning to Aquileia, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus conducted campaigns from there in AD 168.839

The Historia Augusta claims that Verus did not want to cross the Alps, as he enjoyed hunting and feasting at Aquileia: invitoque Lucio Alpes transgressi, cum Verus apud

---

837 Usually dated to AD 43. However, La Rocca (1992) 270 n.19 dated it to the second consulship of Claudius in AD 42, in the belief that line four read: co(n)s(ul) II desig(natus) III; cf. Deichmann (1989) 26. Recorded in Renaissance drawings, the inscription is now lost, save for a few fragments (see e.g. Muratori (1937) 7) and the reading cannot be checked. The picture of the arch by Sangallo which recorded the whole inscription does not include the II. Indeed, the only image to do so is a reconstruction of the arch by Rosi (1939), which I have been unable to see, found in e.g. Bovini (1956) 31, fig.3 and Mansuelli (1967) fig.5.
838 See above p. 160.
839 SHA Marc. 14.2.
Aquileiam tantum venatus convivatusque esset.\textsuperscript{840} After their campaigns had been completed, they returned to Aquileia at the urging of Verus (urguente Lucio Aquileiam redierunt), a man who desired voluptates urbanae.\textsuperscript{841} While we must adopt scepticism towards this hostile characterisation of Verus, that Aquileia, and possibly any imperial property there, could be perceived as a place of leisure shows that this aspect of the north Adriatic must not be neglected.\textsuperscript{842}

We have a handful of literary references to Emperors or imperial family members visiting and staying in Ravenna or Aquileia, and the suggestion that Claudius at least exploited Ravenna and the mouth of the Po for imperial display. Given our good documentary evidence for imperial estates around Ravenna, if not Aquileia, they could have stayed in imperial property. In any case, while all examples cited relate to military activity – even Claudius was returning from a campaign – it does not follow that they would have been relegated to poor accommodation, or that at least some of their time could not have been spent in leisured activity, as the example of Lucius Verus exaggeratedly suggests.

5.6 The luxury villae maritimae of Histria

The reference to Verus at Aquileia suggests that parts of the north Adriatic were considered places for leisure. A poem of Martial on the area begins: aemula Baianis Altini litora villis.\textsuperscript{843} This must refer to the luxury and pleasure of the sinus Baianus, and therefore, at least for Martial (but there is no reason to consider his viewpoint

\textsuperscript{840} SHA Verus 9.8. \\
\textsuperscript{841} Ibid. 9.10. \\
\textsuperscript{842} For the Vita Veri having little if any value see e.g. Mommsen (1890) 246; Birley (1966) 312-14; contra e.g. Barnes (1967); Syme (1968): 133-4; Barta (1971). For recent overviews of the Historia Augusta and its difficulties, see Matthews (2007) 296, 302; Mehl (2011) 171-8. \\
\textsuperscript{843} Mart. 4.25.1.
unusual), its replication in north-eastern Italy. The links between Altinum and Ravenna raised earlier should be considered with this in mind, with the possibility that, as in the *sinus Baianus*, the *classis Ravennas* could have had some part in supporting imperial leisure. However, no literary evidence documents imperial visits to Altinum.

To further argue that the north Adriatic and its *villae* were not simply centres of production, I shall extend the inquiry to Histria. This will provide comparisons for a hypothetical human environment around Ravenna, but perhaps more importantly will hint at the complex characteristics of the wider region surrounding the base of the *classis Ravennas*.

Histria was progressively brought under Roman control from the end of the third century BC. The western coast entered Roman influence most rapidly: several towns were founded or developed by the Romans along this coastline. These included the *coloniae* of Tergeste, Parentium and Pola, the last, *colonia Iulia Pola*, being of particular significance and possessing an excellent port.

The physical distance of Histria from Ravenna means that its inclusion within a regional study of the *classis* base requires some justification. The peninsula can reasonably be examined here because of its economic and social integration within Italy: it was after all part of *regio X* from the Augustan period.

To underline the point, I shall briefly discuss some commercial relationships. Coastal Histria was especially productive, its exported olive oil of

---

844 For the history of Roman Histria down to the Principate, see Matijašić (1991); cf. Weiss in *RE* VIII (1913), s.v. *Histria*, 2111-16; Mlakar (1962) 5-13; Vedaldi Isabez (1994) for literary sources.

845 Tergeste: Str. 5.1.9; 7.5.2; Plin. *NH* 3.127; Ptol. *Geog*. 1.15.3; 3.1.27; Parentium: Plin. *NH* 3.129; Pola: Str. 1.2.39; 5.1.9; Plin. *NH* 3.129; Ptol. *Geog*. 3.1.27; cf. Matijašić (2001b) 169 and below for further references.

846 One example of social integration is the possession of Histrian lands by high status Roman families of the Republic and Empire: for a recent survey, see Tassaux (2005) esp. 140-6. See also Rostovtzeff
particular repute.\textsuperscript{847} Pliny ranked this oil alongside that from Baetica, just below Italy: \\textit{relicum certamen inter Histriæ terram et Baeticæ par est.}\textsuperscript{848} Over fifty sites connected with oil production are known from the territory of Pola alone.\textsuperscript{849}

There is only slim evidence for the products of the major Dressel 6B amphorae workshops of Histria which carried this oil ending up in Ravenna itself, with one stamp of Hadrianic date.\textsuperscript{850} However, these amphorae have been found along the Po and in locations between Ravenna and Aquileia.\textsuperscript{851} For instance, thirty one stamped Laecanii amphorae dating from across the first century AD have been discovered at Aquileia, considered a transit point for Histrian produce, while forty seven are known from Padova in the same period.\textsuperscript{852} The distance which these amphorae and their contents could travel in Italy is hinted at by six stamped vessels known from Vercelli in Piedmont.\textsuperscript{853} This may demonstrate traffic along the Po, the relationship of which to Ravenna should encourage us to consider that city within any systems of exchange between northern Italy and Histria.

There is also evidence for the produce of the Po delta in Histria. The study by Matijašić of the chronology of the \textit{Pansiana} tiles includes eighty three finds from

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Weiss in \textit{RE} VIII (1913), s.v. \textit{Histria}, 2113; Degrassi (1956); Rostovtzeff (1957\textsuperscript{2}) 235-7; Mlakar (1962) 44, 47; Tassaux (1985) 146-8; Bertacchi (1995). Note also Degrassi (1955), basic on the Hlistrian ports.\textsuperscript{847}
\item Plin. \textit{NH} 15.8. Similarly Mart. 12.63.1-2; Paus. 10.32.19.\textsuperscript{849}
\item Matijašić (1993) 248.\textsuperscript{849}
\item \textit{RTAR} II 890: \textit{Imperatoris Hadriani Aug(usti)}, with comments by Marion and Starac (2001) 112 n.92.\textsuperscript{850}
\item For diffusion of Loron amphorae see Marion and Starac (2001); Tassaux (2001); on products of the Laecanii see Beецzky (1998) 73-6.\textsuperscript{852}
\item Beецzky (1998) 74. For Aquileia as a transit see e.g. Degrassi (1956) 106; Tassaux (1985) 148.\textsuperscript{853}
\item Beęczkь (1998) 76.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Histria, thirty three coming from Pola. As a further specific example, three different types have been found at Loron, a productive estate on the western coast of the peninsula. Whether these were to be used on site, or shipped elsewhere, is unclear, but they do again indicate commercial relationships between the Po delta and Histria, encouraging integrating the peninsula into our study.

Before continuing, it must be stated that there is little evidence for the classis Ravennas in Histria. Only one second century AD epitaph, found at Tergeste, attests normal servicemen.

D(is) M(anibus) T(iti) Dom[i]-ti Gracilis
na(tione) Ditio(nis)
vix(it) an(nos) L
mil(itavit) an(nos) XIII
III Pado
heredes
L(ucius) Plaetorius
Bassus et
L(ucius) Murranius
Super b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuerunt).

It is rather likely that two fellow milites erected the monument. Therefore, we can count three classis servicemen at Tergeste. The quadrirere recorded may hint at their involvement in imperial transport, as we shall note in the following chapter, but this is far from certain.

The following discussion of the potential for the classis Ravennas to support imperial activity in Histria must bear this limited evidence in mind, but this does not

---

855 Matijašić (2001a) 45-6.
856 CIL V 541 (= Inscr. It. X 4.52); cf. CIL V 533 (= ILS 2702 = Inscr. It. X 4.32), commemorating a dedication at Tergeste by the classis praefectus Ravennatis Clodius Quirinalis (PIR² P 72 and recently Bollini (2004)) and CIL V 328 (= Inscr.It. X 2.3 = ILS 3290), recording work on a temple and harbour at Parentium in the first century AD by a former subpraefectus classis Ravennatis.
deny the possibility that classis manpower was sometimes deployed on the peninsula. Let us now consider the estates of Histria. Much has been written about the ceramics workshops of the Laecanii, especially Fažana, five miles north east of Pola, and at Loron. However, I shall concentrate on two examples of Histrian luxury *villae maritimae*, which also provide evidence for productive infrastructure, reinforcing earlier arguments concerning potential productive activities at the *villae maritimae* of Baiae.

The Val Catena villa in Verige Bay on the eastern side of Veli Brijun is our first subject. This is one of three main *villae* on the Brijuni isles, just off the coast of Pola. This complex, thought to be of Late Republican origins before being transformed into a ‘true villa maritima’ in the Augustan period, possessed a peristyled *domus* on the south side of the bay, next to a large garden, and with a terrace overlooking the sea. The *domus* included a *pars urbana* and *pars rustica* devoted to production, in which olive and/or grape presses have been discovered. At the end of the bay was a temple area, with a cryptoporticus and *ambulatio* running east towards a thermal complex with a *palaestra*, and *piscina* set before the bathing pavilion. This phase has been considered post-Augustan. East from this is another productive quarter, not well-understood, near to harbour remains.

---

858 Besides the examples discussed, Matijašić (2001c) 300 lists the villa of Sorna near Parenzo and that of Valbadon near Fažana, alongside unexplored sites.
Discovering who owned this villa maritima is not decisive to the argument for luxury in the north Adriatic. However, imperial possession would add support to the proposition of a classis base potentially supporting a range of regional imperial activities.\(^{864}\) The villae on Brijuni are normally supposed to have been owned by the Laecanii, a Histrian senatorial family, whose property is argued to have passed into imperial hands under the Flavians.\(^{865}\) That Val Catena belonged to the Laecanii is based on the discovery of Laecanius stamped amphorae at the site, with over one hundred found in one room.\(^{866}\) Bezeczky has noted that these stamps have been found in no other ‘luxurious’ villae in south Histria, though few sites have received the attention of Val Catena.\(^{867}\)

Whether these were produced there, or at the Fažana workshops, is unclear. One could conjecture that the owner of Val Catena purchased them from nearby Fažana, arguably one of the major Histrian workshops producing Dressel 6B amphorae, or that they were in such widespread use that a large collection at this villa proves nothing about its ownership.

Thus, while an attractive hypothesis, ownership by the Laecanii is unproven. The next step, that the imperial family obtained the villa in the later first century AD, is based on no direct evidence, but follows from the standard hypothesis that the Fažana workshops and other Histrian property of the Laecanii fell into imperial hands at this time.\(^{868}\)


\(^{865}\) Tassaux (1982).


\(^{867}\) Bezeczky (1995) 49.

\(^{868}\) For discussion of which Laecanius Bassus the property was obtained from, see Bezeczky (1998) 14-15; Tassaux (1998) 82-6 and (2007) 51.
Analysing this argument requires a careful review of the evidence. As stated, Dressel 6B amphorae were seemingly the major product of Fažana.\textsuperscript{869} They have been found elsewhere in Histria, northern Italy, Pannonia and Noricum, particularly at Magdalensberg.\textsuperscript{870} Among the thousands of amphorae there are over six hundred and fifty stamps. Through find context, the Magdalensberg material has been used to date the stamps down to c. AD 50, when the site was abandoned.\textsuperscript{871} The earliest of these amphorae were stamped at the centre of the rim with the name of a Laecanius, and above the handle with that of the officinares who managed the workshops. The evidence has been collected and catalogued elsewhere, but a couple of examples will serve to clarify.\textsuperscript{872} Type 2, of the Tiberian or Claudian period, is stamped $C(ai) Laek(ani) // Adel(phi)$.\textsuperscript{873} Type 3, dated to the Claudian or Flavian period, reads $C(ai) Laek(ani) Bass(i) // Amethysti$.\textsuperscript{874}

Baldacci was the first to propose that the Flavian Emperors gained possession of Fažana, noting that the officinatar Clymenus appears to have featured on amphorae stamped with the name of C. Laecanius Bassus ($C(ai) Laek(ani) Bas(si) // Clymen(i)$) and an Emperor ($Imp(eratoris) // Clymen(i)$ or $Clyme(ni)$).\textsuperscript{875} The same argument has more recently been made for the officinatar Paganus.\textsuperscript{876} Importantly, in that case, six of the imperial stamps were found at Fažana itself.

While not conclusive, further evidence encourages the general acceptance of this hypothesis. Four stamps from Fažana, Iuvavum and Aquincum may refer to...
Vespasian explicitly: originally read as *C(ai) Lae(cani) Bas(s)i // Dati*, these have more recently been reinterpreted as *Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) Vesp(asiani)*.\(^{877}\) Although the stamp is not of the best quality, a photograph certainly supports the new reading.\(^{878}\) Amphorae bearing the stamp of Titus have recently been attributed to Fažana: these include one reading *Imp(eratoris) T(itii) Cae(asaris) Aug(usti) // Primigen(i)* and four linking him with an *officinator* whose stamp reads *Berent(i)*.\(^{879}\) Single stamps naming Domitian and Trajan may attest products of the same workshop.\(^{880}\)

The above provides reasonable evidence for the Flavian takeover of workshops which had previously produced ceramics for the Laecanii, and their continued ownership to the Trajanic period at the latest. If the Laecanii did own Val Catena, subsequent imperial possession of that property, and therefore a site of imperial leisure in the north Adriatic, is plausible.\(^{881}\) However, the evidence is simply not good enough to be convincing.

Another example of Histrian luxury, though on a smaller scale, is the *villa maritima* of Barbariga, north-west of Fažana.\(^{882}\) A peristyle around a courtyard forms one part of the complex; one of the rooms off the courtyard contained an ‘elaborate’ floor mosaic, with a floral motif at the centre.\(^{883}\) The villa had a thermal section, and a

---


\(^{878}\) Bezeczy (1998) p.59, fig.641.


\(^{881}\) Note also arguments for imperial ownership at Pola from the Augustan period, providing context for property at nearby Brijuni: Mommsen in *CIL V* (1872), p.3; Forlati Tamaro in *Inscr. It. X 1* (1947), p. 223 discussing no.593; Crawford (1976) 47, 67; Tassaux (2007) 50-3; Maiuro (2012) 343-4. This is based on inscriptions attesting imperial freedmen, and three epitaphs suggesting the presence of slaves or freedmen of Maecenas.

\(^{882}\) Schwalb (1902); Matijašić (1982) 57-8.

\(^{883}\) Matijašić (1982) 57.
promenade from which one could view the sea.\footnote{Ibid. 58.} Possibly connected to this *villa maritima* was an “oil plant” to the north, combining luxury and production in one estate.\footnote{Ibid. 58-9.} Nothing identifies the owners. But again, that matters less than the evidence the property provides for well-appointed *villae maritimae* in a north Adriatic context.

Therefore, I suggest that Ravenna itself, and the wider north Adriatic, deserve a more nuanced appreciation. Several imperial properties in the region have been identified, including the *regio Ravennatium* and possible property at Aquileia. Furthermore, there is inconclusive evidence for property in Histria. While these estates were certainly productive, from the remains of some Histrian *villae maritimae*, alongside comparisons between Altinum and Baiae, we can see that the region was more than a grand workshop. There is little literary evidence for the presence of Emperors or their families in the region in our period, and when they do appear, it is often to fight wars. This has perhaps contributed to a neglect of the proposed resort character of the region. Yet even then the properties in which they resided were surely well-appointed.

Literature encourages contrasting this region with the Bay of Naples, especially the *sinus Baianus*, by concentrating on its luxurious qualities. Yet we saw the weight of the literary topos in generating this image, perhaps underplaying other aspects of Baiae and its surrounds. Similarly, I suggest that we should seek a middle ground in our understanding of the north Adriatic: certainly a productive region and strategically vital for imperial campaigns towards the Alps and the Danube, but also a place of leisure and display. I am tempted to suggest that the regions into which the Italian *classes* were inserted were rather more alike, or grew to be more alike, than
one might suspect. By taking account of some of these neglected similarities we can perhaps gain a fuller understanding of the role of *classis* manpower in its human environments.

6. Conclusion

It is within this overall context that we should reassess the “naval bases” of Misenum and Ravenna. I have attempted to demonstrate the limitations of considering the *classis* ports only as such installations, and treating them in isolation. As an alternative, I have taken a regional approach to Misenum and Ravenna, with particular emphasis on the connection of the bases with imperial property and activity. These relationships must affect how we regard any possible duties entrusted to the *classes*. I cited the example of Centumcellae to suggest how an imperial harbour with a *classis* presence in the vicinity of imperial property should not be viewed purely in terms of military activity, in a traditional sense.

Geography and history are likely to have played some part in encouraging the institution of the *classes* at Misenum and Ravenna, though neither were decisive. Ravenna is perhaps marked out by its military strategic position in a communications corridor, potentially capable of supporting campaigns conducted to the north and east, especially under Augustus. Military activity occurred in the region during both civil wars in our period, and under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. One could conjecture that its position granted to the *classis* Ravennas a greater number of “local” military tasks than the *classis Misenensis*, but this is not explicitly attested. Whether we should claim, as Wickert did, that Ravenna was more of a “military
harbour” than Misenum is very difficult to answer.\textsuperscript{886} It is however interesting that its strategic value was not clearly acknowledged prior to the imperial period.

Both bases were associated with imperial property. At Misenum, it is possible that imperial \textit{villae maritimae} overlooked the \textit{classis} port. It is impossible to identify such features at Ravenna because we have not located the harbour. However, it is tempting to suggest that similar conditions were found there, especially when the next chapter will offer evidence for the association between \textit{classis} detachments and imperial property elsewhere.

I have raised the possibility – certainly at Misenum, more tentatively at Ravenna – that the \textit{classes} were installed on property owned by Octavian, perhaps inherited from Caesar. Further work could reveal why. I am tempted to consider as relevant the apparent siting of the \textit{castra} of the \textit{legio II Parthica} by Septimius Severus on imperial property at Alba.\textsuperscript{887} Strategic reasons, and proximity to Rome, are often advanced to explain this deployment.\textsuperscript{888} Yet Lugli noted that the imperial property around the camp favoured ‘l’espansione e il movimento richiesti da un campo militare’.\textsuperscript{889} More recently, Menéndez Argüín and Maiuro have observed that, by using imperial property, appropriation of private property was avoided, the latter also noting that placing a legion in Italy could still have proved ideologically difficult.\textsuperscript{890} Similarly, the grant of bases (with \textit{territoria}?) to the \textit{classes} in Italy may have been viewed as politically unfavourable by Augustus. By stationing them on his property, such problems would be partly overcome.

\textsuperscript{886} Wickert (1949-50) 105.
\textsuperscript{887} For the \textit{legio} see Ritterling in \textit{RE} XII (1925), \textit{s.v. legio II Parthica}, 1476-83; Forni (1953) 97-9; Smith (1972) 486-7; Menéndez Argüín (2003). On the \textit{castra} see Lugli (1919a); Benario (1972); Tortorici (1974); Menéndez Argüín (2003) 317-21. For the imperial villa see Lugli (1917), (1918), (1919b), (1920); cf. Von Hesberg (2009); Maiuro (2012) 254-5.
\textsuperscript{888} Lugli (1919a) 258; Benario (1972) 258; Tortorici (1974) 18; Menéndez Argüín (2003) 317.
\textsuperscript{889} Lugli (1919a) 261.
We can more safely contend that both *classes* were situated in regions with concentrations of imperial property, at which a variety of activities were carried out, and which were of some import to the imperial family. Due to the nature of the evidence, scholarship has emphasised luxury and debuchery in the *sinus Baianus* and military and commercial activity in the north Adriatic. Yet I have suggested that this provides only a partial picture. While the *sinus Baianus* was a resort, its dubious reputation was largely a literary topos, and its *villae* may well have been productive as well as luxurious entities. Similarly, while the evidence for north Adriatic estates highlights production, its leisure aspects should not be overlooked, nor should its potential use as a resort and display area for the imperial family.

This would suggest that, to a degree, the *classes* were placed in regions more similar than has sometimes been recognised. I have also noted that each base was located not too far from a major communications and commercial hub: Puteoli in the Bay of Naples, and Aquileia in the north Adriatic. We have seen some direct literary evidence for members of the *classis Misenensis* supporting imperial activity around the *sinus Baianus*, and more will be discussed in the following chapter. There is nothing directly comparable for the north Adriatic: one could speculate over the potential role of the *classis Ravennas* in the triumphal departure of Claudius from the Po. Moreover, it is possible that the servicemen attested at Altinum and Aquileia were entrusted with tasks to the direct benefit of the Emperor or his family members, but again we cannot be certain or specific. Nevertheless, these regional backgrounds and imperial interests must be remembered when considering the *militia* which servicemen may have been expected to perform around Misenum and Ravenna, and should caution against a purely military approach to the *classes*. 
We must end with limitations. These conclusions provide a rich background for thinking about the sort of activities which the Italian *classes* may have supported in the Bay of Naples or the north Adriatic. But the distribution of epitaphs and other documentary evidence indicates that both *classes* had a much wider Mediterranean and empire-wide roles, some of which we shall examine in the following chapter. Nonetheless, our findings may encourage a reconsideration of why there is evidence for *classis* servicemen elsewhere in the Mediterranean. It is commonly assumed that they were performing traditional military tasks, but given a potentially wider understanding of *militia*, and the varied activities attested and suggested for the manpower pools around their bases, perhaps other types of duties can be proposed.
IV. The Italian *classes* and imperial organics.

1. Introduction

Having examined the servicemen and main bases of the Italian *classes*, this chapter is devoted to some of their functions. It builds on several key observations: the warning against placing too much emphasis on the maritime characteristics of the *classes*; the identification of the *classis* servicemen as *milites* who performed a variety of tasks broadly considered *militia*; systems of manpower mobilisation; the conceptual closeness of the Italian *classes* to the imperial house; the association of their bases with imperial property and regions of mixed imperial activity. I shall argue that the duties performed by the servicemen demonstrate the role of the *classes* as flexible manpower pools rather than typical Mediterranean war fleets. There is no need to consider these activities as secondary to the imagined main military tasks of the *classes*, or the product of a ‘tendency to draw off “useless” naval personnel’.\(^891\)

Moreover, I shall suggest that the *classes* were integrated into systems, which I shall term imperial organics, supporting the functioning of the empire.

I shall offer a preliminary definition of these organics. Recent collections demonstrate that studies of ancient states and empires often concentrate on highly visible institutions or social relations as interpretative tools.\(^892\) Thus, in analysing the Roman empire, Peter Bang scrutinises the army, the “court”, provincial cities and aristocracies, and how their relationships with the ruling authority (and each other)

\(^{891}\) Starr (1960\(^2\)) 204 n.77.
\(^{892}\) Morris and Scheidel eds. (2009); Arnason and Raaflaub eds. (2011); Bang and Scheidel eds. (2013). See also below pp. 213-14 on Roman “government”.
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were managed. This approach usefully elucidates ‘high-end’ dynamics, such as major relationships between high status actors, the values they held, and how these played their part in the formation, sustainment and evolution of the empire.

But it has its drawbacks and can potentially encourage misleading interpretations. Among these one might place the supposed military logistics activities of the classes. This argument seems influenced by a desire to associate classis activities with some well-known events of imperial history as part of a major institution, the Roman army. However, despite Reddé, classis involvement in military logistics is far from certain.

The approach also neglects less visible activities potentially vital to understanding the empire. As a comparison, Horden and Purcell examined the differences between ‘high-end’ and ‘low-end’ commerce, emphasising how much the historian of the Mediterranean misses when concentrating on the former, prestigious and of high economic value, while neglecting the ‘Brownian motion’ of small traders.

Thus organics can be thought of as ‘low-end’ dynamics maintaining the empire, here especially the placement of manpower sources of use to the Emperor, the movement of people between and through particular interdependent regions, and how placement and movement can be related. These dynamics are often germinated, not always intentionally, by imperial (i.e. by the Emperor or his representatives’) activity. They then function in a self-sustaining manner, requiring little if any direct input from the central authority.


Note also cultural or ideological approaches taken by e.g. Lendon (1997); Ando (2000); cf. Lendon (2006) for criticism. For Rome and world-systems analysis see Woolf (1990).

See Prologue.

This concept owes considerable intellectual debts, and is not wholly new. It bears some relationship to the barely perceptible deep structures favoured by Braudel: transhumance or migrations of *gens de mer* from port to port, their impact on Mediterranean history, and the capacity of empires wishing to control manpower to act within it.  

Some recent studies of ancient empires allude to background structures, but they are often left difficult to grasp, and without clear formulation.

One curious feature of these organics is how they appear to grow and function somewhat of their own accord, hence the biological terminology. The idea that states could act with unintended consequences, affecting their dynamics over the long term, can be found elsewhere, for instance concerning decisions made by central authorities on mechanisms of extraction, which could then grant unintended powers to local figures of high status, as Goldstone and Haldon note regarding sixteenth and seventeenth century Indian states.

This discussion naturally appends to debates concerning the nature of Roman “government”, and whether rational and deliberate acts typical of modern administrations can be identified in our period. By retrojecting modern systems onto the Romans, scholars have discussed Roman government, administration and bureaucracy. Yet there is little evidence for such complex structures, urging the argument, especially following Millar, that the Romans did not create a comprehensive administrative system, or see the need to. Although the Emperor himself dealt with copious business, normally reacting to letters or petitions from
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897 Braudel (1972) e.g. 85-7, 145-7.
899 Goldstone and Haldon (2009) 16.
900 Ubiquitous in non-specialist material and in much scholarship of the twentieth century and earlier, as book titles demonstrate e.g. the *Römische Staatsverwaltung* of Marquardt and *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian* of Hirschfeld; of more recent work see e.g. Eck (1997-98a).
individuals or groups, he had no time or inclination to formulate consistent policy, and Roman “government” can thus be considered minimalist.\textsuperscript{901}

Set against this is the ‘mémoire perdue’ approach advanced by Nicolet and his followers. This argues for exploiting scattered references to study an archival corpus ‘comportera non des textes retrouvés, mais en quelque sorte l’idée des textes perdus’(author’s italics).\textsuperscript{902} For instance, Bats and Coudry have studied references to the \textit{acta senatus} and \textit{senatus consulta} for what can be learnt about their composition, publication, storage and use.\textsuperscript{903} The amount of “paperwork” implied encourages a view of Roman “government” less minimalist than that advanced above.

However, this method suffers from major limitations, wholly acknowledged by its proponents. Because sources rarely do more than fleetingly mention administrative documents or processes, the nature or use of any archived material remains largely obscure. One could also suggest that Roman imperial “government” may still have been limited in its activities, though “paperwork” may have supported those activities to a much greater degree than has been thought.

Thus, even taking into account the possibility of the employment of substantial archived material in administration, many features of modern “government” will be wholly absent from any thorough analysis of the Roman empire. We shall see later how this conception may apply to the figure of the Emperor as benefactor, and the “management” of the \textit{annona}. It is perhaps under such a “government” that imperial organics had the space to evolve, or indeed were required to.

\textsuperscript{902} Moatti (1998) 2. See esp. Demougin ed. (1994); Moatti ed. (1998); cf. Brosius ed. (2003). Note also Burton (2002), arguing that our unrepresentative evidence underplays the ‘normative’ regulations found in, for example, imperial \textit{mandata}.
\textsuperscript{903} Bats (1994); Coudry (1994).
To find evidence for these organics, and their relationship to the Italian *classes*, I shall re-examine three examples of functions performed by the *classes* as pools of manpower, often in ‘high-level’ contexts, but in whose backgrounds lurk less visible dynamics. First, I shall consider the role of the Italian *classis* manpower pool in systems of military mobilisation and redeployment, analysing evidence for the transfer of servicemen to land service, and their apparent replacement with fresh recruits. I shall scrutinise the civil wars of AD 68-70, the Bar Kokhba war of AD 132-5, alongside discussion of the *cohortes classicae*, and the civil strife beginning in AD 193. Although scholars have typically connected such redeployments with emergencies and even with grand strategy, I shall hypothesise that they may have occurred more frequently, and were encouraged by the convenience of a large manpower pool in Italy. I shall contend that the degree to which that manpower pool could be maintained, alongside its general exploitation, can be understood as among the organics of empire.

I shall then argue that the *classis* manpower pool supported imperial communications on water and land. There is some debate over whether and how frequently the *classes* transported members of the imperial family and people conducting business on behalf of the Emperor. I shall review the primarily literary evidence, arguing that we can regard the *classis* role as habitual. Moreover, in studying a passage of Tacitus suggesting that the *classes* transported people from Brundisium to Greece in the Tiberian period, I shall argue that this can be considered evidence for business as usual at the port, and for the role of the *classes* in conveying imperial news and representatives. However, we cannot necessarily generalise from the specific circumstances of Brundisium.
Subsequently, I shall consider the regional role of the *classes* in monitoring communications at Misenum and Ravenna, and in serving as part of an informal communications network which relied on rumour and general news reports passing through major hubs. Regarding Misenum, I shall build on previous arguments concerning the role of Puteoli as a communications hub, and place it alongside a passage of Suetonius indicating *classis* servicemen carried information overland from Puteoli and Ostia to Rome. While we do not have such evidence for the *classis Ravennas*, I shall tentatively propose that the proximity of its base to Aquileia, and the heavy traffic along the *via Flaminia*, would have made a similar arrangement in the north Adriatic not unlikely. I shall suggest that we may perceive imperial organics in the placement of the *classes* in their particular regions, and in the apparent reliance on informal information networks accessible at major hubs.

Finally, I shall consider the relationship between the *classis* manpower pool on the Tyrrhenian coast of Italy and the *annona*. Previous work has conjectured on the activities which *classis* servicemen performed in this relationship, given their presence at harbours frequented by grain ships. However, direct evidence is elusive. Therefore, I shall approach the manpower pool as part of a system which emerged on the western coast of Italy to the benefit of the security of the grain supply, engineered in part by imperial activity. This activity, partly encouraged by the perceived responsibility of Emperors for the *annona*, included the construction of imperial infrastructural projects. I shall suggest that, whatever motivated these projects, they could have been perceived as imperial benefactions, and in turn the imperial character of the ‘port system’ of Rome deserves emphasis. The ideological place of *classis* servicemen, some stationed at harbours possibly constructed at imperial estates, will be analysed. I shall end by considering how this system, not necessarily the product
of considered design, but rather an evolution based on particular attitudes to benefaction and property, might be regarded as evidence for imperial organics.

2. The Italian classes, mobilisation and redeployment

Flavius Josephus praised Roman readiness, believing it had given Rome success in wars and world power: their armies were always prepared, never idly waiting for problems to arise (οὐδὲ ἀναμένουσιν τοὺς καιροὺς). Their promptness and energy were laudable. Rapid manpower deployment in response to trouble would have been integral to this readiness.

Vegetius later applied this idea of readiness to the classes:

Romanus autem populus pro decore et utilitate magnitudinis suae non propter necessitatem tumultus alius classem parabat ex tempore sed ne quando necessitatem sustineret semper habuit praeparatam. nemo enim bello lacessere aut facere audet inuriam ei regno vel populo quem expeditum et promptum ad resistendum vindicandumque cognoscit.

He followed this with a schematic division of the Mediterranean into two zones, east and west, one for each Italian classis. This division has been attacked because of epigraphic evidence for the classes outside their zones. Yet, as Courtois noted in criticising Vegetius, it identifies a concern with rapid reaction to trouble. Vegetius himself stated that the partition allowed directa navigatio, useful because in rebus

904 Jos. BJ 3.72.
906 Veg. Mil. 4.31.1-3.
907 E.g. Chapot (1896) 44; Courtois (1939) 19-20; Starr (1960) 24-5; cf. Reddé (1986) 206, more sympathetic to Vegetius.
908 Courtois (1939) 19; cf. Fiebiger (1894) 320.
bellicis celeritas amplius solet prodesse quam virtus.\textsuperscript{909} Thus, the \textit{classes} as war fleets were a rapid reaction force.

The passage has rarely been directly engaged with, though it underlies views of the \textit{classes} as a final insurance, ‘designed for unpredictable emergencies’.\textsuperscript{910} Somewhat in this vein, Reddé argued that Vegetius considered the \textit{classes} a deterrent, an insurance against the outbreak of further wars.\textsuperscript{911}

It is perhaps unsurprising that Vegetius, writing in a more troubled era, would concentrate on responses to outbreaks of conflict, even employing language recognisable to the modern reader familiar with “military deterrents”. The apparent conception of the \textit{classes} as primarily war fleets is also wholly to be expected, in a period of potential maritime conflict. However, despite its alluring rationality, this anachronistic sketch cannot be uncritically used to understand the \textit{classes} in our period.

Returning to Josephus, the movement of \textit{milites} from one part of the empire to another, especially but not only in crises, relied on well-developed systems of mobilisation. Here, I shall argue that the Italian \textit{classes} had a particular place in these systems by considering the literary evidence for the civil wars of AD 68-70, \textit{diplomata} and papyri revealing possible redeployments in the Bar Kokhba war, and finally literature relevant to the strife of AD 193. This evidence indicates that because their recruitment needs were apparently so well met, the \textit{classes} could serve as manpower pools, their \textit{milites} rapidly redeployed as land forces.

\textsuperscript{909} Veg. \textit{Mil.}, 4.31.6.
\textsuperscript{910} Starr (1960)\textsuperscript{2} 170.
\textsuperscript{911} Reddé (1986) 332-3.
Starr understood such examples as forced by ‘imperial exigencies’, indicating that the classes were a final insurance for land campaigns.\(^9\) This is implied elsewhere, as when Kienast described classis manpower as ‘die einzige militärische Reserve in Italien, auf die der Kaiser bei Notfällen zurückgreifen konnte’.\(^9\) Le Bohec has even understood the classes as the ‘ultimate reserve of soldiers’ and part of the ‘active defence’ of the empire.\(^9\) This draws on concepts of grand strategy, alongside the argument of Reddé that the classes were embedded in military logistics.\(^9\) While I agree that classes were a useful manpower pool, it is another thing entirely to characterise their role in terms of grand strategy. In examining the evidence, I shall suggest that the crisis narrative has been over-emphasised, and that the troop transfers may reflect low-level systems about which we have little information, tentatively hinting at imperial organics.

2.1 The classes and AD 68-70

We have already encountered our first examples of the redeployment of classis servicemen for terrestrial combat. During the civil strife that began in AD 68 and ended with Vespasian becoming Emperor, Nero formed what became the legio I Adiutrix from members of the classis Misenensis, while the Flavian forces created the legio II Adiutrix from men of the classis Ravennas.\(^9\)

\(^9\) Starr (1960) 188.
\(^9\) Le Bohec (1994) 164-5.
\(^9\) For grand strategy and the Roman empire, see esp. Luttwak (1976) with the considered criticism of J. Mann in JRS 69 (1979), 175-83.
\(^9\) On the legio I see Tac. Hist. 1.31, 36-8, 87; Suet. Galb. 12.2; Plut. Galb. 15.3-4; Cass. Dio 64.3; Ritterling in RE XII (1925), s.v. legio I Adiutrix, 1380-1404; Lőrincz (2000a). For the legio II see Tac. Hist. 3.50 and Ritterling in RE XII (1925), s.v. legio II Adiutrix, 1437-56; Lőrincz (2000b). See also above pp. 92-5 for further discussion and bibliography.
One would not deny that these transfers took place in unusual circumstances. Yet modern accounts can imply that the transfers themselves were somehow unconventional. Starr described the presence of the servicemen at the Mulvian Bridge and their attitude to Galba as ‘somewhat importunate and violent’. Miller considered the action of Nero as ‘extremely logical, if unorthodox’.

If we accept that the men who encountered Galba outside Rome were part of what became the legio I Adiutrix, sources describing their confrontation with the Emperor do not really indicate that their demands were unreasonable, or that Nero had done anything especially ‘unorthodox’. Suétionius states that, having been made iusti milites, they refused to return to their old status, obstinately demanding an eagle and standards. Plutarch says that the former classis servicemen wanted to enforce their rights as soldiers, demanding standards and a camp. Dio records that they approached Galba to be retained in their service, and were unhappy when refused.

I am tempted to read these accounts as suggesting that the classis milites expected that their status would be confirmed perhaps because their redeployment was not unprecedented, other than potentially in its scale. Evidence to come for other transfers will make this suggestion more persuasive.

917 Though some accounts offer little real evaluation e.g. de la Berge (1886) 212-13; Kienast (1966) 61; Reddé (1986) 509-10.
918 Starr (1960) 180.
920 On these men see above p. 92 n.390.
922 Plut. Galb. 15.3-4: οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν οὕς εἰς ἐν τῷ τάγμα ὁ Νέρων συλλογήσας ἀπέφηνε στρατιώτας· καὶ τότε παρόντες ἐκβεβαιώσασθαι τὴν στρατεύειν οὕς ἡθήναι τοῖς ἀπαντᾶν οὕς ἀκούσθηναι παρίσταν τὸν αὐτοκράτορα, ἀλλ’ ἐθορύβουσιν βοῇ σημεῖα τῷ τάγματι καὶ χώραν αἵτιντες.
923 Cass. Dio 64.3.1-2: καὶ ἦξιον ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ στρατείᾳ φυλαχθῆναι. καὶ ὡς τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἀνεβάλετο ὡς καὶ σκεψόμενος περὶ τούτου, ὡς δ’ οὕκ ἐπείθοντο ἀλλ’ ἐθορύβουσιν, ἐρήμῃ σφίς τὸ στράτευμα...
However, the reaction of Galba could suggest that he considered their demands unacceptable. Suetonius claims that he decimated the men: *non modo immisso equite disiecit, sed decimavit etiam.*\(^{924}\) Dio elaborates: καὶ οἱ μὲν παραχρῆμα ἐς ἑπτακισχιλίους ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο δεκατευθέντες.\(^{925}\) Yet our sources use this affair to criticise Galba: in particular, Suetonius groups this action under symptoms of his *saevitia* and *avaritia*. Galba, not the *milites*, is in the wrong.\(^{926}\)

Plutarch does not mention a decimation and, although recounting the deaths of servicemen, may partially blame the *milites*, though not for their demands: ἐνίων δὲ καὶ τὰς μαχαίρας σπασαμένων, ἐκέλευσε τοὺς ἱππεῖς ἐμβαλεῖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Γάλβας. ὑπέστη δὲ οὐδεὶς ἐκείνων, ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν εὐθὺς ἀνατραπέντε, οἱ δὲ φεύγοντες διεφθάρησαν.\(^{927}\) This version should be set alongside the suggestion by Miller that a tradition hostile to Galba exaggerated accounts of the Mulvian Bridge.\(^{928}\) Notably, *diplomata* of AD 68 demonstrate that Galba eventually discharged some of these men as legionaries.\(^{929}\) Thus, whether he reacted with quite so much bloodshed is questioned, though I would not dispute that some kind of fractious confrontation occurred outside Rome.

The sources on the meeting between Galba and the new legionaries do not demonstrate that there was anything particularly ‘unorthodox’ about their transfer from the *classes*. One can derive similar conclusions from the Tacitean account of the formation of the *legio II Adiutrix*. The servicemen are perhaps portrayed somewhat negatively in their demands to be made legionaries (*ad has copias e classicis*
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\(^{924}\) Suet. *Galb.* 12.2.

\(^{925}\) Cass. Dio 64.3.2; cf. Tac. *Hist.* 1.6: *introitus in urbem trucidatis tot milibus inermium militum*.

\(^{926}\) Suet. *Galb.* 12.1: *praecesserat de eo fama saevitiae simul atque avaritiae*.

\(^{927}\) Plut. *Galb.* 15.4.

\(^{928}\) Miller (1981) 75.

\(^{929}\) *CIL* XVI 7-9.
Ravennatibus, legionarium militiam poscentibus). Starr speaks of the ‘sailors who had forced Primus to enrol them in a legio classica’. I would emphasise that Antonius Primus partly assented, selecting only the best men (optimus quisque adsciti), perhaps following an established practice when shifting classis servicemen to legionary service.

Fresh recruits were immediately drafted into the classis Ravennas to replace those transferred, a practice we may see repeated. Their origins are important: Tacitus states that Dalmatians were brought in (classem Dalmatae supplevere). As we have seen, these people were a typical source of classis Ravennas recruits. Therefore even in unusual circumstances normal sources could be tapped to replace transferred milites.

While we have no evidence for fresh recruitment to the classis Misenensis, its effective employment by Otho suggests its otherwise excellent manpower resources even when deprived of transferred members. Otho used the classis Misenensis against the Vitellian forces at Forum Iulii, though it is not clear whether this city possessed a naval force at this date. Moreover, according to Tacitus, the fama victricis classis (Misenensis) kept Corsica, Sardinia and nearby islands loyal to Otho. Its deployment for combat reminds us that the classes could be used as war fleets, or to support land campaigns, emphasising the flexibility of these milites who could row.

In sum, the formation of the legiones Adiutrices suggests that the Italian classes could serve as manpower sources for new land forces. The circumstances of

930 Tac. Hist. 3.50.
931 Starr (1960) 185.
932 Tac. Hist. 3.50.
933 Ibid. 3.50.
934 See above pp. 59-60.
935 Tac. Hist. 1.87; 2.12-14; cf. Tac. Agric.7 for the murder of the mother of Agricola by the classis Othoniana in Liguria.
936 Tac. Hist. 2.16.
AD 68-70 were highly particular, but the evidence does not clearly suggest that ancient authorities regarded the formation of the legions as ‘unorthodox’, at least to the degree of some modern works. I cautiously suggest, but for now will not press the point, that this could imply that the movement of classis servicemen to land forces, encouraged by the depth of their manpower resources, was not wholly restricted to special circumstances.

2.2 The Bar Kokhba Revolt

Several scholars have argued that many classis servicemen were transferred to land forces during the Jewish Bar Kokhba uprising of AD 132-5, which engulfed Judaea and surrounding territories. The evidence cited is rather compelling: up to fifteen classis diplomata are known dating to AD 160. Given that at this time servicemen were normally discharged after twenty six years, the recipients most likely enlisted during the revolt in AD 134. This is an extraordinary number of finds for one year: five diplomata date to AD 142, while the special circumstances of AD 71 produced nine. This large number could be down to chance, but following Roxan I am tempted to regard this as evidence for a classis ‘recruitment drive’, specifically the classis Misenensis, arguably in response to the war.

---

937 E.g. Starr (1960) 188; Roxan (1995) 110; Eck (1999) 79-80 and (2010a) 95-100 and see below p. 224 n.943. Much about the uprising is disputed, including its scale and geographical extent: see e.g. Bowersock (1979); Schäfer (1981) and (1990); Eck (1999) and (2007); Goodman (2000) 671-4. I am inclined to side with “maximalists” such as Eck, or at least believe that the Roman response to the uprising involved major troop deployments.

938 AE 1975 245 (= RMD II 105); AE 1992 1507 (= RMD III 172); AE 1995 1822 (= RMD IV 277); AE 1997 1769 (= RMD V 425); AE 2002 1758 (=RMD V 426); AE 2002 1760 (= 2006 1854 = RMD V 427); RMM 39; AE 2006 1855-60; AE 2007 1789; Eck (2010a) 96 for an unpublished document. Around half are extremely fragmentary.

939 See below p. 229 n.964 for AD 142; for AD 71 see above pp. 40 and 62-3.

The conflict did not involve major Mediterranean naval engagements, so such mass recruitment was probably not conducted to support a war fleet. The petition of 22 January AD 150 by members of the *legio X Fretensis* to the governor of Judaea, discussed earlier when considering enlistment, could provide an explanation.\(^{941}\)

Twenty two men were recruited into the *classis praetoria Misenensis* in AD 124/5 (consular dating).\(^{942}\) At some intervening point, they were transferred to the *legio X Fretensis* in Judaea. Vitelli, who published the petition, proposed that the most likely time for the transfer was AD 132/3, portraying this as a response to possibly heavy losses in the reinforced legion during the Bar Kokhba revolt.\(^{943}\)

Vitelli noted that the legionaries had completed over twenty years of service, which would place their transfer at the lastest in AD 130, assuming discharge in 150.\(^{944}\) However, he thought that it most probably occurred in the crisis of the Bar Kokhba war, and therefore suggested either a rounding of nineteen or eighteen years of service, or that the twenty years mentioned was a shorthand for their twenty six total years of service.\(^{945}\) This interpretation has recently been echoed by Eck, who claimed that such a transfer could have happened ‘nur in einer Notsituation’.\(^{946}\)

Yet Degrasse, disputing the posited AD 132/3 transfer, suggested that such movements did not demand a dire situation, though he gave only one other tenuous

---

\(^{941}\) *PSI* IX 1026 (= *CIL* XVI p. 146 no.13 = *CPL* 117 = Smallwood (1966) no.330 = *ChLA* XXV 784); *cf.* above p. 123.

\(^{942}\) Following Degrassei (1952) 37; note that several publications (e.g. G. Vitelli in *PSI* IX (1929), p.36; Degrase (1929) 243; Mann (2000) 156) mistakenly date the recruitment to AD 125-6.


\(^{945}\) Vitelli in *PSI* XI (1929), pp. 38-9.

\(^{946}\) Eck (2010a) 97.
example. Smallwood, disagreeing with Vitelli, argued that we should take the text at face value on the date, but did suggest that a disturbed situation prior to the conflict could have prompted the transfer. Mann suggested the aftermath of the war, leaving the dating problem unconfronted.

There is nothing demonstrably wrong with the solution of Vitelli, but his argument depends on special pleading. Perhaps Smallwood was correct to propose trouble just before the war. Yet it is possible that we have been misled by a fascination with major events, and that the men were transferred in AD 129/30 for reasons mundane and irrecoverable. Thus, this document demonstrates the transfer of classis milites to the land army, perhaps in response to a particular problem, though it cannot be conclusively connected with the Bar Kokhba war, and may be rare evidence for day-to-day manpower redistribution mechanisms.

Whatever the precise solution, the mass classis recruitment of AD 134 should perhaps be understood in a similar way: men from the classis Misenensis were transferred to Judaea, in this case surely because of the effects of the Bar Kokhba war, and were replaced by fresh recruits, recipients of the diplomata of AD 160.

2.3 The cohortes classicae

An examination of the imperial cohortes classicae supports the transfer theory. The earliest two cohortes are generally considered Augustan in origin. Evidence includes two early first century AD epitaphs for members of the cohort I classis

---

947 Degrassi (1929) 252-3. He cites W.Chr. 463 (= CPL 104), a Domitianic edict from Philadelphia (AD 94) concerning the privileges of veterans of the legio X Fretensis. Lesquier (1918) 316-17 speculated without basis that these men had originally been classis members.
949 Mann (2000) 156.
950 For a full collection of the evidence, see Spaul (2000) 477-8, 485.
found at Villeneuve-sur-Lot, for Sex(tus) Valerius Sex(ti) f(ilius) Aniensis Maxsumus, whose home was Forum Iulii, and Valerius Gal(?) Vol(tinia) Tutus, from Luco.\textsuperscript{951} A veteran of the cohort, C(aius) Lucceius L(uci) f(ilius) An(ensis), probably settled in and died at Forum Iulii in the first half of the first century AD.\textsuperscript{952} We also know of at least one member of the same cohort, Sex(tus) Nonius L(uci) f(ilius) / Vot(uria) Severus, who was deducted to Antium in the first century, probably by Nero.\textsuperscript{953}

Based partly on the Villeneuve-sur-Lot epitaphs, Kraft argued that the cohortes were formed from the naval force stationed at Forum Iulii after Actium, and were initially employed in the Aquitanian campaign of Valerius Messalla in 28 BC.\textsuperscript{954} The details of this hypothesis cannot be verified, though the findspots, the probably early dating of the Villeneuve-sur-Lot inscriptions, and cohort members coming from Forum Iulii makes the broad argument attractive.

The above evidence concerns only the cohors I classica, though many assume that the cohors II was created alongside it.\textsuperscript{955} But this unit appears at the earliest datable instance in an inscription from Berytus in Syria mentioning Q. Aemilius Secundus, who served under P. Sulpicius Quirinius (legate of Syria from AD 6-12) as praefectus cohortis II classicae.\textsuperscript{956} Spaul has suggested that the unit may have been raised separately from the cohors I, either from Forum Iulii manpower, or from a

\textsuperscript{951} CIL XIII 923 (= ILA Nitiobroges no.20), 924 (= ILA Nitiobroges no.21). The text of the latter is poorly transmitted, thus it is uncertain what Gal(...) is doing, and one cannot tell whether Valerius was adopted as a praenomen, or if the praenomen was not copied down. Saddington (1982) 142 dated the epitaphs to before a withdraw of troops instigated by Tiberius; cf. Cichorius in RE IV (1900), s.v. cohors I Classica, 272: ‘ziemlich frühe’.

\textsuperscript{952} AE 1904 7 (= ILS 9158).

\textsuperscript{953} CIL X 6672 (= ILS 2574); cf. CIL X 6674 (= ILS 2020) commemorating a veteranus originally from Forum Iulii, buried at Antium. Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 204 n.76 conjectured that he belonged to a cohors classica. On the Neronian colonia see Keppie (1984a) 87-8.

\textsuperscript{954} Kraft (1951) 95-9; similarly Fiebiger in RE III (1899), s.v. classis, 2636; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{1}) 188; Reddé (1986) 351; Le Bohec (1994) 98.

\textsuperscript{955} See the bibliography in the above note.

\textsuperscript{956} CIL III 6687 (= ILS 2683 = AE 2006 1579). Aemilius: PIR\textsuperscript{2} A 406; Sulpicius: PIR\textsuperscript{2} S 1018.
classis presence in Syria.\textsuperscript{957} The evidence allows no certainty. But importantly, this inscription confirms an Augustan date for the cohors I, presumably created before the cohors II.

The above seems to indicate that men were drawn off from classis forces to form permanent land units in the Augustan period. One cannot decisively characterise their formation as crisis responses, though unknown requirements of the Aquitanian campaign may have been significant. If the cohortes had any maritime functions initially, they probably quickly lost them. Diplomata show that the cohors I was in Germany by AD 80.\textsuperscript{958} Other diplomaticata demonstrate that the cohors II remained in Syria and became a unit of archers.\textsuperscript{959}

The second century produced cohortes classicae Aeliae and Aureliae. A diploma recording units in the province of Arabia in AD 142, published by Weiss and Speidel, mentions a cohors I Aelia classica and a cohors II Aurelia classica.\textsuperscript{960} They attractively propose that this cohors Aelia was formed in response to heavy Roman losses during the Bar Kokhba uprising. They considered the possibility that it was formed from a vexillation of the better known British cohors I Aelia classica transferred east in response to the war, though discounted this because of the distances involved.\textsuperscript{961}

\textsuperscript{958}CIL XVI 158 (AD 80); AE 1968 400 (AD 158); AE 1997 1314 (AD 127); RMM 4 (AD 80), 24 (AD 127), 35 (AD 153-4).
\textsuperscript{959}CIL XVI 106, from the reign of Antoninus Pius. Previously they were not called sagittaria e.g. CIL XVI 35; AE 1939 126; AE 2006 1838 (all AD 88).
\textsuperscript{960}AE 2004 1925.
\textsuperscript{961}Weiss and Speidel (2004) 260. For the British cohort see the diplomaticata CIL XVI 93 (= III p. 1982= RIB II 1.2401,1) and AE 1997 1001 (= RMD V 420), from AD 145/6, and 27 February AD 158 respectively. On its formation see Starr (1960) 188; Holder (1998) 254-5. Spaul (2000) 477-8 uniquely argues that this is the same unit as the German cohors I classica, but the latter is never called Aelia, so I am inclined to disagree.
Instead, they argue that the cohort was formed from servicemen of the *classes Alexandrina* and *Syriaca*.\textsuperscript{962} They suggested that these men were put into an auxiliary cohort because of the “lower” status of provincial *classes*, while members of the *classis Misenensis* were sent to a legion. While possible, nothing proves this strict demarcation. Presumably the most advantageous course was adopted. In any case, the unit stayed in Arabia after the conflict, part of the new military settlement. They propose that that the *cohort II Aurelia classica* was created in this context by Antoninus Pius, possibly from further *classis* servicemen brought into the region.\textsuperscript{963}

The above scenario is wholly possible, though lacks conclusive proof. The designation of units as *classica* certainly implies a *classis* origin, and perhaps the most likely point for the redeployment of members of any *classis* at around this time in this region was the Bar Kokhba war or its aftermath, and new troop distributions, which at a stretch could include the *cohort II Aurelia classica*.

The Bar Kokhba war caused high manpower demands, partly because of combat losses, and partly because of the decisive Roman reaction. *Diplomata* indicate that at this time there were high levels of recruitment into the Italian *classes*, the *classis Misenensis* in particular, and following earlier work I have attributed this to members of the *classes* being transferred to the warzone during or just following the conflict. This may also explain the *cohortes classicae* in Arabia in the 140s AD.

However, the discussion has also pointed out the pitfalls of assuming that major events must explain all such redeployments. The circumstances behind the transfer to the *legio X Fretensis* of the authors of the petition of AD 150 are unclear, while similar uncertainty surrounds the creation of the comparative examples of the

\textsuperscript{962} Weiss and Speidel (2004) 262.

\textsuperscript{963} See also Weiss and Speidel (2004) 259 for an unpublished Arabian *diploma* of AD 145, also mentioning a *cohort I Aurelia*, perhaps *classica*.
Augustan cohortes classicae. It is even possible that Bar Kokhba had nothing to do with the creation of the Hadrianic and Antonine cohortes classicae. These examples suggest that the classes could form manpower pools to be redeployed in different environments, but not necessarily that they were the ‘ultimate reserve’ for a crisis. Instead, we might view them as part of a low-level system of manpower mobilisation which relied on access to a large manpower pool in Italy, facilitating everyday transfers across the empire.

2.4. The classes and AD 193

Our final example concerns classis activity in the civil conflict beginning in AD 193. According to the Historia Augusta, Septimius Severus seized the classis at Ravenna on his march to Rome (Severus classem Ravennatem occupat), preempting the attempt by the praetorian prefect, Tullius Crispinus, to take control on behalf of Julianus (Tullius Crispinus, praefectus praetorio, contra Severum missus ut classem produceret, repulsus Romam reedit).

Previously, Julianus had brought troops into Rome, including servicemen from Misenum, to prepare for defending the city against Severus. According to Dio, they were inept: καὶ οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ Μισηνῷ ναυλοχοῦντος...

964 Other potential examples of this practice are the five diplomata of AD 142, possibly attesting high recruitment levels in AD 116: AE 1995 1824 (= RMD IV 264); AE 1997 1781 (= RMD V 393); RMD II 106 with AE 2001 1725; AE 2001 2164 (= RMD V 395); AE 2004 1921 (= RMD V 392). Roxan and Holder (2004) 273 connected this with the Parthian campaigns, but one wonders whether the Jewish uprising of AD 115-17 (Cass. Dio 68.32; Euseb. Hist. Ecc. 4.2; cf. Goodman (2000) 669-71) should be considered. Seider (1978) has argued that ChLA XI 500, a fragmentary early second century papyrus of unknown origin listing various units including the classes Misenensis and Ravennas, is a mobilisation order, and could tentatively record the redeployment of classis units to land service in Egypt. But the the papyrus is too fragmentary for this to be more than a cautious conjecture.

μεταπεμφθέντες οὐδ’ ὅπως γυμνάσωνται ἠδεσαν. This could argue against the classis servicemen being ready for redeployment on land.

It may only reflect conditions of the later second century; Starr believed that it was symptomatic of a lethargic decline in discipline. But, as Millar noted, Dio is consistently hostile to Julianus, and I suggest that this episode could derive from that. Moreover, Reddé argued that we should not give too much weight to the remark, given that epigraphy indicates a well organised and structured classis even at this stage. I am inclined to agree with Reddé, or at least do not think that this situation was typical of our period. If the classes comprised such incompetents, why did Severus and Julianus bother to secure the classis Ravennas, and why did Julianus bring men from Misenum to Rome in the first place?

This example differs from the others because the classis Misenensis servicemen were not demonstrably placed in permanent land units: they presumably retained their status, but were expected to contribute to the defence of Rome. Nonetheless, it again demonstrates that servicemen could be redeployed on land. In this instance the circumstances can reasonably be termed a crisis, at least for Julianus.

2.5 Conclusion

The examples considered indicate that considerable numbers of men would occasionally be moved from the Italian classes to perform military duties on land, sometimes to supplement existing units but at other times forming new ones, the cohorts classicae. The creation of the legiones Adiutrices, the transfers probably

---

966 Cass. Dio 73.16.3.
967 Starr (1960) 190; cf. Courtois (1939) 43.
968 Millar (1964) 136-8.
969 Reddé (1986) 572, mistakenly attributing their summoning to Albinus.
connected with the Bar Kokhba war and the use of *classis* servicemen by Julianus could all be regarded as responses to crises. We might also place the command of Valerius Maximianus, discussed in the Prologue, in this category. In other instances, such as the formation of the Augustan *cohortes classicae* (and perhaps the second century *cohortes*) or the supplementing of the *legio X Fretensis* in the second century, the connection to an emergency is less evident, and need not be assumed. It is impossible to judge how common such transfers were, but because they may have been so mundane our lack of evidence should not uncritically be regarded a counter to this argument.

In any case, one can suggest that the *classes* performed a useful role as a manpower pool from the time of Augustus. This role would seem to have supported the security of the Roman empire by allowing the swift movement of trained men to theatres of operation.

Considering the recruitment of Dalmatians into the *classis Ravennas* in AD 69, and the supplementing of the *classis Misenensis* in AD 134, it would appear that the efficient recruitment of *classis* replacements, probably from commonly exploited regions, was rapidly undertaken to replace redeployed men. This could suggest that the Romans were prepared to use the Italian *classes* as a manpower pool, and to draw up replacements. Their capacity to quickly replace these men indicates that conditions existed in at least parts of the Roman empire facilitating the mobilisation of large numbers of people, some of which were discussed in Chapter Two.

The glimpse of mobilisation systems which this study provides could have partly underpinned the readiness so admired by Josephus. Assuming that the examples considered are preserved reflections of a more constant and dynamic system of mobilisation, rather than the only times when *classis* manpower was ever
redeployed, to what extent can we perceive the organics of empire? The concentration of *classis* manpower in Campania and the north Adriatic, not forgetting those servicemen based at Rome, provided easy access to *milites* stationed in regions with particularly good connections, facilitating redeployment across the empire, whether by land or sea. We have seen in the previous chapter that the placement of the *classes* at Misenum and Ravenna was determined by several factors, including possibly the location of imperial property. There is no evidence for the conscious creation of this system, or that it should be regarded as part of imperial grand strategy.

This system of manpower redistribution was in some circumstances maintained by recruitment arrangements which, as I argued in Chapter Two, were partly self-sustaining and which themselves may be understood as imperial organics. I discussed the possible relationship between movement of recruits from Egypt along the grain route to Puteoli, and similar interdependencies may have encouraged travel from the Danubian provinces to Aquileia and Ravenna, providing the excellent supply of recruits needed to reinforce the *classis* manpower pools. Decisions were taken by individuals to redeploy the *classis* servicemen in each instance, but these decisions were made possible by an easily accessible, well-supplied manpower pool.

### 3. Communications

Vitellius, briefly Emperor and renowned gourmand, dedicated an enormous platter called the *clipeus Minervae πολιούχου*. On it, he served a remarkable range of delicacies: wrasse livers, the brains of pheasants and peacocks, the tongues of...
flamingos and the milk of the murena.\textsuperscript{971} The story implies that he obtained these through the imperial \textit{classes}, doubtless because of the distances they could cover: \textit{a Parthia usque fretoque Hispanico per nauarchos ac triremes petitarum commiscuit}.\textsuperscript{972}

This can be read as an eccentric demonstration of the role of the \textit{classes} in connecting distant parts of the empire. Although the passage emphasises the exotic, it is usually thought that communications were critical to the functioning of the empire: the sending of letters between Emperors, provincial governors and communities is a vital element to the reactive “government” constructed by Millar.\textsuperscript{973} Despite his belief that there was no structured and effective communications system spanning the empire, the above passage encourages an examination of the Italian \textit{classes} in this context.\textsuperscript{974}

Communications can cover a range of meanings, but here I shall focus on transporting people important to the imperial house, and information monitoring and transmission. To provide context, I shall first refer to the \textit{cursus publicus} and other imperial couriers. I shall then turn to transport. Scholars have previously proposed that the \textit{classes}, especially the \textit{classis Misenensis}, conveyed Emperors, members of their households and imperial officials. Having examined some of the literary evidence supporting this, I shall consider a Tacitean passage concerning Brundisium, alongside \textit{classis} epitaphs, arguing that here \textit{classis} vessels were regularly used to support imperial communications between particular ports, but that we cannot necessarily extend this across the empire.

\textsuperscript{971} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{972} Ibid.
I shall then propose that the *classes* monitored communications passing through the regions in which they were based, especially at Misenum and Ravenna, though not necessarily because they were directly instructed to do so. This argument is based partly on the apparently informal nature of many communications networks in the Roman empire, and the sometime reliance on rumour. At least occasionally *classis* servicemen were entrusted with carrying information gathered at port to Rome, as a passage from Suetonius indicates. There is no comparable evidence for Ravenna, but I shall emphasise its situational advantages for monitoring communications passing across the north Adriatic and into Italy, perhaps along the *via Flaminia*.

Having discussed the the uses of the *classis* manpower pool in a communications context, I shall examine whether we can perceive imperial organics, especially in the informal information monitoring and transmission systems identified around Misenum and Ravenna.

### 3.1 The *cursus publicus* and other couriers

The *cursus publicus*, perhaps established by Augustus though only designated as such as late as the fourth century, is the system most commonly associated with imperial communications.\(^{975}\) While it has been understood as a ‘postal service’, with couriers included, Kolb has argued that this is incorrect: the *cursus publicus* was the infrastructure of transportation (e.g. animals, way stations) provided for officials in

---

\(^{975}\) Suet. *Aug.* 49.3. For the sake of simplicity I shall refer to the *cursus publicus*, even when earlier systems are meant.
public service and granted the use of that infrastructure. Millar has emphasised that the infrastructure was created by a set of obligations on communities to provide items for requisitioning. Therefore, concentrating on the *cursus* provides only a narrow take on communications, and it must be studied alongside, for instance, imperial couriers, sometimes granted permission to use the *cursus*.

I shall give several examples of these couriers, but the following is nowhere near comprehensive. Soldiers were frequently used as *ad hoc* couriers. This is implied by Tacitus, who recounts the interception of letters by the Helvetii in AD 68, and the detention of the soldiers carrying them: *aegre id passi Helvetii, interceptis epistulis, quae nomine Germanici exercitus ad Pannonicas legiones ferebantur, centurionem et quosdam militum in custodia retinebant*. Josephus records that Titus sent a cavalryman to announce the capture of Galilean Tarichaeae to Vespasian (Τίτος δ’ ἐκπέμψας τινὰ τῶν ἱππέων εὐαγγελίζεται τῷ πατρὶ τὸ ἔργον). Finally, M. P. Speidel has discussed a Trajanic papyrus letter written by a soldier called Saturnilus to his mother in Karanis, in which he expressed hopes for courier missions.

Some military groups had more permanent courier duties. These included the legionary *frumentarii, officiales* attached to the staff of a governor in a province. They also had a base in Rome at the *castra peregrina*, and were sent on missions by

---

976 Kolb (2000) and (2001); cf. Seeck in RE IV (1901), s.v. *cursus publicus*, 1846-63; Holmberg (1933); Pflaum (1940); Millar (2000) 365.
979 Tac. Hist. 1.67.
980 Jos. BJ 3.503.
982 Fiebiger in RE VII (1910), s.v. *frumentarii*, 122-5; Baillie Reynolds (1923); Sinnigen (1962); Clauss (1973a) 82-117; Paschoud (1979-81) 215-32; Rankov (1990); Kolb (2000) 290-4.
the Emperor. While some older scholarship, seduced by the Historia Augusta, saw the frumentarii primarily as “secret police”, more recent work has emphasised their communications role.

These can be complemented by examples of civilian messengers, including the tabellarii, typically imperial freedmen couriers. Epigraphy, largely from Rome, provides most of the evidence. They appear to have been assigned to specific subjects of imperial interest, as suggested by tabellarii of the officium rationum, those of the officium annonae, and of the st(atio) XX her(editatium). Texts rarely document them performing services for Emperors, though Marcus Aurelius as an imperial family member refers to one (tandem tabellarius proficiscitur) in a letter from AD 144-5. However, they are mentioned several times by Pliny the Younger, confirming their courier functions.

Comparable are the cursores, though there is relatively little evidence for them before the fourth century. They too were primarily imperial slaves or freedmen. Kolb has argued that, like tabellarii, the cursores were seconded to

---

983 Sinnigen (1962) 220-3 persuasively argues for a Domitianic date for the castra; ILTun 778-9 give the Trajanic period as the terminus ante quem.
984 “Secret police”: SHA. Hadr. 11.4; Comm. 4.5; Macrinus 12.4; with e.g. Pflaum (1940) 332; Clauss (1973a) 90-4, 119; Austin and Rankov (1995) 136-7. For courier activities see e.g. SHA Max. et Balb. 10.3; Claud.17.1 and e.g. Clauss (1973a) 86-90; Rankov (1990) 180; Eck (1995b) 69. See also Kolb (2000) 290-4. Another example of military couriers are the speculatores e.g. Suet. Calig. 44.2; Tac. Hist. 2.73 and Pflaum (1940) 329-32; Clauss (1973a) 46-81; Austin and Rankov (1995) 153; Kolb (2000) 286-7.
985 Kolb (2000) 275-8; cf. Desjardins (1878); Hirschfeld (1905) 200-3; Pflaum (1940) 316ff.
986 CIL VI 8424a (= ILS 1706), 8473 (= ILS 1705), 8445 (= ILS 1553); cf. see Kolb (2000) 276.
987 Fronto ad M. Caes. 4.7. (Haines I p. 184 = Naber p. 70).
988 E.g. Plin. Ep. 2.12.6; 3.17.2; 8.3.3.
990 From the late second or early third century see CIL VI 8800: L(uci) Sept(imi) Aug(usti) lib(erti) Zibl[---]/ praep(ositi) cursorum...; cf. CIL VI 241. For some literary documentation see e.g. Suet. Ner. 49.2.
specific imperial concerns. Epigraphy implies their presence on the staff of imperial procurators, but the case is not proven.\textsuperscript{991}

It is difficult to establish whether each group carried distinct message types. Perhaps \textit{tabellarii} delivered news relating to the imperial concern they were attached to, alongside general messages, while the \textit{cursores} were more general purpose couriers. The same uncertainty holds for the following discussion of \textit{classis} servicemen. However, the proposed association of the \textit{classes} with particular ports and imperial estates may indicate that, while no particular types of communications were assigned to them, communications passing through particular places were.

3.2 Conveying the Emperor

Scholars have argued that the \textit{classes} supported imperial maritime communications, often \textit{ad hoc}, primarily by transporting imperial family members or agents, the latter sometimes bearing messages or imperial orders. Starr observed that ‘the Italian fleets might also transport officials, and in times of peace they often had the honour of carrying the Emperor’.\textsuperscript{992} Thus, as war fleets, the \textit{classes} only performed this task when lacking more important duties. Later, he proposed that the ‘real utility’ of the \textit{classes} was their employment as maritime couriers.\textsuperscript{993} Wickert conjectured that particular ships were assigned to certain members of the imperial house.\textsuperscript{994} Kienast

\textsuperscript{991} Kolb (2000) 279. Epitaphs (\textit{CIL} VIII 12622, 12904, 12905) found in Carthage, probably third century, have been linked to service for imperial \textit{procuratores}, though none are explicit.\textsuperscript{992} Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 177-8; note also Courtois (1939) 26; \textit{cf.} Starr (1989) 74-5.\textsuperscript{993} Starr (1989) 75.\textsuperscript{994} Wickert (1949-50) 108 and above pp. 47-8.
argued that the *classis Misenensis* helped the Emperor travel between estates on the Tyrhennian coast of Italy.\(^995\)

Diverging somewhat from the standard position, Reddé proposed that warships may have been used to transport important messages, but that couriers normally travelled on commercial vessels.\(^996\) He also argued that there was no maritime equivalent to the *cursus publicus*, partly because of limited evidence and because regulation of the *cursus* in the *Codex Theodosianus* only appears to have applied to land journeys.\(^997\)

Kolb has disagreed, presenting a few debatable examples of maritime transport which could be linked to the *cursus*.\(^998\) She rejects the argument of Reddé that the lack of evidence for regulation of a maritime *cursus* means that it did not exist, but does accept that it was probably less used than the land *cursus*.\(^999\) As we shall see from the example of Brundisium, probably the best instance considered by Kolb, while there are examples of official travel by warship which could be interpreted as part of the *cursus*, that interpretation is unnecessary. I am thus partly inclined to side with Reddé, though disagree with him on the regularity with which the *classes* carried imperial family members at least, and will add nuance to previous arguments on the transport of imperial agents or messages.

(Primarily) literary evidence informs the position that that the *classes* transported members of the imperial house or imperial officials. For example, Tiberius once travelled in a trireme from Capri to the *horti* near the *naumachia* of Rome (*bis omnino toto secessus tempore Romam redire conatus, semel triremi usque*...
Pliny recorded that the Emperor Gaius travelled between Astura and Antium with a *classis*, the *Princeps* himself journeying on a quinquereme, surely of the *classis Misenensis*. Additionally, when at the start of his reign Gaius collected the ashes of his mother and brother, he made the journey on a bireme (*nec minore scaena Ostiam praefixo in biremis puppe vexillo*). We cannot prove that this was a *classis* bireme, but it would not be unlikely. One might note that Suetonius drew attention to the theatricality of the affair, recalling our earlier discussion about how the *classes* could support imperial display.

According to Tacitus, Agrippina was accustomed to travelling in a trireme crewed by *classiarii* (*sueverat triremi et classiariorum remigio vehi*). It should be pointed out that this is the only clear example of an imperial woman using such transport, so we should be cautious in presuming that *classis* ships carried anyone other than Emperors and perhaps senior male members of the *domus Augusta*.

The context of imperial travel may elucidate the construction of a canal from the Tiber to the *sinus Baianus* by Nero, as Suetonius tells us that it was to be large enough to allow quinqueremes to use it (*qua contrariae quinqueremes commearent*). Tacitus recorded that in AD 64, the freedwoman Epicharis tried to

---

1000 Suet. *Tib.* 72.1 cf. 72.2-3. Note also Suet. *Aug.*, 97.3-98.1 for a maritime journey by Augustus from Astura along the Campanian coastline to his villa on Capri.
1001 Plin. *NH* 32.4: see also below p. 270.
1004 The comment allows Tacitus to explain the *navis ornatrix*, which Nero had drawn up at Bauli, purportedly to honour Agrippina (*honori matris daretur*). That Tacitus mentions the habit of Agrippina may indicate that it was unusual for imperial women to travel with *classis* servicemen. However, the observation could contribute to the presentation of Agrippina by Tacitus as possessing transgressive qualities or engaging in traditionally “male” activities, especially political or military. For other examples see e.g. Tac. *Ann.* 12.27, 37 with Ginsburg (2006) 23, 28, 112-16, 127-32. The use of triremes by imperial women could therefore have been more common than Tacitus may imply.
subvert the *classis Misenensis* because *Nero multo apud Puteolos et Misenum maris usu* laetabatur.\textsuperscript{1006} Although this could imply that Epicharis saw the *classis* as useful simply because it was based in an area familiar to Nero, I am tempted to understand this as indicating a connection between the enjoyment of the sea and the *classis*.

A *diploma* was granted in AD 114 to *ii qui navigaverunt*), who are argued to have carried Trajan on his Parthian expedition.\textsuperscript{1007} In a piece for Marcus Aurelius from AD 162, Fronto imagines the Emperor putting to sea from his estate at Alsium in *alia navis* and taking delight at the sight and sound of the rowers (*remigum visu audituque te oblectares*).\textsuperscript{1008} Starr and Kienast have suggested that this could imply travel on a *classis* vessel, and I am tempted to accept this hypothesis because of our other examples.\textsuperscript{1009} Moreover, an epitaph of the late first or second century AD is known from Alsium: *D(is) M(anibus) / Ti(beri) Claudi Maximi / triarchi classis / [---]*.\textsuperscript{1010} While potentially a coincidence, the epitaph could be further evidence for a *classis* presence at Alsium. Fronto could imply that Emperors, or at least Marcus Aurelius, would habitually take to the sea from their coastal estates in *classis* ships.

Our examples suggest that Emperors and possibly family members undertook journeys on *classis* vessels. The selection is not vast, and we must admit uncertainty over its representativeness. Yet the passages do not imply that *classis* vessels were only used exceptionally: indeed, the plan of Nero to construct a canal for quinqueremes and the assumption by Fronto that Marcus Aurelius could put to sea in an oared vessel hint that they were frequently used thus.

\textsuperscript{1006} Tac. *Ann.* 15.51.
\textsuperscript{1007} *CIL* XVI 60 (= *AE* 1927 3); see above p. 98 n.413.
\textsuperscript{1008} Fronto *De Fer. Als.* 3.1 (Haines II p. 4 = Naber p. 224).
\textsuperscript{1009} Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 178; Kienast (1966) 49.
\textsuperscript{1010} *CIL* XI 3719.
Moreover, the literary sources describe imperial travel on the Tyrrhenian coast of Italy: one could extrapolate to the north Adriatic and *classis Ravennas*, especially given similarities between Campania and that region, but only with caution. We should recall the second century AD epitaph from Tergeste mentioning as many as three *classis* servicemen who served on a quadrireme. Larger ships could be use to transport Emperors, so it is plausible, but cannot be proven, that they were performing such a duty.

3.3 *Commeantes* at Brundisium

From the examples covered, one could suppose that the use of the *classes* for transportation was restricted to certain imperial family members. Indeed, we lack good direct references to governors or other officials travelling by warship, despite assertions by Starr. However, by considering an incident at Brundisium, we may be able to suggest that at particular places the *classes* habitually transported imperial agents.

Brundisium was an important harbour from the Republican period, used both by commercial and military vessels, and a major arrival point for travellers coming to and from Italy, especially those heading across the Adriatic to travel the *via Egnatia*. Strabo strikingly states: ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας διαίρουσιν εὐθύπλοιοι μᾶλλον ἐστιν ἐπὶ τὸ Βρεντέσιον, καὶ δὴ καὶ δεῦρο πάντες καταίρουσιν οἷς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην πρόκειται όδός. Of interest in this context, epigraphy confirms the

---

1011 Note perhaps Tacitus (*Ann*. 2.78) on Domitius Celer, sent by Gn. Piso in a trireme to stir up trouble in Syria in AD 19; *cf.* Starr (1960) 178, 201 n.34, for other examples, though none explicitly mention warships or the imperial *classes*.

1012 Str. 6.3.7; *cf.* e.g. Livy 23.48.3; 24.10.4; Plin. *NH* 3.101. See also Reddé (1986) 221.
presence of members of the Italian *classes* at Brundisium, especially in the first century AD.\textsuperscript{1013}

Tacitus may give us some idea of their purpose. In AD 24, servicemen suppressed a nascent revolt near Brundisium:  
\textsuperscript{1014}

\begin{quote}

eaedem aestate mota per Italian servilis belli semina fors oppressit. auctor tumultus T. Curtisius, quondam praetoriae cohortis miles, primo coetibus clandestinis apud Brundisium et circumiecta oppida, mox positis propalam libellis ad libertatem vocabat agrestia per longinquos saltus et ferocia servitia, cum velut munere deum tres biremes adpulere ad usus commeantium illo mari. et erat isdem regionibus Cutius Lupus quaestor, cui provincia vetere ex more calles evenerant: is disposita classiariorum copia coeptantem cum maxime coniurationem disiecit.
\end{quote}

Translators and commentators have usually supposed that the *tres biremes* protected merchant shipping in the Adriatic.\textsuperscript{1015} Without much discussion, Starr supposed that they transported imperial dignitaries.\textsuperscript{1016} In a detailed treatment, Eck argued that these biremes were permanently stationed at Brundisium for use by imperial officials and messengers (*ad usus commeantium illo mari*), to enable speedy travel between Italy and Dyrrachium or Apollonia.\textsuperscript{1017} He suggested that *classis* vessels were so employed at other major crossings.\textsuperscript{1018} Without evidence, we cannot simply assume the wide replication of this practice, and it may have evolved only at particular places because of particular deployments.

\textsuperscript{1013} Append. 8, 13, 16, 17, 28, 36; AE 1978 242 (= 1980 277); [*---Classius Longin[us] / [vet]eranus / [ex cl]asse pra[et/oria] Ra/[ven][iat]e v(ixit) a(nnis) L(hic) s(itus).* Only the last should be regarded as late first or second century. For earlier suggestions of a *classis* presence at Brundisium, at least in the early first century AD, see Mommsen in *CIL* IX (1883), p. 8 (not beyond the early Augustan age); Fiebig (1894) 336; Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 23; Reddé (1986) 221.

\textsuperscript{1014} Tac. Ann. 4.27; see above p. 96.

\textsuperscript{1015} E.g. de la Berge (1886) 206-7; Furneaux (1896\textsuperscript{2}) 522; Grant (1968) 166. Eck (1997-98b) 340-1 has further examples.

\textsuperscript{1016} Starr (1960\textsuperscript{2}) 23; cf. Reddé (1986) 221, who avoids the question.

\textsuperscript{1017} Eck (1997-98b).

\textsuperscript{1018} Eck (1997-98) 344-5; followed by Kolb (2000) 200.
Eck noted that Tacitus typically used *commeo* to describe soldiers or officials on state business, often carrying messages.\(^\text{1019}\) This may confirm that, despite an absence of explicit evidence, the *classes* were not wholly restricted to the Emperor and his family, but could also conduct people working in their interests. Indeed, the particular emphasis on soldiers in the Tacitean examples tallies with the use of soldiers as couriers, reinforcing the argument that these vessels transported such men.\(^\text{1020}\)

Eck does not prove that these biremes were *habitually* at Brundisium to carry imperial agents. Tacitus does say that they had landed *velut munere deum*, perhaps suggesting that the ships were only irregularly used thus. Yet the phrase *ad usus commeantium* implies regular travel, and the description of the presence of the biremes as fortunate could refer to their timely docking at Brundisium, when they could otherwise have been carrying passengers. This phrase seems to refute the arguments of Crogiez, who suggests that a regular shuttle service existed for any dignitaries, and that the biremes were simply on patrol.\(^\text{1021}\)

The description by Appian of the visit of Octavian to Brundisium in 44 BC may suggest that the above arrangement was “business as usual”, and could even reflect continuity between Republic and Empire. Appian mentioned soldiers at Brundisium, involved in the movement of items to and from Italy.\(^\text{1022}\)

\(^{1019}\) Eck (1997-98b) 341. Most of the nine examples found in Gerber and Greef (1903) 191 fit this description: e.g. Tac. *Ann*. 4.41 on Sejanus hoping to control access to Tiberius: *sua in manu aditus litterarumque magna ex parte se arbitrum fore, cum per milites commearent*; Tac. *Ann*. 13.38 on exchanges between Corbulo and Tiridates: *placitum dehinc, quia commeantibus in vicem nuntiis nihil insummam pacis proficiebatur*.

\(^{1020}\) Only Tac. *Ann*. 1.46; 2.28 and *Hist*. 5.4 certainly do not feature *milites*.


\(^{1022}\) App. *B Civ*. 3.11.
καὶ ἕτεροι στρατιῶται σὺν αὐτοῖς, οἱ μὲν ἀποσκευὰς ἢ χρήματα φέροντες ἐς τὴν Μακεδονίαν, οἱ δὲ ἕτερα χρήματα καὶ φόρους ἐς ἐθνῶν ἀλλῶν ἐς τὸ Βρεντέσιον.

This is not an ideal parallel: the imperial classes are not involved, and the situation in contemporary Italy could hardly be described as stable. However, this activity is suggestive of vital men and materials being conveyed through Brundisium, and the role of milites in overseeing them. A classis detachment could have emerged as a useful successor to a previous arrangement. 1023

These classis ships were not demonstrably part of the cursus publicus or its antecedents, despite assertions to the contrary by Eck and Kolb. 1024 Yet it does appear that they were in place, at the latest by Tiberius, with the same general purpose: to facilitate the movement of officials and news presumably of interest to the imperial house. If correct, it is worth emphasising how early the Italian classes were involved in maintenance of communications. We cannot securely say that the arrangement persisted throughout our period, but traffic to and from Brundisium did not disappear, and it is likely that imperial agents continued to require assistance.

If these arguments are valid, there was a system at Brundisium, of which the Italian classes were a part, habitually facilitating communications between Italy and Greece. Although only one piece of literary evidence, requiring some interpretation, mentions this system, there is no need to regard the circumstances described by Tacitus as exceptional. Indeed, the rather incidental mentioning of the arrangement encourages us to regard it as constant. Thus we can partly disagree with Reddé, who does not consider this example, in his assertion that the classes did not normally have

1023 Note also Kolb (2000) 199 n.3 for a similar point, and other examples.
a role in transporting officials or carrying communications, albeit in one particular location with a history of being so used.

3.4 Monitoring ports and classes milites as couriers

I have suggested that the arrangement at Brundisium lay outside the cursus publicus. Indeed, the limited availability of the cursus seems to have necessitated reliance on other communications systems, including informal arrangements and even rumours. A large number of examples could be cited, but a small selection will suffice. Firstly, Tacitus described how, when Germanicus fell ill in AD 19, reports in Rome exaggerated his condition because of distances involved (at Romae, postquam Germanici valetudo percrebuit cunctaque ut ex longinquo aucta in deterius adferebantur). News of his death then caused a suspension of business ante edictum magistratuum, ante senatus consultum. This implies that the senate and magistrates would have responded to the same sources of information as the people, though perhaps having more thoroughly assessed its reliability.

Merchants from Syria then arrived claiming that Germanicus was alive (forte negotiatores vivente adhuc Germanico Syria egressi laetiora de valetudine eius attulere). This caused popular rejoicing, though Tacitus implies that Tiberius knew the truth of the matter by saying that he did not prevent falsehoods spreading (nec obstitit falsis Tiberius). While possibly indicating that the Emperor possessed better sources of information, perhaps through formal communications networks, this could be a baseless assertion by Tacitus which fits well with his portrayal of a

---

1026 Tac. Ann. 2.82.
scheming Tiberius. In which case, the role of informal communications in relaying news from distant parts of the empire emerges.

Now a couple of less detailed examples. At the end of AD 54, there were rumours at Rome about the Parthians attacking Armenia (turbidis rumoribus prorupisse rursum Parthos et rapi Armeniam adlatum est), to which Nero responded with military measures. According to this hypothesis, classis servicemen, especially at Misenum and Ravenna, though also at Ostia-Portus, were not necessarily given specific instructions to convey particular messages at particular times. Nor indeed were their bases necessarily strategically

Where these rumours came from, and whether the Emperor had received more detailed information, is unknown. The latter seems likely, but this at least provides an example of how informal rumours could influence activity in Rome. As a final obscure example, in recounting his speech directed against Publicius Certus, who had been involved in the trial of Helvidius Priscus, Pliny mentioned that a friend had referred to a man in the east with a large army, concerning whom there were grave but unconfirmed rumours (non sine magnis dubiisque rumoribus obtinebat).

Such examples should be set alongside rumours heard at Puteoli, as mentioned in Chapter Three. Much was uncertain, and even official communications might be unreliable. The news brought to Rome by travellers was clearly considered at least one basis for making decisions.

I shall now investigate whether the monitoring of certain communications hubs by the classes, and the conveyance of important news gained, could be considered among these informal or semi-formal measures. According to this hypothesis, classis servicemen, especially at Misenum and Ravenna, though also at Ostia-Portus, were not necessarily given specific instructions to convey particular messages at particular times. Nor indeed were their bases necessarily strategically

---

1027 Ibid. 13.6.
sited to access communications hubs. Instead, their presence at or near those hubs meant that they were the most convenient group at the disposal of the Emperor to monitor and report interesting news.

This arrangement is not irreconcilable with the views of Miller, who argued against developed structures of communications in the empire, because it does not explicitly concern ‘high-level’ elements of formal communication. Thus, rather than the movement of messengers carrying letters or petitions sent by or to Emperors, this section considers the idea that merchants and other travellers visiting communications hubs would bring information with them, and classis servicemen could react to that information. Moreover, the argument will suggest that, while Reddé may have been correct to assert that classis ships were rarely used to deliver messages, classis servicemen may have been more habitually involved in maintaining overland communications.

The classis bases at Misenum and Ravenna were well-placed to oversee communications passing through Puteoli and Aquileia respectively. Other classis detachments, for instance at Ostia-Portus, could potentially monitor traffic. While much of the information may only have been of tangential significance, some was probably of direct concern to the Emperor, like news about grain harvests in Egypt, or disturbances on the frontiers. We have seen that news could travel with the grain ships from Alexandria, making traffic through the ports visited by those ships potentially a particularly rich harvest of information.

---

1029 See above pp. 232, 235.
1030 Puteoli: above pp. 166-9; Aquileia: above pp. 190-3.
1031 Ostia-Portus: below pp. 272-7.
1032 See above p. 169.
Some evidence may suggest the monitoring of the major ports of western Italy by \textit{classis} servicemen, and their conveyance of information to Rome. Suetonius recorded an incident demonstrating the proverbial frugality of Vespasian.\textsuperscript{1033}

classiarios vero, qui ab Ostia et Puteolis Romam pedibus per vices commeant, petentes constitui aliquid sibi calciarii nomine, quasi parum esset sine responso abegisse, iussit posthac excalciatos cursitare; et ex eo ita cursitant.

Sixteen inscriptions, mostly funerary, corroborate this evidence for \textit{classis} servicemen at Ostia-Portus. Most are relatively simple monuments and texts, set up by or for individual \textit{milites}. None obviously date to before the Flavian period, and all probably come from the second or early third century AD.\textsuperscript{1034}

However, the above passage of Suetonius implies their presence in the first century AD, and one is tempted to suggest that they were installed in significant numbers by Claudius when he constructed Portus. In any case, I suggest that this presence was permanent, as most scholars have assumed.\textsuperscript{1035} A range of ranks appear, indicating that we are probably not dealing with a few \textit{milites} on special missions. Moreover, some of these men saw long service. One epitaph commemorates a \textit{gubernator}, apparently in service for forty five years.\textsuperscript{1036} A dedication from AD 186 reveals the presence of a \textit{trierarchus}.\textsuperscript{1037} That we know of two discharged servicemen, who could have served in the area for some time, may further support the

\textsuperscript{1033} Suet. \textit{Vesp.} 8.3.
\textsuperscript{1034} \textit{CIL} XIV 110 (=Thylander (1952) B.319 = \textit{CCID} 440), 233 (= Thylander (1952) B.18), 234 (= Thylander (1952) B.37), 235 (= \textit{AE} 1992 219 = Thylander (1952) B.55), 236 (= \textit{CIL} VI 32768 = Thylander (1952) B.73), 237, 238, 239 (= Thylander (1952) B.105), 240, 241, 242 (= Thylander (1952) B.70), 243, 4496 (= \textit{AE} 1929 140 = Thylander (1952) A.178), 4497 (= Thylander (1952) A.128); \textit{AE} 1953 262; \textit{AE} 1983 124.
\textsuperscript{1035} See bibliography in e.g. p. 277 n.1161.
\textsuperscript{1036} \textit{CIL} XIV 238: \textit{D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucius) Licinius Capito / nationae Pan(n)onius / vix(it) an(nos) LXIII mil(itivit) an(nos) XLV / ex classae(sic) prae(toriae) Misenie(n)si(sic) / gu(bernator).
\textsuperscript{1037} \textit{CIL} XIV 110.1.5: [...] \textit{in iusit tr(ierarchi)...See below pp. 276-7.}
idea of a permanent base. Both epitaphs mention family members, indicating that the men had settled down locally. Perhaps these servicemen originated from Ostia or its surrounds, though evidence for classis recruitment would indicate that they were probably not from Italy. Naturally, the majority were standard milites, including L. Carisius Valens, C. Lusius Rufus and M. Marius Nepos.1039

We shall return to Ostia-Portus.1040 While probably largely monitored from Misenum, a few epitaphs confirm the presence of classis servicemen in Puteoli itself. These include a first century AD inscription perhaps suggesting early supervision of the port.1041 A mid-second to third century epitaph records P(ublius) Aelius Lucius miles / cl(assis) pr(a)et(oriae) Misenensium / natione Surus.1042 He had performed twenty eight years of service, and so could have received discharge. Two other epitaphs explicitly attest veterans, Ti(berius) Claudius T[iberi] fl(iliae)] / Arrianus veter(anus) and C(aius) Iulius Antoniu/nus, who could simply have moved to Puteoli in retirement, but may have also been stationed there.1043 At least some of these men could have been employed as the runners found in Suetonius, whom Starr has asserted acted as couriers, carrying letters delivered at these ports to Rome.1044 Although I am not so convinced that they would have been concerned solely with

---

1038 CIL XIV 235: C(aius) Domitius Pollio / pater veter(anus) Augusti ex / classe praetoria Misenat(ium) / fecit sibi et / Domitiae C(ai) f(iliae) Piae et / Domitiae Spei lib(ertae) et coniugi / libertis libertabus posteris / eorum / huius monumenti intro euntibus / pars sinister ad familiam / s(upra) s(criptam) pertin(et) / in fr(onte) ped(um) XVI in agro ped(um) XXXVIII: CIL XIV 4497: [D(is)] M(anibus) / [---.] Her[---] / [---.veter(anus)] Aug(usti) ex cl(asae) praet(oriae) Rave[nati] / [---.] Her[meti(?)] et [---] / [---.] imia[---]. Although Rather than a veteranus, the latter could commemorate an [evoca]tus (thus Wickert in CIL XIV (1930), p.646); cf. CIL X 3417: veter(anus) evoka(tus) ex classe.

1039 CIL XIV 234, 239, 4496.

1040 See below pp. 272-7.

1041 Append. 31.


1044 Starr (1960) 18 and (1989) 75; briefly noted already by Hirschfeld (1905) 228 n.3; cf. Kienast (1966) 71 who described them as ‘Ordonnanzen’.
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official letters, this generally seems an attractive interpretation simply because it is hard to fathom an alternative.\textsuperscript{1045}

A couple of points can be drawn from the passage, which Starr paid only cursory attention to. Given our earlier discussion of \textit{commeo}, the use of the verb in this context could be suggestive of Roman \textit{milites} carrying messages.\textsuperscript{1046} However, Suetonius did not use the verb quite like Tacitus. He employed \textit{commeo} of Nero coming to see games in Rome early in his reign \textit{(ad omnis etiam minimos circenses e secessu commeabat)} and for the yearly movement of labourers from Umbria to Samnium to work the land \textit{(quae ex Umbria in Sabinos ad culturam agrorum quotannis commeare soleant)}.\textsuperscript{1047} Other examples repeat the idea of frequent travel, and none involve \textit{milites} or exclusively imperial functionaries.\textsuperscript{1048}

Although this anecdote refers to the Flavian period, the use of the present tenses \textit{commeant} and \textit{cursitant} imply that this situation persisted during the lifetime of Suetonius, and indeed that the \textit{classis milites} did habitually carry out this task, and were not simply visiting Vespasian for a special occasion. If correct, the \textit{classis} couriers would have been a persistent presence for at least fifty years, and there is no reason to suppose that they were abolished later.

While it is wholly possible that Starr was correct, and that these men did specifically carry imperial letters, I am tempted to interpret their constant movement as a reaction to the tremendous amounts of information passing through Puteoli and Ostia-Portus. The major limitation to this argument is that nothing directly attests the servicemen monitoring the ports. But, as noted above, it is hard to propose a more convincing explanation for their description by Suetonius.

\textsuperscript{1045} Reddé (1986) 200 n.157, 447 believes there is too little evidence to be certain.
\textsuperscript{1046} See above pp. 243.
\textsuperscript{1047} Suet. Ner. 22.1; Vesp. 1.4.
\textsuperscript{1048} Suet. Iul. 27.1; Calig. 19.2; Claud. 17.3; Ner. 31.3.
There is no evidence for servicemen travelling as couriers from Ravenna, or any other north Adriatic port, to Rome. If news about the *annona* was the primary concern of *classis* couriers on the Tyrrhenian coast, the absence of major grain shipments to eastern Italy could have rendered such couriers unnecessary.

Yet Ravenna occupied an advantageous position near to several major communications hubs, especially Aquileia. We examined some evidence for traffic through that city, including from the Danubian provinces. News carried through there could have been relevant to the security of Italy: we might think of Virgil, presenting the *coniuratio descendens Dacus ab Histro* as a general threat to Italian countrymen.

We should also take into account the connection of Ravenna through a *via Popilia* to the head of the *via Flaminia* at Ariminum. The *via Flaminia* was the major public road linking the north Adriatic and the Po valley to Rome, probably constructed by C. Flaminius in his consulship in 223 BC or censorship in 220 BC. References to its heavy use imply its significance. According to Tacitus, when the Emperor Vitellius summoned Dolabella to be executed, he told him to avoid the crowded *via Flaminia* (*vitata Flaminiae viae celebritate*). Martial alluded to the frequent traffic on the road by listing the wheel ruts carved into its surface (*quae Flaminiam secant salebrae*) among things often used.

---

1049 See above pp. 192-3.
1050 Virg. G. 2.497; Mynors (1990) 170 notes other references to Dacian threats in Hor. Sat. 2.6.53; Carm. 3.6.13-14.
1051 See above p. 176 n. 730.
1053 Tac. Hist. 2.64.
1054 Mart. 9.57.5.
We can assume that all kinds of travellers, including merchants, perhaps some who had come through Aquileia, ventured along it. Tacitus provides one example when describing the return of Gn. Piso to Rome after the death of Germanicus. Having reached Ancona, Piso travelled through Picenum along the *via Flaminia*, on which he encountered a legion heading from Pannonia to Rome (*per Picenum ac mox Flaminiam viam adsequitur legionem, quae e Pannonia in urbem, dein praesidio Africae ducebatur*). While Piso himself did not take the route from Aquileia to Altinum and then down to the *via Flaminia*, one could reasonably conjecture that the legion did.

This quotation indicates its military importance, which may relate to why Augustus repaired the road in 27 BC, crowing this achievement with an arch at Ariminum. Cassius Dio explicitly stated that Augustus intended to lead an army along it (*τῆς δὲ δὲ δὴ Φλαμινίας αὐτὸς, ἐπειδήπερ ἐκστρατεύεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ ἔμελλεν, ἐπεμελήθη*), and this is surely linked with his oversight of campaigns against the Pannonians and Dalmatians from Ariminum (*ἵν’ ἔγγυθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς Δελμάταις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς Παννονίοις πᾶν δὲ τι χρή συμβουλεύειν ἔχῃ, πρὸς Αρίμινον ἐξώρυμησε*). This suggests that the *via Flaminia* was considered a launching pad for operations towards the north and the Danube. Although Ravenna itself was not on the road, it has been considered by its location capable of supporting (in a wide sense) campaigns towards the same regions, particularly in the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods, and thus can be regarded as part of a communications corridor of which this *via Flaminia* was an integral part.

---

1055 Tac. Ann. 3.9.  
1057 Cass. Dio 53.22.1; 55.34.3.  
1058 See above p. 178.
Travellers coming from Aquileia and Altinum to join the *via Flaminia* would almost certainly have passed near Ravenna. As we saw in Chapter Three, if coming from Altinum they could have followed the system of inland waterways to Ravenna.\(^{1059}\) I hypothesised, if inconclusively, that the *classis Ravennas* monitored communications along this route in particular, and perhaps could have gathered information from travellers while doing so.\(^{1060}\)

Thus, while we possess no direct evidence for *classis Ravennas* members carrying news to Rome, the sheer volume of traffic passing through a region in which, as we have seen, Ravenna held a strategic position, would render a complete absence of such activity rather surprising. As the major imperial manpower source in that region, such duties would surely have been most likely to fall to the *classis Ravennas*.

### 3.5 Conclusion

It is commonly argued that the receipt of messages by the Emperor was critical to imperial “governmental” activities.\(^{1061}\) Systems supporting this could therefore be considered fundamental. Yet the arrangement which I have hypothesised around Puteoli and Ostia, and far more tentatively in the north Adriatic, worked on a different level from the communications usually considered, relying more on interdependencies and movements established by commercial or military traffic than direct action undertaken by the Roman state. The Italian *classes* were conveniently based in places from which they could monitor traffic: they may have been there less by design than modern thought might consider, perhaps influenced by the location of

---

\(^{1059}\) See above pp. 175-6.

\(^{1060}\) Ibid.

\(^{1061}\) See above pp. 213-14.
imperial property. The backwards and forwards travel undertaken by classis servicemen in western Italy, barely visible except for our single passage of Suetonius, may have been vital in bringing to Rome critical news discovered from travellers passing through these regions. I suggest that in these communications systems imperial organics may again emerge.

There are clear limitations. This picture would ideally be supported by more explicit testimony, though is surely a reasonable interpretation of the limited evidence and makes a sensible attempt to understand how classis manpower could have reacted to being deployed near to busy communications hubs. The humdrum character of the systems proposed may be the reason for their relative obscurity, as our sources simply were not interested in them.

Moreover, these communications would not have been supported by the Italian classes alone: other couriers probably relayed messages between Campania or the Adriatic and Rome, while infrastructural projects, on which more will follow, facilitated the transfer of news and people. The classes were only one part of an imperial communications network, some of which, arguably a very limited part, operated through the specific commands of the Emperor or other Roman officials.

The movement of the Emperor must be a third limit: although Suetonius portrayed the classis servicemen as repeatedly travelling to Rome, we have no evidence for what would happen if the Emperor was out of the city, and whether they continued to perform their function and deliver news to magistrates or other officials.

Whether the other major communications function which I have identified for the Italian classes, transporting the Emperor, perhaps his family members and agents, should also be considered among the organics of empire, is less certain. I have argued that the literary evidence for this practice allows us to interpret it as common and
habitual, though not conclusively so. That *classis* servicemen were potentially on hand at imperial estates at places like Baiae, Centumcellae or Alsium to facilitate travel would fit better under the category of organics, though again the evidence is not especially good. Finally, at Brundisium *classis* ships seem to have been available for ferrying imperial agents between Italy and Greece at least in the early first century AD, though there is no reason to believe that this arrangement was cancelled during our period. Imperial organics may been seen in the constant, almost hidden motion at work, dependent on the placement of a putative *classis* detachment at Brundisium, perhaps the successor to Republican arrangements, and heavy traffic passing through the port.

4. The *classes*, the *annona* and the imperial coastal landscape

Our final case-study for the potential functions of the *classis* manpower pool in Italy will consider the relationship between the Italian *classes* and the *annona*. Although this topic concerns primarily the *classis Misenensis*, epitaphs demonstrate the presence of *classis Ravennas* servicemen at Ostia-Portus, Centumcellae and Rome, hinting that both *classes* could have had some involvement in the grain supply. The maintenance of the *annona* is presented by our sources as of upmost import to the control exercised by Emperors at Rome, and their relationship to the *plebs urbana*. We might therefore expect the manpower pool of the Italian *classes* to have been employed in its support, and possibly to perceive the organics of empire in systems supporting the *annona*.

1062 Ravenna servicemen at Ostia: *CIL* XIV 4496-7; possibly *CIL* XIV 233 with comments by Thylander (1952) B.18 and Starr (1960) 85 and 102 n.68. Centumcellae: *CIL* XI 3528-30; 3531 (= *ILS* 2859), 3531a, 3536.
I shall begin by considering past scholarship on the relationship between the classes and the annona. While I agree with the common position that the classes did not convoy grain ships from Egypt and Africa, I shall suggest that it is very difficult to identify any particular tasks they carried out because of lack of explicit source testimony.

In light of this, I shall argue not so much for ascribing particular duties to the classes, but for conceptualising them as part of a system facilitating the supply of Rome, where that system had a strong connection to the Emperor and emphasised his authority and role as granter of beneficia, alongside, potentially, the splendour of Rome itself. Therefore, this section differs from the previous two in that it concerns not so much practical tasks performed by the classes, but their potential ideological impact through their presence in littoral Italy, and how Emperors benefited from this.

I shall begin by treating the perceived care of the Emperor for the annona, regarded among his duties as benefactor of the plebs urbana. By drawing on the Panegyricus of Pliny and the Life of Caesar by Plutarch, I shall suggest that by the early second century an infrastructure involving roads, canals and ports was recognised to have emerged along the Tyrrhenian coast, considered the responsibility of the Emperor and which facilitated the supply of Rome.

Subsequently I shall treat the combined literary, epigraphic and archaeological evidence for relevant infrastructure projects undertaken under imperial auspices in the first and second centuries AD, and the connection of the imperial classes to these. Regarding ports in particular, I shall cover Astura, Rhegium, Ostia-Portus, Antium, Centumcellae and a series of villa harbours around the Argentario peninsula. This treatment will partly respond to recent work, especially by Schörle, on the hierarchical ‘port system’ of Rome, which has underlined the significance of ports at
(imperial) *villae maritimae*, but proposed that they were developed for rational, economic reasons. Instead, I shall argue for a mixture of private motives, alongside the expectation on the Emperor as a high status Roman to provide benefactions in the form of refuges for ships, and to secure the grain supply of Rome.

Aside from providing an alternative framework for thinking about the *classes* and the *annona*, this discussion will have consequences for our view of the role of imperial estates, the evolution of the Tyrrhenian coast of Italy, and the role of Roman “government” in this.

4.1 The *classes* and the *annona*

Scholars have suspected some link between the *classes* and the *annona*, not implausible given evidence for servicemen at Portus, Puteoli and Centumcellae. Most have considered that the *classes* were strategically placed for the surveillance of the grain supply but did not escort grain ships. Fiebiger linked the stationing of detachments at Ostia with the *annona*.1063 Starr concurred, also suggesting that the *classis Alexandrina* secured its end of the grain route.1064 He explicitly stated that the *classes* did not convoy grain ships.1065 In contrast, Kienast assumed that the *classis Alexandrina* may have escorted those vessels.1066 Rickman stated that the Italian *classes* made conditions safe for grain shipments.1067

---

1063 Fiebiger (1894) 322; similarly Chapot (1896) 70; Meiggs (1973) 304.  
1064 Starr (1960) 17, 111-12, 177; cf. Fiebiger in *RE* III (1899), s.v. *classis*, 2641 on the *classis Alexandrina* and the *annona*.  
1065 Starr (1960) 176.  
1066 Kienast (1966) 86.  
Reddé argued that the classes had no interest in the supervision of civilian shipping, the Roman state providing only general navigational security. Although noting the classis servicemen at Ostia-Portus, Reddé insisted that they had nothing to do with the annona, but that the harbour was simply a convenient way-station.

The argument of Reddé rests on his claim that the Roman system of navigational control was based on the land, and not on the sea; because, in his opinion, the classes were a maritime institution, they were not employed in such activities. In support he cited the Athenian Hadrianic oil law from around AD 124. Any exporter caught avoiding the declaration of merchandise and paying their taxes risked confiscation. If they escaped Athens, a suit would be filed with the home city of the shipper and the Emperor by the Athenian demos (ἐὰν δὲ ἐκπλεύσας φθάσῃ καὶ μηνυθῇ, γραφέσθω καὶ τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ/ δήμου κάμῳ). Nothing suggests the involvement of the classes in chasing down the offender, arguably expected for hypothetical police of maritime commerce. This point could then be extended to the supervision of imported grain.

But we have clearly seen there are limitations to understanding the Italian classes as purely maritime institutions. Therefore, they could have assisted the land-based navigational control identified by Reddé and found in the Hadrianic inscription. Little suggests that classis servicemen would have been at every port checking that merchants carried out their obligations. However, it is conceivable that where appropriate they were concerned with specific resources, especially grain for Rome, because of its value to the Emperor.

---

1069 Ibid.
1070 IG II² 1100 (= SEG XV 108); cf. Pleket (1964) for further bibliography.
1071 IG II² 1100 ii.43-5.
1072 Ibid. ii.45-7.
I therefore broadly support the standard position on there being some connection between the *classes* and the *annona*. However, it is virtually impossible to be more specific. I have suggested that servicemen based near Puteoli and Portus brought news to Rome, possibly relating to the grain supply, but we can say little else. 1073

### 4.2 The Emperor and the *annona*

Therefore I propose an alternative approach, considering the *classes* not just in relation to several major ports which served the *annona*, but within a wider context of the infrastructure which emerged to support it in the first two centuries AD. We shall see that various Emperors had some responsibility for this infrastructure, and that its components could be considered imperial *beneficia*.

First, to provide suggestive context for infrastructural projects, we should examine why the maintenance of the *annona* was of such import to the Emperor. Much has been written concerning the *annona*: on the administration, collection, transportation and distribution of grain, and changes in the system over time. 1074 Yet, its practical functioning is obscure, especially how grain was brought from the provinces to Rome, and by whom, leading to diverse interpretations, particularly over the involvement of “the state”. Scholars such as Harris and Temin believe that grain was largely bought and sold on the free market, while at the other extreme Erdkamp argues for a system tightly controlled by the state, with the majority of grain shipped

---

1073 See above pp. 246-7.
to Rome generated as taxation in kind or the produce of imperial estates. Some take a middle course, emphasising the interplay between private and state actors. I shall not enter directly into this debate for now. However, the supply of grain to Rome was unquestionably a concern of the Emperor, demonstrated by organisational and legal measures taken to secure it. These are so well-known that I shall not treat them at any length, mentioning only a couple of examples. For instance, some time between AD 8-14 Augustus appointed C. Turranius Gracilis to better manage city provisioning as the first praefectus annonae. Legal and financial measures incentivising transport of grain to Rome included Claudius offering exemption from the Lex Papia Poppaea to citizens, Roman citizenship to Latins and the privileges afforded to mothers of four children to women if they built ships of a particular size for grain conveyance.

Such developments are unsurprising, when authorities indicate that keeping Rome well-supplied with grain was critical to maintaining public safety and contentment. Seneca wrote about a potential shortage of grain when the Emperor Gaius died that would have lead to hunger and destruction (quae famem sequitur, rerum omnium ruina). Whether this shortage was real or not is immaterial. Tacitus connected an attack by a mob on Claudius with the prospect of famine:

---

1079 Suet. Claud. 18.2-19; Gai. Inst. 1.32c; Ulp. 2.6. Note also the offer to guarantee any losses incurred from storms to encourage winter shipping (Suet. Claud. 18.2). For other legal measures see: Tac. Ann. 13.51 (Nero, AD 58); Dig. 27.1.17.6 (Trajan); Dig. 50.6.6.5 (Hadrian); cf. Dig. 50.5.3, 6.6.3. See also Rickman (1980) 71-93; Erdkamp (2005) 237-57.
1082 For suspicion about the sources, see Garnsey (1988) 222-3.
1083 Tac. Ann. 12.43.
frugum quoque egestas et orta ex eo fames in prodigium accipiebatur. nec occulti tantum questus, sed iura reddentem Claudium circumvasere clamoribus turbidis.

Later, the overthrow of the praetorian prefect Cleander in AD 190 was associated with grain shortages.1084 So the annona was of practical import.

However, the annona was perhaps even more important because of its ideological significance to the portrayal of an Emperor. A “good” Emperor managed the corn supply effectively, while a “bad” one neglected it, hence criticism of Gaius Caligula.1085 We should emphasise portrayal and perception: whatever the Emperor did or did not do to secure the grain supply of Rome, it was important that he appeared to care about it.1086

The Panegyricus of Pliny contains a powerful expression of this perceived responsibility, with a section dedicated to the health of the annona under Trajan.1087 Pliny devotes part of this to praising Trajanic engineering works which improved communications and facilitated movement of people and goods, including grain.1088

Pliny then lauded Trajan for his excellent management of the annona: there was plenty in Rome, but not at the expense of the rest of the Empire (inde hic satietas nec

---

1088 Plin. Pan. 29.2.
Supplies to Rome were so good that the Emperor could send grain to Egypt when the harvest failed. Whether the reality lived up to this celebration so early in the reign of Trajan matters less than the perspective that successful management of the annona, including work facilitating grain movement, would conventionally generate praise. It would then be unsurprising if imperial resources were employed to abet this endeavour.

One must emphasise that the support of the annona cannot be straightforwardly considered the responsibility of Roman “government”. Rather, we must take into account the position of the Emperor as as benefactor of Rome, especially towards the plebs urbana, acting within Greek and Roman traditions of euergetism. Noreña, following Veyne, has recently contended that positive actions of the Roman state were regarded as the beneficia of the Emperor by his subjects, whatever the precise realities of their execution, a point indicated by our discussion of the Panegyricus. Note also a letter by Pliny the Younger which contains an edict of Nerva, stating that he became Emperor ut et nova beneficia conferrem et ante me concessa servarem, indicating the importance of the ideology of benefaction to Emperors themselves. Within this context, the provision of a secure grain supply can be understood as an imperial benefaction, motivated partly by societal expectations laid upon the Emperor as a high status Roman.

---

4.3 Coastal benefactions: security and accessibility

That imperial construction work could be perceived as facilitating travel and hence the supply of Rome is implied by the *Panegyricus*, when Pliny enthusiastically proclaims: *fide reclusit vias portus patefecit, itinera terris litoribus mare litora mari reddidit.*\(^{1094}\) Plutarch may allude to a system existing on the Tyrrhenian coast by the early second century AD, alongside the assumption that its development was attributed to Emperors. The biographer claimed that Julius Caesar wanted to improve access to Rome, especially maritime connections.\(^{1095}\) He apparently intended to divert the Tiber and build a canal to Terracina (καὶ τὸν Τίβεριν ἐφθανός ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως... ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν πρὸς Ταρρακίνη θάλατταν) to help merchantmen going to Rome (ἀσφάλειαν ἁμα καὶ ῥᾳστώνην τοῖς δι’ ἐμπορίας φοιτῶσιν εἰς Ρώμην μηχανώμενος). Furthermore, he planned moles near to Rome (τῇ δ’ ἔγγιστα τῆς Ῥώμης θαλάσσῃ κλείθρα διὰ χωμάτων ἐπαγαγών), to clear away the hidden and dangerous shoals off the Ostian shore (καὶ τὰ τυφλὰ καὶ δύσορμα τῆς Ὠστιανῆς ἀνακαθηράμενος) and to construct harbours and anchorages sufficient for great ships, surely including grain vessels (λιμένας ἐμποιῆσαι καὶ ναύλοχα πρὸς τοσάτην ἀξιόπιστα ναυτιλίαν).

Meiggs, Rickman and others have regarded these plans as the basis for Claudian Portus, perhaps supported by some Suetonian comments: *portumque Ostiensem... alterum a Divo Iulio saepius destinatum ac propter difficultatem omissum.*\(^{1096}\) Yet this scheme seems narrower than that in Plutarch. Meiggs was

---

\(^{1094}\) Plin. *Pan.* 29.2.
\(^{1095}\) Plut. *Caes.* 58.8-10.
suspicious of the latter, suggesting that we should interpret Plutarch “naturally” rather than “literally”, and that Caesar planned a single harbour, anticipating Portus.\textsuperscript{1097}

I am not so convinced. The comprehensive improvement of harbours leading to Rome seems to reflect steady developments from the Claudian-Neronian periods onwards, coming to a head in the early to mid-second century.\textsuperscript{1098} Suspicion of such “last plans” leads to questioning the purported schemes of Caesar. Rather, Plutarch may show that in the early second century, the provisioning of Rome was considered as secured by, among other measures, a series of harbours and improvements along the Italian coastline, and that these improvements were the responsibility of the top man in Rome.

The following will chart the evidence for the evolution of this infrastructure, working roughly in chronological order, and paying particular attention to the imperial character of harbours and in some cases their association with imperial property, alongside the presence of \textit{classis} servicemen. These projects will be considered, like the \textit{annona}, through the framework of the perception of imperial activity as benefactory, partly because of the support they potentially provided to the grain supply, and partly because provision of harbours was regarded as a good thing in itself.

The value of accessibility supports the second point. Well-known is the praise of Italy by Pliny, where he stated that among its other benefits were its \textit{accessus cunctarum gentium facilis} and \textit{portuosa litora}.\textsuperscript{1099} Contrastingly, Strabo had earlier stated: δεύτερον δὲ τὸ ἄλιμενον κατὰ τὸ πλείστον καὶ τὸ τούς ὄντας ὑμένας

\textsuperscript{1098} See below pp. 269ff.
\textsuperscript{1099} Plin. \textit{NH} 37.201.
Horden and Purcell have perceived varying interests behind this apparent contradiction: they suggest that Strabo was concerned with ports as places of exchange, rather than general accessibility. Schörle perceives real change over time, and the development of the coast of Italy as already mentioned. Both points have much to recommend. In any case, the sources present its harbours as advantageous to Italy: any additions or improvements to those advantages would surely have been well received.

Indeed, we can go even further and demonstrate that the imperial provision of harbours and the resulting improvements to the accessibility of Italy could be celebrated. We can adduce the inscription from the arch commemorating the harbour constructed at Ancona by Trajan. This gives the following reason for the erection of the arch: *senatus p(opulus)q(ue) R(omanus) quod accessum / Italiae hoc etiam addito ex pecunia sua / portu tutiorem navigantibus reddiderit.*

My emphasis on imperial activity, particularly concerning imperial estate harbours, departs somewhat from recent studies on port hierarchies of the central Tyrrhenian coast. These argue for a gradual development of the harbour infrastructure of that region from the second century BC to the second century AD. Portus and Puteoli emerged as primary emporia, supported by satellites, in particular Centumcellae and Antium, along with many smaller harbours, including at *villae maritimae.* These smaller harbours can be understood as ports of call for vessels sailing to the large emporia.

---

1100 Str. 6.4.1; note also Plin. *Ep.* 6.31.17.
1102 Schörle (2011) 95 with n.28.
1103 *CIL* IX 5894 II.5-7; see also on Ancona above p. 151 n.619.
Much of this agrees with my own analysis, as will be evident. Yet, while the imperial ownership of some estate harbours has been noted, the private and imperial role in the provision of harbour infrastructure, alongside its ideological impact, has been underplayed. For instance, regarding Antium and Centumcellae, Schörle has argued that, while both ports were close to imperial estates, they should not be understood as ‘imperial requests or whims’ but as ‘investments to boost the local economy and as satellite harbours of a developing maritime façade’.\(^{1105}\)

This prompts consideration of debates on the role of imperial estates in the empire. Millar has emphasised the great difficulty of measuring their wider economic role, or even the degree to which they provided for the Emperor and his dependants, because of disparate and allusive evidence.\(^ {1106}\) He does however note that estates were ‘a store of benefits which the emperor could confer on his subjects’.\(^ {1107}\)

Thompson argued that the extent of imperial estates was a sign of the prestige of the Emperor.\(^ {1108}\) However, she emphasised that their most important role was economic: the Emperor as a landholder played a ‘central role’ in the imperial economy because of the ‘apparent coincidence’ between areas of concentrated imperial property and crop production to supply Rome and the armies.\(^ {1109}\)

More recently, Lo Cascio has noted the expansion of imperial estates in our period, and proposes that their produce supplied armies and urban centres, but that these developments were not due to direct imperial intervention in economic

---


\(^{1106}\) Millar (1977) 175-89. For older studies see Hirschfeld (1902-3); Pelham (1911); Kornemann in RE Suppl. IV (1924), s.v. Domänen, 227-68; Broughton (1934); Rostovtzeff (1957): most usefully see Index 779 s.v. estates, imperial; MacMullen (1962).

\(^{1107}\) Millar (1977) 187: especially based on the evidence of the Liber Pontificalis (L. Duchesne (1955-7), Le Liber Pontificalis I, 170-87); note also e.g. grants of marble by Hadrian to Smyrna (IGRRP IV 1431 and Millar (1977) 184); cf. Thompson (1987) 558, 566.

\(^{1108}\) Thompson (1987) 566; cf. earlier as Crawford (1976) 54-6, arguing that Emperors desired to increase estate production to boost taxation revenues.

\(^{1109}\) Thompson (1987) 566.
policy. At another extreme, Maiuro has contended that we can observe a rational political and economic approach to the acquisition and possession of imperial estates in Italy: he argues that most property was found in five ecologically defined regions, each producing particular goods marketed in Rome, Italy and the provinces with which ‘il governo imperiale’ was actively concerned.

Following Millar, I believe that the evidence is far too disparate for proposing any kind of rational economic use of imperial estates. Moreover, little suggests that such economic activities were within the remit of the Roman “government”, as Maiuro seems to imply. However, one should not forget the interest of high status Romans in the productive landscapes of their properties, as Purcell has examined, and thus improvement to property which had economic effects, intended or otherwise, should not be discounted.

Thus, and against Schörle, we should be wary of suggesting that Emperors developed ports at or near their estates for “economic” purposes. Several motivations may instead be offered. Firstly, we can conjecture the personal: the simple desire to improve private property. Relatedly, such harbours provided security and reception points for Emperors when they travelled the coasts of Italy by ship, *classis* or otherwise.

Secondly, we can again consider the perception of the Emperor as benefactor to suggest that there could have been particular motivations for creating harbours not just anywhere along the Italian coast, but specifically at their coastal estates. The reported behaviour of the mid-second to early third century AD sophist Damianus of

---

Ephesus indicates that elites of the ancient Mediterranean might euergetistically develop harbours on their land.\textsuperscript{1113} Philostratus tells us that Damianus spent his money on useful things from a young age (πλούτῳ δὲ χρῆσθαι καλῶς ἐκ μειρακίου ἔρξατο), acting as an excellent benefactor for Ephesus.\textsuperscript{1114} Among the useful ways in which this wealth was displayed (πλούτου δὲ ἐπίδειξιν τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ κάκεινα εἶχεν...), Damianus constructed artificial islands and moles on coastal property, securing mooring sites for cargo ships (ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπὶ θαλάτη καὶ νῆσοι χειροποίητοι καὶ λιμένων προχώσεις βεβαιοῦσαι τοὺς ὅρμους καταρθοῦσαι τε καὶ ᾧμείσαις ὀλκάσιν). Schörle emphasises the commercial opportunities offered by these structures, but the context highlights their significance as euergetistic display pieces offering shelter, admittedly to merchant vessels.\textsuperscript{1115}

We have already encountered some suggestion that imperial harbour works near their estates could be considered in the realm of benefactions. Recall Pliny on the potential use of Centumcellae: eritque vel maxime salutaris; nam per longissimum spatium litus importuosum hoc receptaculo utetur.\textsuperscript{1116}

Thus, in the following an infrastructural system will emerge which I suggest could have emphasised imperial concern for the safety of mariners in general, and in particular for grain ships supplying the anonna, for which many of the improvements would have been of practical help.\textsuperscript{1117} Within the discussion, I shall note the presence of classis servicemen at particular ports, who I suggest could have served to reinforce the perception of this infrastructure as one formed through imperial action.

\textsuperscript{1113} For Damianus, see Bowersock (1969) 27-8, 47.
\textsuperscript{1114} Philostr., VS 2.23.
\textsuperscript{1115} Schörle (2011) 101.
\textsuperscript{1116} Plin. Ep. 6.31.17.
\textsuperscript{1117} We must acknowledge Houston (1980) 163-6, who found no evidence for imperial administration of ports other than Ostia-Portus and Puteoli in epigraphy. His assumption that ports were usually administered by local officials is quite plausible. However, this would not detract from the knowledge (reinforced by inscriptions perhaps) that Emperors had provided the infrastructure.
Our first example, and one recently considered part of the Tyrrhenian port system, is Astura, modern Torre Astura, a former island and site of a grand *villa maritima* on the southernmost point of the Punta di Astura.\(^{1118}\) Its ownership by the imperial family is implied, though not proven, by imperial visits in the first half of the first century AD. Astura was one of the stopping points Suetonius mentioned in the final journey of Augustus before his death (*atque itinere incohato Asturam perrexit*).\(^{1119}\) The same author states that Tiberius fell ill there while travelling (*rediens ergo propere Campaniam Asturae in languorem incidunt*).\(^{1120}\) Gaius Caligula is recorded by Pliny as travelling from Astura to Antium (*tenuit et nostra memoria Gai principis ab Astura Antium renavigantium*), discussed further below.\(^{1121}\)

Although one is wary of connecting the imperial property arguably implied by the literary authorities with the mentioned *villa maritima*, its harbour was exceptionally large, at over 7 ha., twice the size of the Cosa harbour and sufficient, as Lafon stated, for it to have a public role.\(^{1122}\) Piccarreta argued that it could only have been so large if its primary purpose was as a ‘porto di rifugio’, suggesting that Claudius built it to provide a haven for ships bringing grain to Rome.\(^{1123}\) The structure is early imperial, but has even been dated to Augustus or Tiberius, rendering a Claudian connection uncertain.\(^{1124}\) Nonetheless, an early imperial date would fit with our literary references. Marzano connected the harbour with the shipment of fish


\(^{1119}\) Suet. *Aug.* 97.3.

\(^{1120}\) Suet. *Tib.* 72.2.

\(^{1121}\) Plin. *NH* 32.4.

\(^{1122}\) Lafon (2001) 364-8; Schörle (2011) 103 on Cosa.

\(^{1123}\) Piccarreta (1977) 65.

or fish products produced by the enormous *piscina* at the site.\textsuperscript{1125} However, following the hypothesis that it was imperial property, she noted that the harbour also provided a ‘proper place’ for the Emperor to dock.

While the above is inconclusive, the unusual size of its harbour, capable of offering shelter to grain ships and imperial traffic, makes imperial ownership of the Astura villa a tantalising possibility. But what about a *classis* presence? There is virtually no epigraphic material from the site, and none relevant to the *classes*. However, Maiuro has drawn attention to Pliny recounting how, when the Emperor Gaius was sailing from Astura to Antium, his ship was stopped by a fish getting stuck on the rudder and thus: *e tota classe quinqueremis sola non proficeret.*\textsuperscript{1126}

This *classis* does not certainly equate with all or part of an imperial *classis*: this could be a collection of “pleasure ships”, barges, sailed vessels and so on. However, the quinquereme, a type crewed by *classis* servicemen, alongside evidence for the association between *classis* servicemen and imperial estates, encourages the identification.\textsuperscript{1127} We can cautiously suggest that some of the servicemen who transported Gaius from Astura were actually based there. We would therefore be dealing with a significant harbour along the routes used by grain ships, with some kind of *classis* presence.

However, this interpretation is very tentative. In addition to caveats already noted, it is critical that nothing explicitly shows that grain ships used the harbour, even if it was constructed under imperial auspices. Its very availability for their refuge is significant to my argument, but such absence of evidence does not help. In

\textsuperscript{1125} Marzano (2007) 48-50.
\textsuperscript{1126} Plin. *NH* 32.4; Maiuro (2012) 194.
\textsuperscript{1127} *Classis* quinqueremes: e.g. *CIL* X 3410, 3455 (= Tuck (2005) no. 37); *CIL* XI 50, 58.
sum, while Astura could represent a harbour constructed at an imperial *villa maritima* with a *classis* presence, it cannot be considered a good example.

### 4.5 Rhegium

We now move to the southern tip of Italy. Josephus stated that the Emperor Gaius began, though never completed, an unspecified project around Rhegium for the reception of Egyptian grain: \(^{1128}\)

\[\text{ἐργὸν δὲ μέγα ἢ βασίλειον οὐδὲν αὐτῷ πεπραγμένον εἴποι ἃν τις ἢ ἐπ᾽ ὑφελεία τῶν συνόντων καὶ αὐθής ἀνθρώπων ἐσομένων, πλὴν γε τοῦ περὶ Ῥήγιον καὶ Σικελίαν ἐπινοηθέντος ἐν ὑποδοχῇ τῶν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου σιτηγῶν πλοίων.}\]

Josephus considered this project μέγα ἢ βασίλειον. The latter can be read as underlining how such projects, partly because of the benefits that they offered to the subjects of the benefactor (directly to the mariners, and indirectly to those in Rome who would benefit from a secure grain supply), were appropriate for a “kingly” figure. \(^{1129}\)

---

\(^{1128}\) Jos. *AJ* 19.205. Meiggs (1973\(^3\)) 57 suggested that Claudius completed it, but as Levick (1990) 109-10 notes, there is no evidence.

\(^{1129}\) Note *SupIt.* V.RI.17 (= *AE* 1975 284), an epitaph of perhaps the first century AD (Reddé (1986) 205 suggests start of the Julio-Claudian period), though nb. M. Buonocore in *SupIt.* V (1989), p.65 who proposes triumviral: *C(aio) Iulio Neoptol(emi) f(ilio) / Evandro trierarch(ho) / C(aius) Iulius C(ai) f(ilius) Niger / [----] trierarchus.* One could include this among the pre-Flavian epitaph types, but I have hesitated over whether this is related to the imperial classes. Schmiedt (1975) 100 and Linderski (1988) 184 both consider it evidence for a *classis staiao, contra* Reddé (1986) 204-5, 284-5 who argues that Rhegium was simply a relay point, while noting its use by Octavian in the civil wars (App. *BC* 5.81, 84; Cass. Dio 48.18.1, 47.1). There is no direct evidence for imperial property at Rhegium, though see Tac. *Ann.* 1.53; with Linderski (1988) for the banishment of Julia the Younger there.
4.6 Ostia-Portus

We have seen that Claudius enacted legal measures encouraging grain shipment.\footnote{See above p. 260.} Perhaps most famously, he also constructed the vast artificial harbour of Portus, just to the north west of the *colonia* of Ostia. I shall break chronological sequence here to consider Portus in full. Its initial purpose appears to have been to alleviate Tiber flooding, to provide a safe mooring point for ships which would otherwise have to wait outside the Tiber mouth, and to create extra storage, especially for grain shipped to Rome.\footnote{Plin. *NH* 9.14-15; 16.201-2; 36.70; Suet. *Claud*. 20.1, 3; Cass. Dio 60.11.1-5. See also *CIL* XIV 85 (= Thyländer (1952) B.310 = *ILS* 207) for a Claudian inscription connecting Portus and flood relief measures; cf. Keay *et al.* eds. (2005) 11-12; 297ff. In general see now Keay *et al.* eds. (2005); Keay and Paroli eds. (2011); Keay ed. (2012). See also Bruun and Zevi eds. (2002). Meiggs (1973) is still valuable. See below pp. 274-5 on its location.} Following minor developments, as the second major stage in the life of Portus, in between AD 100 and 112 Trajan constructed a hexagonal inner harbour, alongside further improvements.\footnote{See esp. Plin. *Ep.* 8.17.1-2; *scholia* on Juv. 12.75-6; *portum Augusti dicit sive Traiani... portum Augusti restauravit in melius et interius tuiorem nominis sui fecit*. The hexagonal harbour appears on *RIC* Trajan 471; cf. Keay *et al.* eds. (2005) 321-2.}

Recent scholarship has emphasised the specifically imperial character of Portus in contrast with Ostia. For instance, based on stamped finds, Keay *et al.* have argued that provisioning of bricks for Portus followed a ‘state pattern’, with produce of people with links to the imperial house, such as the *gens Domitia*, used.\footnote{Keay *et al.* eds (2005) 182-3.} This contrasts with second century Ostia, where Delaine has shown that ‘imperial bricks’ were only used in significant quantities on prestigious public buildings, such as the barracks of the *Vigiles* and the Forum Baths.\footnote{DeLaine (2002) esp. 49-57, 61-2, 75.} A free market operated otherwise.

The so-called Palazzo Imperiale, on the north western side of the Trajanic hexagon, also overlooking the Claudian harbour, is currently seen as the headquarters...
of an imperial official.\footnote{Keay, Earl and Felici (2011); Keay (2012) 46.} Lead pipes stamped with the name of Messalina may indicate that the early second century complex was preceded by an official building somewhere in its south-west sector in the mid-first century AD.\footnote{Thylander (1952) B.384 (= CIL XV 7759 = XIV 2008) with Keay, Earl and Felici (2011) 84.} Whether this building was an imperial residence is unknown, but given its apparent scale and complexity, alongside its convenient position for monitoring both harbours, that it was used by an official, or by the Emperor when he passed through Portus, seems very possible.\footnote{Keay, Earl and Felici (2011) 86.} In contrast, no such building has been convincingly identified at Ostia.\footnote{Spurza (2002) 127-30 convincingly argues that the building previously identified as the Ostian Palazzo (see Meiggs (1973) 47) was initially a ‘sumptuous bath complex’ before it was transformed into a ‘deluxe insula’ in the Severan period; cf. Keay, Earl and Felici (2011) 86.} Such evidence should be put in the context of a tantalising suggestion by Maiuro that the position of the Claudian harbour was connected to land ownership patterns, and in particular the localisation of imperial property.\footnote{Maiuro (2012) 170, 262-3, 266; it is generally accepted that there were imperial properties locally see e.g. Meiggs (1973) 47, 145, 163-5 and above n.1134; cf. Spurza (2002) 132-3: the evidence is limited.} There is some evidence for the latter. Most important are later first or early second century AD epitaphs attesting a vilicus (T(ito) Flavio Botrycni et / Ianuario Caes(aris) ser(vo) / vern(ae) vil(ico)) and T. Flavius Olympicus, quite probably an imperial freedman, described as de praetorio vilico.\footnote{CIL XIV 198, 199 (= ILS 1582). For further evidence see Maiuro (2012) 262-3.} Any imperial property is difficult to precisely locate, with both inscriptions described vaguely as coming from Ostia. A third, commemorating Plato Caesaris, a diaetarcha (‘valet-de-chambre’) was erected by Olympicus, a vilicus, at the Portus Laurentina necropolis on the south-eastern
outskirts of Ostia. Whether their physical distance from Portus is significant is worth pondering.

Imperial visits to Ostia, especially by Claudius, may further hint at imperial property. Prior to the fall of Messalina in AD 48, Tacitus states that Claudius went to visit Ostia (Claudius Ostiam proficisceretur) and stayed there for a long time (longa apud Ostiam Caesaris mora). Pliny recorded that Claudius became involved with a struggle with a whale at Portus while the harbour was being built (orca et in portu Ostiensi visa est oppugnata a Claudio principe; venerat tum exaedificante eo portum...); as Spurza suggests, perhaps the Emperor resided at his property to oversee the building work. Suetonius described how Nero would drift along the Tiber to Ostia on pleasure cruises, notably coupling it with Baiae (quotiens Ostiam Tiberi deflueret aut Baianum sinum praeternavigaret): it seems reasonable to suggest that the Emperor stayed somewhere when he reached his destination.

If we accept imperial property around Ostia-Portus, we may be able to relate this to the position of the harbour, criticized in modernity because the site was vulnerable to being choked by silt driven north from the Tiber. Meiggs observed that this may not have been obvious to the Romans, and that the site provided the easiest connection with the Tiber. Keay et al. have suggested that the position was selected as most appropriate for digging canals between the Tiber and the sea to alleviate flooding.

1141 AE 1939 150.
1145 Suet. Ner. 27.3.
1146 Meiggs (1973) 153; described as ‘difficult to understand’ by Keay et al. eds. (2005) 298; Keay (2012) 44.
1147 Meiggs (1973) 153.
Such hypotheses could be correct. However, it is also possible that the location of imperial land was influential; this difficult project would have been more achievable if it was carried out there, with less opposition from other landowners. The density of occupation of the coast to the south of Ostia has been noted, alongside the possible controversy that the construction of Portus aroused, as indicated by Quintilian stating that it was topic suitable for an orator to develop a position on.\footnote{Coastal occupation: Keay et al. eds. (2005) 298, citing Lauro and Claridge (1998); controversy: Quint. Inst. 2.21.18; 3.8.16 with Keay et al. eds. (2005) 36.}

It is therefore possible, though unproven, that Claudius constructed Portus where he did not only because the land was unoccupied, but because he already owned it.

Even if we do not accept that imperial property was influential in the location of Portus, some of its other features imply a special type of imperial harbour, of quite a different character to colonial Ostia.\footnote{We should also count its supervision by an imperial procurator, among other imperial and local officials, initially called the procurator portus Ostiensis (CIL XIV 163 (= XV 7146 = ILS 1533 = Thylander (1952) B.378)). The development of this administration is much debated: by the third century at least there existed a procurator portus utriusque (surely interpreted correctly by Bruun (2002) 166 as concerned with the Claudian and Trajanic harbours, not Portus and Ostia), but we have yet to ascertain precisely when this post was created, or understand its relationship to the procurator annonae Ostis. See Hirschfeld (1905) 248-50; Boulvert (1970) 267-8; Meiggs (1973) 298-304; Pavis d’Escurac (1976) 106-25; Houston (1980) 157-62; Bruun (2002), all offering different views.}

We saw earlier that epigraphy attests classis servicemen at Ostia-Portus. Their relationship to the imperial harbour has usually been considered without proper attention to the differences between Ostia and Portus. Fiebiger simply discussed the statio Ostiensis.\footnote{Fiebiger (1894) 322-4; cf. Chapot (1896) 70-5.} Kienast similarly spoke of a detachment in Ostia.\footnote{Kienast (1966) 52.} Starr acknowledged that the two were separate: ‘one...station of the Misene fleet was situated at Ostia, or to speak more correctly, at Portus’.\footnote{Starr (1960) 17.} However, he did not consider possible implications. Reddé is similar.\footnote{Reddé (1986) 201-3.}
We would like to more accurately place the *classis* detachment at one port or the other. However, the find-spots of the fourteen *classis* epitaphs do not allow this. Three were found on the Isola Sacra, just south of the Fossa Traiana.\(^{1155}\) Four were found at the Episcopium to the south of the Trajanic hexagon, while three are recorded as from the Basilica of Santa Aurea at Ostia.\(^{1156}\) We do not know how they reached either site, but it is easy to imagine they were not set up there originally. References for the remaining epitaphs are vague or unhelpful.

Therefore, it is impossible to locate a particular burial area for *classis* servicemen, which might give clues as to where they were based. A dedicatory inscription on half a marble plaque, found at Portus, contributes to the discussion, but does not resolve it. Mommsen restored:\(^{1157}\)

\[
\text{[adnuent]e}^{1158} \text{Imp(erator) Caes(are) Com-} \\
\text{[modo Antonino] Pio Felice}^{1159} \text{sacr(um) qu-} \\
\text{[od vov(erant) I(ovi) O(ptimo)] M(aximo) Dulic(heno) milit(es) cl(assis) } \\
\text{[pr(aetoriae) Mis(enatis) cum es]sent}^{1160} \text{Ostia sub} \\
\text{[cura---]ti Iusti tr(ierarchi) VII Id(us)} \\
\text{[---Com]modo Aug(usto) V co(n)s(ule)} \\
\text{[curam agente---] Ter(entio?) Prisco.}
\]

Based on the consulship of Commodus, the inscription has been dated to AD 186. Bloch inferred that these *milites* were simply passing through the area, but others have probably correctly considered this further evidence for a permanent *classis*

\(^{1155}\) *CIL XIV* 4496-7; *AE* 1983 124.

\(^{1156}\) Episcopium: *CIL XIV* 233-4, 239, 242; Santa Aurea: *CIL XIV* 237, 241, 243.

\(^{1157}\) *CIL XIV* 110

\(^{1158}\) Extremely unlikely, the use of the verb virtually without parallel in epigraphy. Garrucci (1852) 16 no.3, following de Rossi, suggested *pro salut[e],* though that is usually followed by a genitive.

\(^{1159}\) Garrucci (1852) 16 no.3 stated that this was a miscarving for *Felici.* Certainty would help in determining the relationship of the imperial nomenclature to the lost first word. Unfortunately, there is none.

\(^{1160}\) This assumes that *Ostia* is ablative, the preposition omitted. One might expect the locative *Ostiis* (e.g. Livy 9.19.4; *CIL XIV* 4505; *AE* 1925 27). Perhaps the verb should be something that the *milites* were doing to *Ostia,* either an ablative, or accusative *Ostia(m)?
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While found at Portus, the inscription refers to a group at Ostia. If the imperial harbour was meant, we might expect Portus Ostiensis or Portus Ostiae, perhaps even Portus Augusti by this date. However, the inscription could commemorate a special visit to Ostia by a group normally based at Portus: uncertainty over reconstructing the text, especially the verb in line four, leaves lots of room for interpretation.

Despite the weak evidence, I am tempted to suggest, but cannot prove, that the servicemen would have primarily been stationed at Portus because of the particular imperial character of the site. Moreover, if they were equipped with ships, it is perhaps more likely that they would have been kept in the larger harbour afforded by Portus. Naturally, this does not rule out their sometime presence at Ostia too.

4.7 Neronian canals, Neronian Antium

Nero too took an interest in the annona. Coinage struck in Rome and Lugudunum from AD 63-7 promoted the image of Nero as guarantor of the grain supply: one type, whose reverse legend reads ANNONA AUGUSTI CERES S.C., carries a draped female figure representing Annona, facing Ceres. With the head of Nero on the

---

1161 Bloch (1953) 242; contra e.g. Chapot (1896) 70; Starr (1960) 71-18; Reddé (1986) 202.
1163 Though note Heinzelmann and Martin (2002), identifying as navalia a large complex occupying the space between the Ostian harbour basin and the ‘Palazzo Imperiale’. Citing only Meiggs (1973) 304, they propose that its fairly small vaulted chambers were used by warships. But we have seen that Roman navalia are notoriously difficult to identify, and Rankov (2013) 41-2 has urged caution, suggesting that only the western vaults of the complex could have been used as shipsheds, and even these are too small for any ships attested in Ostian epigraphy.
obverse, imperial concern for the *anonna* is suggested. Slightly less explicit is a type showing the imperial harbour of Portus on the reverse.\textsuperscript{1165}

It is within this context that Neronian infrastructural projects can be interpreted. Several sources mention a canal planned to run from the Tiber to the *sinus Baianus*. Pliny blamed a decline in production of Caecuban wine around the Bay of Amyclae on this: *magis tamen fossa Neronis, quam a Baiano lacu Ostiam usque navigabilem incohaverat.*\textsuperscript{1166} Statius alluded to it in his poem on the *via Domitiana*: *nec frangit vada montibusque caesis / inducit Nero sordidas paludes.*\textsuperscript{1167} Tacitus described how the architects of the Golden House tempted Nero in AD 64: *namque ab lacu Averno navigabilem fossam usque ad ostia Tiberia depressuros promiserant.*\textsuperscript{1168} Criticising its failure, he noted that its early stages were still visible: *effodere proxima Averno iuga conisus est; manentque vestigia inritae spei.*

Finally, Suetonius also mentioned a *piscina* from Misenum to lake Avernus, perhaps part of the same project:\textsuperscript{1169}

praeterea incohabet piscinam a Miseno ad Avernum lacum contectam porticusque conclusam, quo quidquid totis Baiis calidarum aquarum esset converteretur; fossam ab Averno Ostiam usque, ut navibus nec tamen mari iaret...qua contrariae quinqueremes commearent.

We have already seen that the canal was perhaps intended for general imperial travel.\textsuperscript{1170} However, as Meiggs suggested, it could also have improved security for grain shipments from Puteoli to the Tiber if smaller transports used it.\textsuperscript{1171}

\textsuperscript{1165} *RIC*\textsuperscript{2} Nero 178-83, 440-1, 513-14, 586-9. Rickman (1980) 257-67 contrasts the relatively limited appearance of the grain supply in pre-Claudian (if not pre-Neronian) coinage to its far greater prevalence afterwards; cf. Noreña (2011) 114-20.
\textsuperscript{1166} Plin. *NH* 14.61. Archaeological remains along the western Italian coast show that the canal was at least begun; see Johannowsky (1990); cf. Champlin (2003) 158-9.
\textsuperscript{1167} Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.7-8.
\textsuperscript{1168} Tac. *Ann.* 15.42.
\textsuperscript{1169} Suet. *Ner.* 31.3.
A second Neronian project is the harbour at Antium, which we may be able to understand as a port associated with imperial property and at which there was a classis presence.\textsuperscript{1172} From Augustus, Emperors and members of their families stayed there. For instance, in 2 BC a legatio was sent to Antium to offer the title pater patriae to Augustus, implying his residence there.\textsuperscript{1173} In investigating the controversy over the birthplace of Gaius Caligula, Suetonius decided that Antium was the most likely because:\textsuperscript{1174}

\begin{quote}
omnia semper locis atque secessibus praelatum non aliter quam natale solum dilexerit tradaturque etiam sedem ac domicilium imperii taedio urbis transferre eo destinasse.
\end{quote}

This also implies that Gaius owned property at Antium, probably inherited from Augustus.\textsuperscript{1175} In his Life of Apollonius, Philostratus refers to τὰ βασίλεια τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἀνθίῳ, οἷς μάλιστα δὴ τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν βασίλειών ἔχαιρεν, implying that Emperors continued to own property in and frequent Antium beyond the first century AD.\textsuperscript{1176}

Nero too was born at Antium and visited there.\textsuperscript{1177} He also settled veterans at the colonia in AD 60 and, according to Suetonius, constructed a very expensive

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[1170]{Above p. 239.}
\footnotetext[1172]{For a recent archaeological study of Antium with further bibliography, see Brandizzi Vittucci (2000); \textit{cf.} Marzano (2007) 269. For older summaries see Mommsen in \textit{CIL} X (1883), pp.660-1; Hülsen in \textit{RE} I (1891), \textit{s.v. Antium}, 2561-3 and for imperial property see Nissen in \textit{Ital. Landes}. II 629; Hirschfeld (1902-3) 62-3; Miller (1977) 26; Maiuro (2012) 266-7.}
\footnotetext[1173]{Suet. \textit{Aug.} 58.1.}
\footnotetext[1174]{Suet. \textit{Calig.} 8.5.}
\footnotetext[1175]{\textit{Cf.} Cass. Dio 58.25.2 for Tiberius celebrating the marriage of Gaius at Antium.}
\footnotetext[1176]{Philostr. \textit{VA} 8.20.}
\end{footnotes}
harbour (*ubi et portum operis sumptuosissimi fecit*).\textsuperscript{1178} With an estimated area of 25-30 ha., the harbour lay to the south-east of an extensive *villa maritima*, which tellingly underwent major work in the Neronian period.\textsuperscript{1179} As Brandizzi Vittucci notes, the villa has traditionally been designated imperial because of its sheer scale.\textsuperscript{1180} Lead pipes naming Gaius Caligula (*C(ai) Caesar(is) Aug(usti) Germanici*) and Domitian (*Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) Domitiani Au[g(usti)]...*) come from Antium, but the precise provenance of the first is unknown, while the latter was found during works on the railway line in the late nineteenth century, perhaps at the margins of the villa estate.\textsuperscript{1181}

Thus we might reasonably question the imperial identification, though the apparent contemporaneity of work at the villa and the harbour, clearly attested as the built by Nero, is rather suggestive. At the very least, ownership of estates at Antium seems irrefutable, and one suspects a relationship between this and the Neronian harbour.

Thus at Antium we do have a large harbour which could offer shelter to grain ships and which was perhaps connected to imperial property, or was certainly constructed by an Emperor. Moreover, from limited epigraphic evidence we can tentatively locate *classis* servicemen there. A funerary monument was erected in the second century to L. Lucretius, *miles* of a *classis*.\textsuperscript{1182} Unfortunately we do not know whether he was still serving at death, or whether those who commemorated him were *classis* members.
Keppie has hypothesised that another epitaph, to M. Antonius Fronto, a veteranus Augusti of Syrian origin, attests a classis serviceman buried in the later first to mid-second century AD. Given that Syrians served in the classes, this suggestion is not unreasonable. While Syrians are known elsewhere in the Roman army, the use of the origin formula natione plus ethnic is particularly common to the classes. There are virtually no examples of non-classis milites recorded as natione Syrus earlier than the very late second or third century. Furthermore, the only other epitaph from Antium to feature natione was that of the above-mentioned L. Lucretius. Therefore, I am inclined to accept that Antonius was a classis veteran.

Keppie discussed Antonius in the context of the Neronian colonial deduction, but it is perhaps equally likely that, as a classis member, he had been at Antium in connection with imperial property and the possibly associated port. Indeed, Keppie noted that the inscription appeared rather late for the Neronian settlement. Placed alongside the description of Gaius travelling between Astura and Antium with a classis, we can tentatively propose that classis servicemen frequented this harbour and nearby imperial estate, and were thus part of a system suggestive of imperial concern for shipping security along a route used by grain ships.

\[1183\] CIL X 6669: Dis Man(ibus) / M(arcus) Antonius / Fronto veter(anus) / Aug(usti) nat(ione) Syr(us) militavit / ann(os) XXXV sibi et libertabusque su(is) fecit; cf. Keppie (1984a) 87-8.
\[1184\] E.g. CIL VI 3114, 3138, 32776; CIL X 3407 (= ILS 2885), 3414 (= ILS 2871), 3450; CIL XI 43 (= ILS 2863), 352; Mansuelli (1967) no. 148.
\[1185\] See above pp. 64-5.
\[1186\] Possibly CIL XIII 11962a; for later examples, see CIL III 3301; CIL VI 3197, 26883.
4.8 The via Domitiana

Perhaps as an alternative to the Neronian canal, Domitian shortened the land journey between Puteoli and Rome by constructing the via Domitiana, completed in AD 95, which joined Puteoli to the via Appia at Sinuessa.\textsuperscript{1188} While it is uncertain whether much grain was sent along it, the road could have indirectly supported the annona.\textsuperscript{1189} For instance, it could have decreased journey times for the classis servicemen who I have argued acted as couriers between Puteoli and Rome, quickening the transfer of information concerning the annona.

4.9 Trajan and Centumcellae

Trajan undertook a range of infrastructural projects, including the renewal of the Italian road system, with the repair of the via Appia and the construction in AD 109 of the via Traiana from Beneventum to Brundisium.\textsuperscript{1190} Of course, Trajan did not limit himself to Italian roads, and some harbour works are of direct relevance to our discussion.\textsuperscript{1191} We have already covered Portus, and noted his construction of


\textsuperscript{1189} D’Arms (1970) 102, without providing details, suggested that the road served commercial traffic.

\textsuperscript{1190} For the via Appia, see milestones e.g. CIL X 6926-7, 6928 (= ILS 285); for further evidence and discussion see Laurence (1999) 47-52; Boatwright (2002) 265-6. Nearly fifty milestones refer to the via Traiana e.g. CIL IX 6003 (= ILS 291), 6004-5; cf. RIC\textsuperscript{3} Trajan 636-41. See Ashby and Gardner (1916) and more recently Volpe (1990) 86-9 for further bibliography.

\textsuperscript{1191} See above p. 151 n.619. A local tradition has led some (e.g. Laurence (1999) 47; Bennett (2001)\textsuperscript{7} 143; Schörle (2011) 99; cf. Paribeni (1927) 116-17) to claim that Trajan reconstructed the harbour at Tarracina. There is no evidence: two inscriptions, CIL X 6310 (= ILS 282 = AE 1980 203) and Coppola (1989) 86 no.114 suggest work at or near the city by Trajan, but neither mentions the harbour, in contrast with the Ancona arch: CIL IX 5894 (= ILS 298) ll.5-7: quod accessum / Italiæ hoc etiam addito ex pecunia sua / portu tutorem navigantibus reddiderit; cf. Coarelli (1982) 323 and (1996a); Zevi (2000b) 509 n.1; Boatwright (2002) 267.
Centumcellae. Scholarship has suggested its function as an outlying port of Rome. Meiggs characterised Centumcellae as part of a ‘comprehensive plan’, which provided shelter for ships going to and from Ostia. More recent work continues to emphasise the importance of Centumcellae as a port of call and satellite for Rome, including for African grain ships.

It must be admitted that direct evidence in our period seems limited. Bastianelli did identify remains in the port area as horrea. Moreover, it is suggestive that Pliny believed that it would serve as a port of call and refuge for mariners. This allows us to consider Centumcellae an example of an imperial port, constructed at an imperial estate, which could provide refuge to grain ships and at which classis servicemen were present.

4.10 Argentario, Giannutri, Giglio and Tagliata

A system of Trajanic ports of call may extend further north of Centumcellae. Several villae maritimae with harbours are known on the coast and islands between modern Orbetello and Centumcellae, to which “commercial” purposes have been attributed. Maiuro, developing a position taken by Ciampoltrini and Rendini, has argued that Trajan developed these harbours as refuges for grain ships. Specifically, he is concerned with estates at Telamon, S. Liberata on the Argentario peninsula, villae on the islands of Giglio and Giannutri and Tagliata at Cosa. Grain

---

1192 See above pp. 148-51.
1194 Meiggs (1973) 59-60.
1196 NSA (1940), 186-7; discussed by Reddé (1986) 199-200; Caruso (1991) 38.
1197 See above pp. 149-50.
1198 Schörle (2011) 100-3.
from Africa could be brought from Carthage, Utica, or ports even further west, to Caralis in Sardinia. Ships would then coast along to Corsica, cross the sea to Elba and Italy, before sailing down to Argentario and Rome. He presents this as part of a rational economic plan to support the feeding of Rome. We must dispute this last point, because of our earlier discussion of the potential uses of imperial estates within a wider economic context. If the scheme is correct, we could posit several alternative reasons for the development of these ports, as catalogued above. But we must test its validity.

This argument relies on several premises. Firstly, that this was a route plausibly used by African grain ships. We lack direct evidence for the proposed route followed in toto. However, as Maiuro indicates, the Itinerarium Maritimum, a ‘miscellany’ of routes recorded with the Itinerarium Antonini in the MSS, mentions a route between Thabraca, west of Carthage, and Caralis. There is also limited evidence for journeys along the Sardinian coast. In 46 BC, having crossed from Utica to Caralis, Caesar appears to have coasted northwards before crossing to Rome, though whether this was purely because of bad weather is unclear. Furthermore, routes are attested along the eastern coast of Corsica, as well as crossings from both north and south Corsica to Elba and Populonia or Vada Volterrana in Italy. Therefore, one can reconstruct a route from North Africa to Rome along the lines proposed by Maiuro. That the whole route was not recorded is not necessarily

---

1201 For others arguing for this or a similar route, see e.g. Celuzza and Rendini eds. (1992) 70-3 with figs.50, 52; Ciampoltrini and Rendini (2004) 86; Marzano (2007) 26.
1203 B Afr. 98: navis conscendit et a Caralibus secundum terram provectus duodetricesimo die, ideo quod tempestatibus in portibus cohibebatur, ad urbem Romam venit.
1204 Corsica: Plin. NH 3.80 with Arnaud (2005) 170-1; Corsica to Italy: Ps-Scylax 6; Str. 5.2.6; Plin. NH 3.80-1 and Arnaud (2005) 164.
surprising: the Mediterranean offers a vast array of possible routes, and ‘routes within routes’, many unrecorded.

Although there is no direct evidence for African grain ships following this route, its probable exploitation by other African vessels makes this a reasonable possibility. We cannot guess at the proportion of ships which used this route, as opposed to travelling to Sardinia and then crossing straight over to Rome, or those which sailed via Sicily. But it is enough to have shown that this journey was available.

The other premises on which the argument of Maiuro rests are that the *villae maritimae* were in imperial hands by the Trajanic period, and that they were developed at that time. At virtually none of the *villae* is either premise proven. For example, the imperial ownership of five *villae*, S. Liberata, S. Stefano, Giglio, Giannutri and Porto Ercole is based on the possibility that they belonged originally to the Domitii Ahenobarbi, passing to the imperial *patrimonium* under Nero. Caesar recorded that in 49 BC, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus raised an “army” from the residents of his possessions around Cosa and Giglio. Moreover, a *Domitiana positio* is located in this area by the *Itinerarium Maritimum*. This is all well and good, but we simply do not know if these are the properties in question.

While some of the sites mentioned could have been imperial estates, only one has produced hints of the *classes*. This is is the villa of Telamon, around 1 km north

---

1207 Caes. B Civ. 1.34.
1208 Cuntz (1929) p.79 499.8.
of modern coastal Talamone.\textsuperscript{1209} Dating to the later first century and early second century AD, the majority of the structural remains belong to cisterns, perhaps associated with a thermal complex attached to the villa. A lead pipe was found stamped with the name of Trajan and mentioning an imperial procurator: \textit{Imp(eratoris) Caesaris Nervae Traiani Aug(usti) Germ(anici) Dacici / sub cura Hebri Aug(usti) lib(erti) pr(ocuratoris) Tuendus ser(vus) fec(it)}.\textsuperscript{1210} In a detailed study of Roman water supply, Bruun argues that this stamp does point to imperial ownership, with the genitive of the name of Trajan signifying his ownership of the pipe, and thus the property which it supplied.\textsuperscript{1211} While not absolutely conclusive, this evidence may indicate that the property had passed into imperial ownership by the time of Trajan, if not before.\textsuperscript{1212}

Further remains suggest that the villa extended to the south-east, down towards the modern port.\textsuperscript{1213} It has therefore been connected with the \textit{portus Telamonis} of the \textit{Itinerarium}.\textsuperscript{1214} The broken tombstone of a \textit{classis} serviceman, dating probably to the second or early third century AD, was found in the cemetery area of Talamone in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{1215} The cemetery lies around 0.6 km north east from the town, near the shore. Although we cannot know precisely how the tombstone ended up in the cemetery, one is struck by the position of the latter, sloping down

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotetext[1210]{\textit{AE} 1920 102.}
\footnotetext[1211]{Bruun (1991) 273-4; cf. 20-6 for the standard interpretation of stamped \textit{fistulae}, though see also 87-95 where the interpretation of the genitive as the owner is shown to be sometimes unsafe.}
\footnotetext[1212]{E.g. Carandini ed. (1985) 157 for the possibility that Nero took possession of the estate, assuming original ownership by the Domitii Ahenobarbi (see above p. 285); cf. Marzano (2007) 705.}
\footnotetext[1213]{See Von Vacano (1985) 190 and 194-5 for details.}
\footnotetext[1214]{Cuntz (1929) p.79 500.3-6; connection made by e.g. Ciampoltrini (1994) 179; Marzano (2007) 705. A link between villa and port was made in e.g. Carandini ed. (1985) 157; Von Vacano (1985) 194, but without reference to \textit{portus Telamonis}.}
\end{footnotesize}
from the villa remains above. I cautiously suggest that Telamon may match our ideal of an imperial *villa maritima* with a harbour and, although the evidence is slight, an imperial *classis* presence.

The scheme proposed by Maiuro is enticing because works at these northern *villae maritimae* would fit well in the context of other Trajanic infrastructural and port projects, and would be neatly paralleled by earlier developments to the south. Yet the evidence is simply not conclusive enough to declare that all the *villae* mentioned underwent systematic development, or even that they were imperial properties. Only perhaps Talamone, which underwent major Trajanic developments, was potentially an imperial estate with a harbour sufficient to provide moorings to grain ships. The small amount of evidence for a *classis* presence allows us to tentatively include it within our broader scheme.

### 4.11 The imperial coastal landscape and ἐπίνειοι φρουραί

The above has delineated a series of roads, canals and ports constructed under the auspices of several Emperors down to Trajan. The early second century AD can be seen as a culmination of a series of individual projects, though probably not a unified scheme pursued by several Emperors. Later projects are less well documented, but nonetheless visible. Pausanias states that Hadrian constructed a harbour at Lupiae (Λουπίας... ὁ δὲ ὄρμος ταῖς ναυσὶ χειροποίητος καὶ Αδριανοῦ βασιλέως ἐστίν ἐργον).\(^{1216}\) The *Historia Augusta* attributes a number of harbour projects to Antoninus

---

\(^{1216}\) Paus. 6.19.9.
Pius, including at Caieta and Tarracina (*Caietae portus, Tarraciniensis portus restitution*).\textsuperscript{1217} Two inscriptions attest his work on the harbour at Puteoli.\textsuperscript{1218}

I suggest that we could regard the above system as providing increasing navigational security along the western coast of Italy, in particular aiding ships transporting grain to Rome, especially important for how the Emperor was perceived. We have identified a series of imperial harbours at Rhegium, Antium, Portus and Centumcellae, alongside the more tentative examples of Astura and Talamone, some of which were strongly associated with imperial property dispositions.\textsuperscript{1219} Their imperial character could have promoted their being perceived as benefactions of the Emperor, a viewpoint encouraged by some of the comments made by Pliny the Younger and Plutarch, though also by Philostratus on Damianus.

I have identified possible *classis* detachments at several of these harbours, particularly at Ostia-Portus and Centumcellae, whose very presence could have contributed to a consciousness of this infrastructure as the gift of the Emperor. Nor should we forget their presence at or near Puteoli, admittedly a municipal harbour, but critical to the grain supply, and a port which received imperial investment.\textsuperscript{1220}

There are several major caveats. The connection between some of the ports and imperial property is fairly conjectural, and in some cases the presence of *classis*

\textsuperscript{1217} SHA. *Ant. Pius* 8.3.
\textsuperscript{1218} *CIL* X 1640 (= *ILS* 336), 1641; cf. Noreña (2011) 120-1.
\textsuperscript{1219} One could also potentially include imperial property at Formiae and Caieta, its port. Imperial ownership here is attested from the Claudian or Neronian period (*CIL* VI 8583 (= *ILS* 1578) commemorates an imperial freedman *procurator Formis Fundis Caietae*), and there are later literary references to it (Fronto ad M. Aur. 5.19 index (Haines I p. 191 = Naber p. 76), 20 (Haines I. p. 192 = Naber p. 78); SHA *Marc.* 19.7; *Avid. Cass.* 10.6-7). Monuments commemorating imperial slaves and freedmen are known from Formiae and Caieta: for a recent collection see Arnaldi, Cassieri and Gregori (2013). See also Mommsen in *CIL* X (1883), p. 671; Hirschfeld (1902-3) 65; Millar (1977) 26; Maiuro (2012) 272-4. No *classis* inscriptions have been found at either site, which could suggest that *classis* servicemen were not present all maritime imperial properties (assuming a coastal imperial villa with harbour at Formiae or Caieta, for which there is no evidence).
\textsuperscript{1220} Note also the Neronian refoundation of the *colonia* at Puteoli: see Tac. *Ann.* 14.27; *ILS* 6326 (= *CIL* IV 2152); *CIL* X 5369 (= *ILS* 6327 = *AE* 1973 172) and Keppie (1984a) 82; cf. Frederiksen (1984) 337.
servicemen cannot be conclusively demonstrated. Regarding the second point, we can note the more visible connection between *classis* servicemen and imperial harbours and property at Misenum and Ravenna, and indeed at inland imperial properties, suggestive of a pattern. Moreover, although I have talked of *classis* detachments, for my system to be plausible the presence of *classis* servicemen at several harbours did not have to be permanent. Occasional visits could have been enough to further suggest the imperial character of places like Antium.

There is at least one other major limitation to my general hypothesis. Although one can reasonably argue for an infrastructural system based on ports, canals and so forth which provided navigational security for grain ships, and which is at least imagined by some literary sources, *classis* servicemen are never specifically mentioned as part of this system. This critical point should be set against the certain presence of *classis* servicemen, themselves associated with the imperial house and often employed to support imperial activity, at or around the ports, when such ports could be considered benefactions.

Moreover, there is perhaps one hint at a port system of which the *classis* servicemen were a part. In his preface, Appian summarises the contents of his historical opus. Of the concluding book, unfortunately lost to us, he says:1221

> ἡ δὲ τελευταία καὶ τὴν στρατιὰν αὐτῶν ὅσην ἔχουσιν, ἢ πρόσοδον ἢν καρποῦνται καθ᾽ ἐκαστὸν ἔθνος, ἢ ἐὰν τι προσαναλίσκουσιν εἰς τὰς ἐπινείους φρουρὰς, ὅσα τε τοιουτότροπα ἄλλα, ἐπίδειξει.

Most of the above can be paralleled in other descriptions of the *ratio imperii*: the size of the army, the revenues from the different peoples of the empire, and

1221 App. Pr.15.
expenditures.\textsuperscript{1222} The unexpected interest in the \ἐπίνειοι φρουραί stands out. Horace White unsatisfactorily translated this as “naval service”.\textsuperscript{1223} Appian used φρουρά for abstracts like garrison or guard duty, and the word commonly means men who serve in this role.\textsuperscript{1224} The adjective ἐπίνειος describes, as one would expect from a word derived from the substantive ἐπίνειον, something “of the port”.

This unique phrase therefore suggests something like a coastal or port watch. Are these, in fact, the \textit{classis milites}? This view is perhaps encouraged by the ratio recorded by Tacitus, which mentioned the \textit{classes} (\textit{opes publicae continebantur...quot classes...}).\textsuperscript{1225} When White translated the term as “naval service”, one suspects that he was thinking of the \textit{classes} but understanding them as generic Mediterranean war fleets. Yet ἐπίνειοι φρουρά implies something rather more static, and perhaps more like our \textit{classis} manpower pools, deployed at particular ports in Italy, and beyond.

Understanding Appian is not helped by a dearth of comparisons. There are no precise parallels for the phrase. However, Appian himself uses something similar in his \textit{Libyca}. In 149 BC, the consuls Censorinus and Manilius attacked Carthage without much success. Censorinus returned to Rome to hold the elections, leaving Manilius with the Roman army in North Africa. After a Carthaginian attack, Manilius decided to improve camp defences:\textsuperscript{1226}

\begin{quote}

ὅ δὲ Μανιλίος τὸ μὲν στρατόπεδον ἐτὶ μᾶλλον ὑμέρου, τεῖχός τε ἀντὶ χάρακος αὐτῷ περιτείχεις καὶ ἐπίνειον φρούριον ἐγείρων ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης διὰ τὴν καταπλέουσαν ἀγοράν·
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1222} E.g. Tac. \textit{Ann.} 1.11; Suet. \textit{Aug.} 101.4; Cass. Dio 56.33.2.

\textsuperscript{1223} White (1912) [1972] 23.

\textsuperscript{1224} For the word meaning watch or garrison in Appian see e.g. \textit{B Civ.} 2.56; 5.48; Sam.12.1. For clear examples of it being used for a group of men see e.g. \textit{Hann.} 34; \textit{B Civ.} 3.5.

\textsuperscript{1225} Tac. \textit{Ann.} 1.11.

\textsuperscript{1226} App. \textit{Pun.} 100.
Alongside strengthening the perimeter, Manilius built a ἐπίνειον φρούριον by the sea. This was presumably to ensure safety for Roman supply ships. A φρούριον was a fort or citadel, a defensive structure. This is a typical use of the word by Appian, though occasionally, especially in the plural, the term can be ambiguous, and mean garrison. Presumably the ἐπίνειοι φρουραί considered above could occupy an ἐπίνειον φρούριον. Elsewhere we see Sulla demand that Mithridates must remove his φρουραί from his φρούρα (ἐξαγάγῃ δὲ καὶ τὰς φρουρὰς ἐκ πάντων φρουρίων). If this parallel has any validity, the ἐπίνειοι φρουραί could have been charged with overseeing shipping, primarily in places where supplies were meant to come in.

Clearly, these passages present their problems. But one wonders if Appian was talking about classis servicemen based at φρούρα, and to what extent these can be connected with the imperial harbours discussed above. With caution, one is tempted to regard the passage as perhaps suggestive of the place of classis servicemen within an imperial system which supported grain shipments to Rome and which, surprisingly, hints at some of their roles.

We should return to some wider debates. The discussion suggests that imperial estates could have indirectly supported the representation of imperial power, because harbours constructed at them had the potential to serve as ports of call, including for grain ships. This appears to be attested for Centumcellae, acknowledging the debate over whether it did serve the annona, and can be suggested for other sites considered. If their harbours were used thus, as that of Damianus of Ephesus supposedly was, they could also have contributed indirectly to the commercial health of the empire. One cannot quantify such effects, nor easily

1227 There are many examples of a φρούριον as a physical structure in Appian e.g. App. Hisp. 81; Pun. 102; Mith. 84. In the plural, it can be used for forts or towers, for instance Hisp. 90-2; Pun. 101; B Civ. 4,107. Other instances are more ambiguous, e.g. Hisp. 12, 38; Syr. 41; Mith. 66.
1228 App. Mith. 55.
measure any ideological impact. However, in keeping with the view of Millar, that they can be perceived as ‘stores of benefits’, we could regard the coastal imperial properties of the Tyrrhenian as significant props for the power of an Emperor, and for his self-representation.

This does not mean that they were rationally exploited to facilitate rulership or to develop coastal economies, or even that any harbours constructed at them were primarily intended to be used as ports of call. Other possibilities include Emperors desiring appropriate landing and departure places at their *villae*. This must be true for other imperial harbours along the Tyrrhenian coast. For another possible motivation, we can recall the comments of Josephus on Emperors at Baiae building *villae* in competition with each other.¹²²⁹

Moreover, we must be cautious in drawing wider conclusions from this tentative picture. Our survey is far from comprehensive: we have concentrated on coastal estates in the west of Italy with which harbours of some size were associated, and at which *classis* servicemen could be present. The degree to which, for instance, Centumcellae or Antium can be considered “typical” of imperial estates in Italy, let alone the rest of the empire, is debatable. Each estate should ideally be studied in its own context, to see how it could support imperial activity, ideologically or practically.

That said, the *villae maritimae* of Tyrrhenian Italy should not be studied in isolation. My account proposes that over time a sort of imperial coastal landscape facilitating access to Rome emerged. The imperial *villae maritimae* were but one part of this, alongside imperial ports, infrastructure projects, and the human

¹²²⁹ See above p. 159. Note also above p. 272 n.1131 on Portus being constructed to counter Tiber flooding.
representatives of imperial power, among whom I would include the praetorian classes. This landscape could have promoted the idea of the Emperor as a benefactor, or even his power in a wider sense, while potentially contributing to maritime safety. We should set this within the context, observed by Purcell, of the perception and promotion of Rome as the ‘world-capital’.\textsuperscript{1230} We should bear in mind its grand physical appearance, at least by the mid-point of our period, and literary encomia, such as those of Pliny and Aristides.\textsuperscript{1231} The grand development of maritime approaches to the city, particularly focused on Portus, could be regarded as integral to the representation of Rome.

But, as already intimated, we cannot easily regard the creation of this landscape as a deliberate, rational act of Roman “government”. Instead, we could perhaps perceive the organics of empire. Ideologies of benefaction, the ways in which high status Romans could exploit their property, and routes which were already taken by trading vessels appear to have combined in the evolution of a coastal system which, as one result, facilitated the supply of Rome with grain, hopefully ensuring social stability and demonstrating, for the most part, that the Emperor was a competent benefactor. I have cautiously proposed that the manpower pool of the Italian classes was part of this system, not by design, but because they were based at or frequented imperial harbours which either offered shelter or mooring to grain vessels, or were able to monitor them, as Misenum could Puteoli.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has examined three case-studies for the functions of classis manpower based primarily in Italy. I have posited that the classis milites could perform a range of maritime and terrestrial functions, including ideological ones, which given earlier arguments might reasonably be termed militia. These roles should be considered as among their major functions, not be marginalised as make-work tasks given to war fleets with nothing better to do. Instead, the classes were used, just like the legionaries and auxilia, for tasks to the benefit of the Emperor or his representatives, and could arguably be perceived as demonstrations of imperial authority.

First, I have contended that the classes were integrated into a manpower mobilisation system which facilitated quick responses to crises and potentially supported more day-to-day troop movements, barely visible in the sources. The redeployments of classis manpower attested by literature and diplomata in AD 68-9, potentially in the Bar Kokhba war and in AD 193, can be understood as reactions to emergencies. But this is not necessarily so for the formation of the cohortes classicae recorded in documentary material, or the transfer of men from the classis Misenensis to the legio X Fretensis in the first half of the second century AD. We cannot pronounce on the frequency of such transfers, though the apparent flexibility of classis manpower, its convenient location at the heart of the Mediterranean alongside its possession of ships, and its apparently good access to fresh recruits could have made it particularly suitable for redeployment.

Secondly, I have proposed that the manpower of the Italian classes were among many groups at the disposal of the Emperor to facilitate imperial communications. This is not a new claim, but I have emphasised what I perceive as
the habitual character of the place of the *classes* in communications, alongside their land roles. Literary evidence indicates that Italian *classis* ships could be responsible for conveying the Emperor, and possibly imperial family members, at least along the western coast of Italy, but potentially also along its eastern littoral. Additionally, drawing on Starr and Eck, I have advanced that *classis* servicemen were ready at Brundisium to support the movement of imperial agents between Italy and Greece. Unlike Eck, I am not convinced that this represents a wider pattern, proposing that particular circumstances at Brundisium fostered this arrangement.

On the land, I proposed that *classis milites* had some responsibility for conveying information from Puteoli and Ostia-Portus at least, and from the Claudian period at the latest. While it is possible that they carried letters and thereby supported a formal imperial communications network, I have contended that they could also have reported general news and rumours picked up through monitoring the heavy traffic passing through Puteoli and Ostia-Portus. This argument has its limitations: it is based on a somewhat obscure passage of Suetonius, and leans heavily on the presence of *classis* servicemen at these ports, and the apparent significance of rumour or informal news to Roman activity. However, given the well attested role of *milites* in carrying news around the empire, that they were used in such a manner would not be surprising. Nothing directly attests a comparable arrangement at Ravenna. However, given its situational relationship to Aquileia, the *via Flaminia* and the routes over the north Adriatic, it was conveniently placed to monitor communications, and therefore the possibility cannot be ruled out.

Finally, I have suggested that the *classis* manpower pool was part of a system which developed on the Tyrrenian coast of Italy and which facilitated the supply of Rome with grain, intentionally or otherwise. In contrast with previous scholars, who
have tried to identify the activities which the classes performed in relation to the annona, or Reddé, who denied any link whatsoever, I have contended that the classes could have served among several markers of imperial power or activity, alongside imperial infrastructure projects including harbours. Some of these, for instance Centumcellae, Antium, Astura (very tentatively) and Talamone, were perhaps closely associated with imperial property. This contributed to the creation of an imperial coastal landscape, which could have been interpreted as an imperial benefaction for all mariners, and in particular for grain ships when the security of the annona was apparently of such import to the relationship between the Emperor and the plebs urbana. There is no good direct evidence in literature for the appreciation of the place of the classes in any such system, though it is possible that Appian alludes to them when mentioning the ἐπίνειοι φρουραί. However, the presence of classis servicemen could be considered as suggestive of imperial activity or power, as several literary sources make clear when describing their roles in, say, the death of Agrippina or the populating of the Tyrrhenian with fish, and even in more mundane imperial transport activities.

Partly because of the apparent significance of these functions, by studying them I have argued that we may be able to perceive what I have termed imperial organics: low-level dynamics, possibly engendered by imperial activity, often based on the movement and deployment of people, and which seem to largely grow and function of their own accord, or at least without the direct intentions of the central authority. Thus the basing of the classes at Misenum and Ravenna, which I argued in the previous chapter could partly have depended on natural, historical and strategic influences, but which may also have been determined by the presence of property held by Octavian, concentrated large manpower pools at sites in Italy through which
heavy volumes of traffic passed and from which men could be relatively easily moved about the empire.

These points arguably helped the Italian *classes* to serve as manpower pools for redeployment. Furthermore, as we saw in Chapter Two, the replacement of any men reassigned may have been partly facilitated by processes which can also be regarded as imperial organics. In that case regional interdependencies between Campania and Egypt, particularly focused around the grain trade, could have encouraged movement to Misenum. Moreover, we have observed similar interdependencies between the Danube provinces and the north Adriatic, especially seen in the Aquileian evidence, which may have had some role in encouraging recruitment to the *classis Ravennas*.

In addition, and acknowledging the limitations to the argument mentioned just above, the placement of servicemen near to communications hubs allowed them to support imperial communications formally and informally. The traffic running through Puteoli and Ostia-Portus arguably provided an excellent source of information, even if some of it was far from accurate, which *classis* servicemen could have repeatedly conveyed to Rome, without evidence for close management.

Finally, the development of the imperial coastal landscape relied on several independent factors. Firstly, the attitude of Emperors as high status Romans to the *annona* and to how their property could be used, alongside the potential for imperial coastal building projects being regarded as benefactions which improved the accessibility of Italy. Secondly, the fact that the western Italian coast was already travelled by grain ships bringing supplies to Rome, largely via Puetoli. Thirdly, and concentrating on the potential role of the *classes* in this system, their deployment at imperial property or harbours, which could, for instance, have had as much to do with
providing transport for the Emperor as anything else. The combination of these elements, which contributed to the impression and actualities of imperial “government”, could be conveniently understood as imperial organics.

I stress that my study of imperial organics, their definition and their precise characteristics are at a very preliminary stage. Further questions will be considered in the Conclusion. However, the identification of these low-level systems as heuristic tools could offer a useful way to approach how the Roman empire worked, worrying less about the bureaucracy of Roman administration, for which there discouragingly little evidence and the study of which is so affected by modernist approaches, and trying to understand some day-to-day processes through which the empire functioned and evolved.
Conclusion

This thesis has attempted to understand the nature and functions of war fleets maintained by an empire without maritime rivals. Scholars have offered various solutions: that the Italian classes were kept simply because the Romans liked tradition; that they policed piracy; that they were an insurance policy against military threats that never materialised; that they were a military institution employed primarily to support military logistics. All assume that the imperial classes were like other Mediterranean war fleets, and should be understood primarily through the prism of naval history. Thus, scholars have viewed any attested non-naval tasks as secondary duties performed during long periods of peace, or, as Reddé, in between transporting soldiers and military supplies.

The Introduction presented several problems with equating the imperial Italian classes with other Mediterranean war fleets, including the political conditions in which they operated, and their professional, permanent character. I also noted that the Latin term classis never only meant war fleet, but suggested broader organisational terminology. Therefore, I have approached the classes without preconceptions of their nature and duties.

Hence, I have argued that we should consider the classes as a manpower pool at the disposal of the Emperor, particularly in Italy. This manpower pool was equipped with ships and could be entrusted with tasks suited to a war fleet, as the employment of the classis Misenensis by Otho in AD 69 demonstrates. However, it also performed various terrestrial functions beyond the usual remit of naval organisations.
My argument rests firstly on the identification of *classis* servicemen as a category of *milites* available to the Emperor to perform *militia*, but whose stationing in Italy and rowing training suited them for particular tasks. Where documentary evidence suggests change in the first century AD, I have argued that this can be understood as formalisation comparable to processes commonly proposed to have affected the contemporary *auxilia*, rather than militarisation.

By examining primarily *classis* epitaphs and *diplomata*, Chapter One suggested that these servicemen were a mixture of peregrines, imperial freedmen and Roman citizens, the first group seemingly much in the majority. The nature of the evidence for their origins imposes considerable limitations on detailed recruitment studies. However, there is little evidence for recruitment primarily from the *gens de mer*, implying that the servicemen were not expected to perform exclusively maritime duties, but a range of tasks in support of imperial activity.

Epitaphs and *diplomata*, alongside some often obscure literary evidence, indicate that *classis* servicemen were regarded as *milites* responsible for *militia* comparable to that of the legionaries and *auxilia*. Although the servicemen appear to have been officially categorised as *remiges*, at least in the first century AD, I have argued that this made them no less *milites* than the *pedites* or *equites* of the *auxilia*. Nothing in literary evidence disputes this interpretation, and the flexibility demonstrated by accounts of servicemen acting on land seems to support it.

Chapter Two supplemented the above arguments by analysing processes of recruitment relevant to the second century AD Fayoum. By examining a dossier of papyri, including letters - in particular those of Apion and Apollinarius - wills, contracts and more, I argued that recruitment could be voluntary, affected by the seasons, and partly dependent on the presence or movements of soldiers and veterans.
Thus, despite some evidence for regulation of army enlistment in the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos*, elements beyond the control of Roman authorities should arguably be considered important to recruitment. The evidence is *not* conclusive, but it seems difficult to dispute the point that the sailing seasons had some impact over when recruitment could occur. The complex interplay between the movement of soldiers and veterans and commercial relationships between Egypt and the Bay of Naples, and how these may have affected recruitment of Egyptians into the *classis Misenensis* in particular, offers our first example of imperial organics.

More conclusively, that at least some *classis milites* came from the Fayoum reinforces the argument that the *gens de mer* were not the particular focus of *classis* recruitment. This adds further support to my contention that the Italian *classes* were not purely institutions of the sea. In this context, the Romans appear to have overcome the maritime manpower shortages which Fernand Braudel identified for Mediterranean powers across history. The nature of the *classes*, alongside the political unity of the Mediterranean, may be regarded as partly responsible on an initial analysis.

In Chapter Three, I argued for conceptualising the *classis* installations at Misenum and Ravenna not as “naval bases”, but as sites concentrating imperial resources (*classis* manpower) available to support imperial activity in regions of interest to the Emperor. I presented the limitations of applying the heuristic category of the “naval base” to our Roman imperial installations. Instead, the proximity of the ports at Misenum and Ravenna to imperial property should be taken into account.

Literary and archaeological evidence suggests that imperial interest in the region around Misenum was primarily concentrated in leisure and luxurious display. This is particularly true for Baiae, though the port of Misenum itself was overlooked.
by a *villa maritima*, possibly under imperial ownership from the reigns of Augustus or Tiberius. However, we can set this alongside limited direct evidence, alongside comparative examples, for production at Baian *villae maritiae*. I also adduced Puteoli to demonstrate commercial aspects of the region, and emphasise that Misenum lay in close proximity to one of the major communications hubs of the Tyrrhenian coast, through which traffic potentially of interest to the Emperor passed. A handful of literary examples demonstrate that imperial activity here could be supported by the *classis Misenensis*.

At Ravenna, documentary evidence suggests imperial interests lay mainly in productive estates, perhaps centred around the *regio Ravennatium* attested in the second to third centuries AD, though with ceramics produced at imperial workshops from the Tiberian period at the latest. However, by drawing on the *sinus Baianus*, where leisure and production could be mixed, and by collecting examples of imperial visits to Ravenna and Aquileia, especially in the first century AD, one can argue that imperial properties in the region may also have had leisure and luxury aspects. When we take praise of Altinum by Martial into account, and some known luxury estates of Histria (whose imperial ownership is admittedly speculative), it is possible that the *classis Ravennas* could have been available to support similar imperial activities to those attested around Misenum. In this connection, one must also note the role of Aquileia as a major commercial and communications hub. Despite the similarities, it would be going too far to say that the regions were identical: a greater emphasis on imperial military activity, especially under Augustus and in the latter half of the second century AD, may be seen around Ravenna than Misenum.

At both Misenum and Ravenna, I have argued that property ownership by Octavian may have partly encouraged the deployment of the *classes*, though we must
not neglect geographical, historical and strategic factors. Property ownership by Caesar is directly attested near Misenum, while it is possible that the villa of Lucullus had fallen into Caesarian hands before the creation of the classis. The evidence for Ravenna is less explicit, and the situation harder to unravel because the classis port remains elusive, but residence by Caesar at the city, alongside plans to build a gladiator school make his ownership of land a tempting possibility. If correct, this has potentially significant implications for why imperial resources were located at particular sites, in Italy at least.

Building on some major arguments in the previous sections, Chapter Four contended that the Italian classis manpower pools were involved in several systems of significance to the functioning of the empire. Thus, in an analysis of literary evidence and diplomata typically associated with the civil wars of AD 68-70 and AD 193, alongside the Bar Kokhba war, I proposed that the Italian classis servicemen were part of the manpower mobilisation and redeployment system of the empire. They appear to have been redeployed to land duties in emergencies, but there is some evidence that they were considered a manpower pool to be drawn on in more usual circumstances.

Secondly, I argued that the classes supported several types of imperial communications. Literary evidence suggests that they transported Emperors, and possibly imperial family members, along the Tyrrhenian coast of Italy; it is plausible, though nowhere shown, that the classis Ravennas performed a similar function in the east. A classis detachment appears to have carried imperial agents between Italy and Greece at Brundisium, though we cannot say whether this arrangement was found elsewhere. Lastly, I contended that servicemen acted as couriers between Puteoli and Ostia-Portus and Rome, possibly carrying imperial correspondence, but arguably
bringing informal reports based on information passing through those ports. There is no evidence for a similar system operating around Ravenna, but its position in relation to major communications routes renders such an arrangement at least plausible.

Thirdly, I proposed that the Italian *classes* were part of a imperial coastal landscape which developed across our period on the western shores of Italy leading to Rome. This function is different from the other two discussed, exploring the possible ideological effects of *classis milites* being present in particular places, rather than tasks entrusted to them. The harbours and other infrastructural elements of this system functioned practically to support the grain supply of Rome, by providing docking facilities and potentially ports of call offering safe havens. Based on evidence for the importance of the perception of the Emperor as a benefactor guaranteeing the grain supply, and for similar attitudes towards imperial provision of harbour facilities, I suggested that this system could have had an ideological function of emphasising the role of the Emperor in these areas. Because of their particular association with the imperial house and with supporting imperial activity, *classis* servicemen associated with imperial harbours, near to imperial properties or otherwise, could be considered one element in this expression of imperial authority and benefaction. The lack of direct testimony for this function, aside from a possible allusion by Appian, is problematic, but it seems difficult to assert that *classis* servicemen had no ideological impact as human representatives of imperial power.

In the above examples, I have suggested that we can perceive low-level systems, which I have defined as imperial organics, often revolving around the relationship of the placement of imperial agents or resources and movement of people, which largely functioned without too much interference from any central
authority. These imperial organics may be a useful tool for investigating how the Roman empire formed, functioned and evolved from an almost bottom-up perspective, and could offer an alternative to traditional thinking about Roman “government” and administration.

Aside from their implications for the Italian classes, my arguments suggest alternative approaches to their provincial counterparts. As mentioned in the Introduction, the rather different human and environmental conditions in which they operated would have potentially engendered in them different characters. I have emphasised, at least around Italy, the apparently significant connection between the Italian classes and imperial activity. One might expect the link to be weaker in the provinces. On the other hand, certain fundamentals, such as their conception as milites, could well have been similar.

Moreover, the arguments of this thesis could affect how we think about Roman classes of earlier and later periods. Courtois and Starr proposed that Roman naval power in the Mediterranean collapsed in the third century AD. Evidence cited includes several inscriptions honouring men apparently entrusted with special commands against piracy, implying that the imperial classes no longer suppressed this menace, alongside a simple absence of literary references.

Departing completely from this narrative, Reddé argued that the Italian classes remained important in the third century and the Mediterranean largely peaceful, citing examples of men with classis commands who he argues ran logistics operations. These included C. Sulgius Caecilianus, praepositus reliquationi classis

\[1232\] Courtois (1939) 42-7, 225-38; Starr (1960) 191-2.

\[1233\] E.g. CIG 2509 from Cos, dated to AD 232/3, honouring P. Sallustius Sempronius Victor because: τῆς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν θάλασσαν ἀσφαλείαν ἑγεμόναν εἰρήνης μετ’ ἐξουσίας σιδήρου; cf. Reddé (1986) 607. See also AE 1948 201; ILS 8870 (= IGRRP III 481).

praetoriae Misenatium Piae Vindicis under Severus Alexander. Thus, for Reddé, the character of the classes remained essentially unchanged. However, given that I have contested his view that the Italian classes were primarily responsible for military logistics, such examples should be reconsidered.

Looking back to the Republican period, the relationship of the Italian classes to what went before has drawn interest. The last century of the Republic and especially the civil wars are typically seen as the main influence in determining the formation and character of the permanent Italian classes, because they demonstrated to Octavian the importance of sea power as represented by Hellenistic war fleets. Picking up on earlier work, Starr saw potential models in the forces raised by Pompey in 67 BC, and the fleets in Asia and Italy, which he argued were maintained in 62-1 BC. Reddé identified two major Republican naval fallibilities, their improvisational character, and the weakness of western naval resources, arguing that the imperial classes were designed as a response them.

Certainly, the civil wars resulted in Octavian commanding a large number of ships and crews, and something had to be done with them after the deaths of Antony and Cleopatra. However, given the observable differences between the Italian classes and typical war fleets, we might question the supposed influence of these civil maritime conflicts on their character.

Perhaps we should not ignore the influence of the real or imagined Republican past. Roman elites of the Late Republic and imperial period possessed a respect for

---

1236 E.g. De La Berge (1886) 67; Fiebiger (1894) 280-1; Starr (1960) 4-8; Reddé (1986) 463-72.
1237 Starr (1960) 3-4; see also De La Berge (1886) 66-7; Fiebiger (1894) 279-80; Chapot (1896) 40-2. Regarding 62-1 BC see Cic. Flac. 26-33. Cicero (Flac. 30) does speak of money spent on the Tyrrenian and Adriatic in 62 BC, but this must be interpreted in the specific context of the aftermath of the campaigns of Pompey.
1238 Reddé (1986) 486.
the past and claimed to desire to emulate the actions of their ancestors, as visible in the recent examination by Van der Blom of how Cicero used *exempla*.\(^{1239}\)

Turning to how the Romans are supposed to have managed the coasts of Italy from the fourth century BC, one encounters the phenomenon of *coloniae maritimae*. Defining them as coastal citizen *coloniae* in his classic study of Republican colonisation, Salmon argued that they were created to protect littoral Italy.\(^{1240}\) This view has been criticised by Galsterer, who has argued that the populations of the *coloniae* were insufficient to serve as coastal fortifications.\(^{1241}\)

This debate is not fundamental here, because I am concerned with what the Romans of the Late Republic and Empire thought about their past. More recently, Bispham has argued that traditions concerned with colonisation before the second century BC cannot be taken at face value, and were probably constructed in light of later practices.\(^{1242}\) We must therefore be extremely cautious in accepting the *colonia maritima* as a genuine Mid-Republican concept. Nonetheless, our evidence conveys what later writers thought about early colonisation, relevant when considering how the Republican past might have informed decisions taken in the imperial present.

Some traditions suggest that many early *coloniae* were founded to expand and control Roman territory and conquered peoples. Appian connected Republican *coloniae* with garrisons:\(^{1243}\)

---

\(^{1239}\) Van der Blom (2010) esp. 1-17, including a thorough collection of previous bibliography. Note also Peachin (2007), arguing that *exempla* were considered a major constitutional principle for the ‘imperial regime’, and p. 76 n.6 for bibliography.

\(^{1240}\) Salmon (1969) 71-81; *cf.* Sherwin-White (1973) 77.

\(^{1241}\) Galsterer (1976) 41-6.


\(^{1243}\) App. *B Civ.* 1.7.
Ῥωμαῖοι τὴν Ἰταλίαν πολέμῳ κατὰ μέρη χειρούμενοι γῆς μέρος ἐλάμβανον καὶ πόλεις ἐνῴκιζον ἢ ἐς τὰς πρότερον οὔσας κληρούχους ἀπὸ σφῶν κατέλεγον. καὶ τάδε μὲν ἀντὶ φρουρίων ἐπενόουν...

These ideas are found in Augustan reconstructions of the past. Thus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus recorded that Romulus established *coloniae* at Caenina and Antemnae to prevent their inhabitants from attacking Rome again. Livy mentioned that Tarquinius Superbus sent out settlers to Signia and Circei to be *praesidia* for Rome. In 63 BC, Cicero had described *coloniae* as *propugnacula imperi*, though this was perhaps primarily to stress the nefarious consequences of the *lex agraria* of P. Servilius Rullus, whom he accused of scheming to develop colonies as a threat to Rome.

Siculus Flaccus, a land surveyor considered to have written during the second century AD, connected *coloniae maritimae* with defence. He stated that most people believed (*quod pluribus placet, maritimas appellari existimant ideo*) that they were called *coloniae maritimae* because all of the shores of Italy faced opponents. Thus, colonists were sent out to guard Italian shores: *in his ergo litoribus Romani colonos miserunt, ut supra diximus, qui ora<s> Italiae tuerentur.*

Livy refers to these *coloniae* indirectly when he mentions their inhabitants as *coloni maritimi* asserting their rights to their *sacrosancta vacatio* from military service in 207 and 191 BC. In total ten sites are named: Ostia, Antium, Tarracina (Anxur), Alsium, Minturnae, Sinuessa, Sena, Fregenae, Castrum Novum and Pyrgi.

1245 Livy 1.56.3; for other examples see e.g. Livy 2.34.6; Dion. Hal. *Ant Rom*. 3.49.
1248 Ibid. p. 102 II.23-7.
1249 Ibid. p. 102 II.27-8.
1250 Livy 27.38.3-4; 36.3.4. Salmon (1969) 90, 97-9 argues that this *vacatio* was based on the inhabitants having to reside in their *coloniae* and guard the shores.
Regarding the deductions at Minturnae and Sinuessa in 296 BC, Livy stated that the Romans were considering the protection of a region laid waste by the Samnites (de praesidio regionis depopulatae ab Samnitibus agitari coeptum).\(^{1251}\) That these sites were regarded by Livy as watch-posts is underlined by the unwillingness of citizens to move to them, because they would have to settle stationes perpetuae in an infesta regio.\(^{1252}\) Unfortunately, this is the only direct statement on why any coloniae maritimae were founded.\(^{1253}\)

There are critical differences between these coloniae and the imperial Italian classes: the former were citizen settlements, and, if Salmon was correct, were not considered bases from which to launch naval expeditions. The mostly non-citizen Italian classes were demonstrably equipped with ships and had maritime duties. But, in their association in certain places with imperial villae maritimae (thus particular locations which themselves had some history as defensive structures), bearing in mind that some of their duties were carried out on land, and recalling the possible perception of the classes by Appian as ἐπίνειοι φρουραί (noting that Appian himself considered coloniae as substitutes for φρούρια), certain echoes of the coloniae maritimae come to mind. The arguments presented here should at least encourage debate of how the Romans viewed and “managed” coastal regions, re-examining in detail the ora maritima.

This opens up further discussion on how “governmental” decisions were made during our period, and how the Roman empire “worked”. This thesis has suggested that one approach to such difficult questions may be through the identification of the

\(^{1251}\) Livy 10.21.7.
\(^{1252}\) Ibid. 10.21.10.
\(^{1253}\) The archaeology of known sites points to small fortifications in their earliest phases: see esp. for Ostia Calza ed. (1953) 63-77; Meiggs (1973) 20-3; Von Hesberg (1985) 129-37; Pavolini (2006) 22-3, 26-30. For collected evidence from some other sites see Von Hesberg (1985).
low-end dynamics which I have categorised as imperial organics. Such an approach would appear to offer an alternative to traditional debates over the nature of Roman administration, and could usefully integrate various fields of social, economic, cultural etc. history.

As one possible field of inquiry, we could examine what part local or regional interdependencies and imperial activity had in processes of recruitment of other categories of Roman milites. The Batavians, discussed several times in this thesis, and for whom we have evidence of recruitment for a continuous period, could be a valuable case-study. Alternatively, the question remains of why northern Italy appears to have been so significant for praetorian recruitment in the first two centuries AD. Indeed, the place of regio X as among the major sources is rather striking: one wonders about the role of communications networks and, for example, traffic along the via Flaminia in encouraging movement to Rome. Bringing together the epigraphic evidence for praetorian origins with material concerning particular cities and their connections with Rome, alongside any imperial activity in their territories, could point the way forward in a study of these patterns.

As another example, the concept of imperial organics could be applied to mining and quarrying operations in our period. Alfred Hirt has done much to elucidate how imperial mines and quarries were organised and administered, while the work of Ben Russell sets stone quarrying in a wider economic context, and emphasises the significance of local and regional patterns of production and demand, alongside the influence which imperial demand exercised on the stone trade. The administration at arm’s length which both of these scholars have proposed for

---

1254 Durry (1938) 239-47; Passerini (1939) 148-71.
1255 For collected evidence for recruitment from regio X, see Passerini (1939) 154-4. Etruria was also apparently important: see Passerini (1939) 151-2.
1256 Hirt (2010); Russell (2013).
imperial interests may fit well with elements of imperial organics. But one also wonders, for instance, how imperial exploitation of a particular resource, and the deployment of imperial representatives at some sites, affected or was affected by patterns of movement possibly already established. We could ask whether the exploitation of the Egyptian Red Sea quarries encouraged movement along routes which extracted stone followed to Rome.\footnote{1257} Again, one might see in this the potential for better understanding how imperial activity, intentional or otherwise, encouraged the mobilisation of manpower resources.

We can briefly catalogue some other areas on which the arguments of this thesis could have influence. One is the status and roles of the Roman imperial *miles*. I have argued that *classis* servicemen were regarded as *milites* who performed *militia*. Their placement within that group suggests a broader understanding of the term than sometimes supposed. We saw that a “paramilitary” group such as the *Vigiles* were also regarded and organised as *milites*. Additionally, we know that quasi-military terminology could be extended to certain groups of freedmen who can barely be regarded as performing “military” tasks: for instance, while the *tabellarii* do not seem to have been called *milites*, they did have *optiones* and *praepositi*, whose precise functions are unclear.\footnote{1258}

The latter in particular suggests an interesting blurring between the status and functions of *milites* and slaves. In a recent study of Roman military service, Sara Phang has pointed to the similarities, at least from an elite and legalistic perspective,
between militia and servile existence, especially in punishment and menial labour. This problem may deserve a more in-depth examination, also taking into account the debate over the relationship between soldier and civilian in Roman society. It may be helpful to approach milites as an organisational category, attempting to put aside their associations with modern soldiers and military service. Moreover, the development of militia between Republic and Empire deserves further close examination, to see if we can better understand the transition between a system in which all Roman citizens could be expected to perform militia, and one in which such services were confined to one group, and performed for the sake of the Emperor.

Secondly, Chapter One underlined some of the difficulties the epigraphic evidence presents for traditional recruitment studies, but encouraged alternative approaches. On diplomata, Richard Talbert has recently offered some very preliminary comments on how these documents could be used for researching Roman worldview. His approach appears to be supported by the observable developments in classis diplomata, which indicate the increasing importance of geographical identity in the second century AD. A fuller study of all diplomata, placed alongside other evidence for changing views of the empire, would therefore appear worthwhile. If Talbert is correct in the assumption that these documents represent non-elite perceptions of the Roman world, a comparison with elite ideas could be instructive.

---

1259 Phang (2008) 130, 227-39; cf. Campbell (1984) 303-14. For similarities between attitudes to slave and soldierly punishment see e.g. Arrius Menander at Dig. 49.16.4.14: levius itaque delictum emansionis habetur; ut erronis in servis, desertionis gravius, ut in fugitivis; cf. Tac. Ann. 14.44 and Phang (2008) 229-30. As a counterbalance (pp. 242-6), Phang notes that labor and virtus were associated. The picture is more complicated than a simple militia = servitium equation, but the parallelisms are worth considering.


1261 Talbert (2013).
One could add that Chapter Three urges further work on the character of Roman ports, or even ports in Antiquity. Having argued that the bases at Misenum and Ravenna could be regarded as support bases for regional imperial activity, we could compare them to other Mediterranean “naval bases” at other times, to see if there were evolutions in the uses of “state-controlled” ports, and the sort of economic or social relations which they had within a local or regional context. Some steps have been taken recently by Baika, at least in an urban context, though in that case the work often relies on some uncertain reconstructions of archaeological data.\footnote{Baika (2013c).}

Acknowledging the great difficulties of the evidence, this thesis has attempted to provide an alternative framework for examining the Italian classes. In doing so, it has suggested that in the first two centuries AD the classes were a significant manpower resource for the Emperors in Italy, but one which could potentially act across the Mediterranean. Returning to the themes of the introductory section, the classes seem to have emerged, perhaps surprisingly given the pessimism of so much scholarship, as a rather eloquent demonstration of imperial power over land and sea.
Appendix

Freedman type

1. *CIL* X 3357 (= *ILS* 2817), Misenum.

C(aio) Iulio Caesaris
l(iberto) Automato trierar(cho)
Iulia C(ai) l(iberta) Plusia soror
fecit et sibi et suis.

2. *CIL* X 3358 (= *ILS* 2818), Misenum.

Ti(berius) Iulius Aug(usti) et
Augustae l(ibertus) Diogenes tr(ierarchus)
sibi et Nigidiae Eutychiae
coniugi et suis Nigidia Eutychia
S[ta]beriae C(ai) l(ibertae) Margaritae amicae
suae h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).

3. *CIL* VI 8927 (= *ILS* 2823), Rome.

Ti(berio) Iulio Aug(usti) l(iberto) Hilaro
nauarcho Tiberiano
Claudia Basilea
viro suo.

4. *CIL* XIII 3542, Bononia (Boulogne-sur-Mer).

Ti(berius) Claudius
Aug(usti) l(ibertus) Seleucus
tr(ierarchus) monument(um)
fecit Claudiae
Primae l(ibertae) suae.


C(aius) Iulius Aug(usti) l(ibertus)
Hilarus
nauarchus
sibi et
Iuliae Nice
coniugi suae
posterisque suis.
Freedmen / Peregrines


Caspius
trierarchus
Ti(beri) Caesaris hic
situs est.

7. *CIL VI 8929* (= *ILS 2820*), Rome

Helios Caesaris trierarchus.

8. *CIL IX 41* (= *ILS 2819*), Brundisium.

Iulia Cleo-
patra quae et
Lezbia C(ai) Iuli Men-
ootis f(ilia)\(^{1263}\) Antiochensis
Syriae ad Daphnem
uxor Malchionis
Caesaris trierarchi de
triere Triptolemo.


Antho Caesaris
trierarcho Liviano
C(aius) Iulius Iaso f(aciendum) c(uravit).


Athenio de
III Danae coro-
narius Quartae
Aufidia uxori suae
benevolenti eius et
honoris caussa
fecit h(ic) s(itus) e(st).

---

\(^{1263}\) Mommsen omits *f* in *CIL* IX, but Dessau includes it without comment.
11. *InscrAq* II 2821 (= CIL V 1048; cf. Panciera (2006c) 1288-9), Aquileia.

Sestia
Lini tr(ierarchi)
[d]e lib(urna) Aug(usta)
[---].


Aurelio\(^{1264}\)
ex l(iburna) Sal(via)
Augusta
an(norum) LX st(ipendiorum)
XXX h(ic) e(st) s(itus).

13. *AE* 1966 97 (= Sciarra (1963) no.84), Brundisium.

Marcinus\(^{1265}\)
cemturio*(sic)* de […]\(^{1266}\)
Triptolemo […]

Peregrines – serving


Idiopantus Alex-
andri f(ilius)
d(e) liburna Mur-
ena vixit an(n)o-
s XXXVIII militavi-
t an(n)os XVI
h(ic) s(itus).

---

\(^{1264}\) EE VIII 734 follows the suggested readings of Mommsen (based on copies made by M. Tamponi), as presented by Fiorelli in *NSA* (1888), p. 402, leaving the first line unrestored, possibly as A[...]C[...]+O (see Le Bohec (1990) 116). Haverfield in *CR* 3 (1889), p. 228, also drawing on Tamponi’s copies, proposed *Aurelio*, but this cannot be verified. Moreover, the texts presented in *NSA* and *CR* both read XXX in line five. However, Ihm in *EE* prints XX, though notes Mommsen on the text: ‘an(norum) LX st(ipendiorum) XXX’. Le Bohec (1990) 116 took this as showing Mommsen restored the service length, i.e. XX[X], though one wonders whether Ihm’s XX is simply an error. Le Bohec further proposed *augustalis* for *Augusta* in line three, but this does not seem especially likely.

\(^{1265}\) Note *CIL* XIII (= ILS 2559 = Bauchhenß (1978) no.40), considered Neronian: *Marcinus Suri/cons filius* Brequis(s)/es ex coht(orte) VIII / Brevcorum… This Marcinus was of the Illyrian Breuci, from Pannonia Inferior. Given the number of Pannonians and Dalmatians in the Italian classes, perhaps our Marcinus was also Illyrian.

\(^{1266}\) The presentation of the text by J. Gagé, *et al.* in *AE* 1966 does not make clear that the line *may* not end here; the stone is broken, with potentially space for a few letters.

Batol[a]e Dionis f(ilio)
de libur[n]a Clupeo
t(estamento) [f(ieri)] i(ussit)
Paius Ver[zonis] f(ilius)
de Mârte
bic[r]ota
v(ivus) f(ecit) s[ibi] et suis
lib(ertis) lib(ertabus)q(ue).

16. *ILS* 2826 (= *CIL* IX 42), Brundisium.

Scaeva Liccai
mil(es) de lib(urna) Triton(e)
[(centurio) M(arci) Vetti vixi[t] an(nos)
XXXV mil(itavit) an(nos) [---]
h(ic) s(itus).

17. *CIL* IX 43 (= *ILS* 2874), Brundisium.

[---]ulo Pinthisi
f(ilio) de triere
Quadrig(a) vixit
an(nos) XXXV h(ic) s(itus)
Symphonia-
cus.

18. *CIL* IX 3892 (= *ILS* 2825), Lucus (Luco).

Vero Misai f(ilius)
miles ex clas(se)
Raven(nate)
stip(endiorum) XII vix(it)
a(nnos) XXX h(ic) s(itus) e(st).


Basus Virti
f(ilius) an(nos) XVIII d(e)
Neptuno IIII
dis P(enatibus?) hic sit(us)
est.

Phallaeus  
Dioclis f(ilius) guber(nator)  
de Galeat(a)\(^{1267}\) Pieris  
et Nice l(ibertae) p(atrono) f(ecerunt)  
in fr(onte) p(edes) VI in agr(o)  
p(edes) XV.


Ulcia M(arci) l(iberta) Glap(h)yr(a)  
ob meritis eius  
posuerunt T(itus) Alfius  
Labeo et Murcius  
Zanatis f(ilius) et Suavis  
di(*sic*) liburna Diana.


Velageno  
Caroni f(ilius)  
Gralis d(e) vico  
Clablo dol-  
ator d(e) libu/rna Satura  
et tu.


Daza Panet-  
tis f(ilius) an(nos)  
vix(it) XXX mi-  
lit(avit) XVI III  
Corcodo-  
lo(*sic*) f(ecit) Plusia  
lib(erta) patro(no)  
suo et sibi  
in fron(te) p(edes) IV.


Liccaeus  
Verzonis f(ilius) l((centurio)  
testament(o)  
fieri iussit.

\(^{1267}\) Probably the name of the ship, as Bormann in *CIL XI* (1888), p.22 suggests.

Cleo Lucc[i(?)] f(ilius)\(^{1268}\)
trierarchus
Didymo Lucc[ei(?)] f(ilio)]
fratri [(centurioni)
sibi et suis
l(oenus) m(onumenti) q(uo)q(uo) v(ersus) p(edes) X[VI?].


Clemens
Caprari [(centurionis)
f(ilius) de lib(urna) Pinn(ata)
h(ic) s(itus) e(st).


Liccaeus Ve[i] f(ilius)
[(centurio) de liburna
Lucusta
testamento
fieri iussit arbit(ratu)
Dabali Triti
heredis
a(mico) mer(ito) an(norum) XXX
loc(us) publ(ice) dat(us).


Verzo
Themi f(ilius)
de libur(na)
Tritone
militavit annos XX
vix(it) ann(os) XXXX
h(ic) s(itus) e(st).


Apella Socratis
fil(ius)
guber(nator) de Neptu(no)
Eros et Aneros l(iberti)
de suo.

\(^{1268}\) Brusin (1970) 572 restored *Cleo Lucc[ius]*, and *Didymo Lucc[eio]*. However, given the context of naming patterns within the *classis* in the earlier first century, a filiation is possible.
30. *TitAq* II 609, *Aquincum*.\(^{1269}\)

Eburo Milionis fil(ius) miles
in classe
an(norum) LII
h(ic) s(itus) e(st).


[......]us Dabali f(ilius)
[......]o de lib(urna) Margarita
[sibi et (?)] Q(uinto) Valerio Apro et Valeriae
[......]ae contubernali suae et
[liberti]s libertabusque suis
[posteri]sque omnibus testament(o)
[---].

32. *ILN* I 23 (= *CIL* XII 5736 = *ILS* 2830), *Forum Iulii*.\(^{1270}\)

[---P]ọṣṭuṃọ[---]
[---A]rstonis[---]
[---c]eleustae[---].

**Peregrines – Veterans.**


L(ucio) Decimio
Scave
Dercelonis
f(ilio)
missicius ex
classe Monus.

34. *CIL* X 3361 (= *ILS* 2844), *Misenum*.

C(aius) Marcius Volson(is)
f(ilius) Serg(ius) Maximus tr(iearchus)
de lib(urna) Aquila sibi et
Siliae Eutychiae uxori
et libertis libertab(usque) posterisq(ue)
eorum omnib(us) t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussit) ex HS X(milibus) adiecit eo
Silia Eutychia coniunx HS VIII(milibus) CCC.

\(^{1269}\) Mócsy (1968) 305 and more recently M. Németh in *TitAq* II (2010), p.93 proposed that this man had served in an Italian *classis*. This is plausible given *classis* recruitment from this region, though alternatively he could have belonged to a provincial *classis*.

\(^{1270}\) A very uncertain case, with a peregrine name formula only a possibility: see J. Gascou and M. Janon in *ILN* I (1985), p.60.

P(ublius) Arrius P(ubli) f(ilius) Montanus
Mocazia Helpis uxor
P(ublius) Arrius Polux
Q(uintus) Decimius Dacus opt(io) de III
Pinnata Mocazia Iucunda uxo[r]
P(ublius) Arrius P(ubli) l(ibertus) Primigenius
P(ublius) Arrius P(ubli) l(ibertus) Castor.

36. *ILS 9218 (= AE 1900 185)*, Brundisium.

L(ucius) Boionius Zeno
veteranus de Phryge
triere nauta v(ixit) a(nnos) XCV
h(ic) s(itus).

**Roman Citizens**

37. *CIL VI 2491*, Rome.

[---]lus M(arci) f(ilius) Ani[es(ni)] Crispus
[mil(es)] coh(ortis) III pr(aetoriae) fecit
[---]nio M(arci) f(ilio) An(iensi) Silvano
[fraitri]i suo mil(itii) coh(ortis) III pr(aetoriae)
[mil(itavit) annos] VII vix(it) ann(os) XXVII m(ensem) I
[M(arco)---]nio C(ai) [f(ilio)] A[n(iensi)] Silvano pat[r]i
[veter]ano ex classe Misen(ense)
[---]nio Abascanto lib(erto)
[---]niae Chr[y]sidi lib(ertae)
[liber]tis libertabus
[poste]risque eorum
[in] f(ronte) p(edes) XXII in agr(ore) p(edes) XX
[Abasc]antus ad[i]cet ad
monument(um)
[in f(ronte)] p(edes) VIII s(emisse) in agr(o) p(edes) XXV.


G(aio) Mucio G(ai) f(ilio) Cla-
udio Gemenelo
mathe(maticulo) tr(ierarchi) ex
classe Ravenn-
ate quravit
M(arccus) Aemilius
Fuscus optio.
39. *InscrAqu II 2823* (= *CIL V* 938 = *ILS* 2905 = *AE* 1972 194), Aquileia.

L(ucius) Trebius T(iti) f(ilius)
pater //
L(ucius) Trebius L(uci) f(ilius) Ruso
fieri iussit //
natus sum summa in pauperie merui post classicus miles
ad latus Augusti annos septemque decemque
nullo odio sine offensa missus quoq(ue) honesta
l(ocus) p(edum) q(uadratorum) XVI.


[hoc monimen(tum)---] A(ppaeus A(uli) f(ilius) Agricola
[vet(erus)? ex classe sexvir Aug(ustalis)]
[testamento fieri iussit si]bi et Aufidiae Q(uinti) f(iliae) uxori
[heredes fec(erunt) arb]itr(atu) Aufidiae Q(uinti) f(iliae) Secund(ae)
[sor(oris) uxor(is)] et Suavis l(iberti)?:

41. *IG IX 1.4.1548* (= *AE 2001 1789b*), Sami.

Ditius Pa[---]
faber nava[li]s
militavit a(nnos) XXXV
domo Savona
have viator
estis bibitis
moriendu(m) (e)st.
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