

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era.

نظام الضرائب العينية في روما قبل العصر الإمبراطوري المبكر.

**Noureddine Karima* (University of Mouloud Mammeri
Tizi Ouzou ; Algeria)**

karima.noureddine@ummtto.dz

Received: 06/03/2025 Accepted: 19/05/2025 Published:05/06/2025

Abstract:

The Roman in-kind tax system before the early Imperial era was a cornerstone of the Republic's economic and administrative structure. This system primarily involved the collection of goods such as grain, livestock, and other agricultural produce to support the state's financial needs. The reliance on agrarian output reflected the predominantly rural and subsistence-based economy of early Rome. This paper explores the development, administration, and socio-economic impact of the in-kind tax system, highlighting its role in financing public expenditures, sustaining military campaigns, and facilitating state-sponsored grain distributions. By analyzing historical records and scholarly interpretations, the study underscores how these taxation practices laid the foundation for more sophisticated fiscal mechanisms under the Empire.

Keywords: Roman taxation; in-kind tax; agrarian economy; public finance; early Republic; grain distribution.

***- Noureddine Karima**

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

ملخص:

كان نظام الضرائب العينية في روما قبل العصر الإمبراطوري المبكر حجر الأساس في الهيكل الاقتصادي والإداري للجمهورية. وقد اعتمد هذا النظام بشكل أساسي على جمع السلع مثل الحبوب والماشية والمنتجات الزراعية الأخرى لتلبية الاحتياجات المالية للدولة. وتعكس هذه الضرائب المستندة إلى الإنتاج الزراعي طبيعة الاقتصاد الروماني المبكر، الذي كان يغلب عليه الطابع الريفي والمعيشة القائمة على الكفاف. تتناول هذه الورقة البحثية تطور هذا النظام وإدارته وتأثيره الاجتماعي والاقتصادي، مع إبراز دوره في تمويل النفقات العامة ودعم الحملات العسكرية وتوزيع الحبوب الذي ترعاه الدولة. ومن خلال تحليل السجلات التاريخية وتفسيرات الباحثين، يوضح البحث كيف أسهمت هذه الممارسات الضريبية في تأسيس آليات مالية أكثر تطوراً في ظل الإمبراطورية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الضرائب الرومانية، الضرائب العينية، الاقتصاد الزراعي، المالية العامة، الجمهورية المبكرة، توزيع الحبوب. (*)

Introduction:

The tax system of ancient Rome before the early Imperial era represents a critical aspect of the Republic's economic history, reflecting the societal and administrative complexities of the time. Taxation, in the form of goods rather than currency, was a fundamental tool for financing the state's activities, particularly during its formative years when coinage was less prevalent, and economic practices were largely agrarian. This period witnessed the systematic collection of agricultural produce -primarily grain- alongside other essential goods, serving as the backbone of public finance.

The origins of the in-kind tax system can be traced back to Rome's early agricultural society, where land ownership and productivity were closely tied to civic obligations. Roman citizens, especially landowners, were required to contribute a portion of their yield to the state. The collection and redistribution of these resources were managed through various administrative mechanisms, including the *annona* system, which played a pivotal role in ensuring a stable food supply for the growing urban population.

The primary purpose of the in-kind tax system was to support the Roman military, public infrastructure, and grain distributions to citizens, particularly during periods of economic distress or political unrest. The system's efficiency depended heavily on local magistrates and tax farmers, who were tasked with assessing and collecting these taxes from rural communities. Over time, the administrative practices associated with this system evolved in response to Rome's territorial expansion and the increasing complexity of its economy.

This paper examines the key components of the in-kind tax system, including the types of goods collected, the administrative procedures employed, and the socio-economic implications for Roman citizens and provincial inhabitants. It also investigates the challenges and criticisms faced by the system, such as corruption among tax collectors and regional disparities in tax burdens.

By analyzing historical accounts from authors like Livy and Cicero, along with archaeological evidence, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of the in-kind tax system's function and significance. Furthermore, it explores how these practices set the stage for the transition to monetary taxation under the Imperial administration, reflecting broader economic and political transformations within the Roman state.

Ultimately, understanding the in-kind tax system before the early Imperial era offers valuable insights into the fiscal strategies of ancient Rome and their long-term impact on the Empire's administrative evolution. The analysis highlights the adaptive nature of Roman fiscal policies and their enduring influence on subsequent economic systems in the Mediterranean world.

I. The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era Officials of the In-Kind Tax System

1. Temporary Governors of the In-Kind Tax

The aediles were among the earliest officials in Rome (Mommsen: 483) tasked with managing the *Annona* (grain supply and

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

food distribution system)¹. They had previously been responsible for distributing in-kind and monetary aid at the entrance of the Temple of Ceres. In this sense, they were already somewhat designated to manage a service that included assisting the poor while simultaneously ensuring the city's food supply (Gaffiot, 2001 : 465). Cicero defined the role of the aediles as: "**Curator urbis annonae ludorumque solemnium**" ("City curator, manager of the Annona, and overseer of public games.")

However, unlike the city administration (*cura urbis*), which was exercised by each aedile individually within their designated district, the management of the *Annona* was conducted collectively and extended to the entire city (Mommsen: 471-492).

The *Annona* administration generally encompassed all matters related to Rome's food supply, including ensuring market diversity, maintaining order, guaranteeing the quality of goods - especially grains - according to weight and standards, and preventing price inflation, monopolies, and usury in grain trade.

To maintain stable prices in the market, the aedile would, at an early stage, purchase significant quantities of imported wheat from Umbria, Etruria, and Sicily.

Aediles' Jurisdiction and Punitive Measures:

The aediles had the authority to impose the following penalties in relation to their duties:

1. They had the power to independently resolve cases of police order violations issued under their authority. They possessed the right of **Pignoris capio** (seizure of property as a penalty) and **Jus Mulctae** (the right to impose fines). Their court was located in the Forum, at the entrance of the Temple of Ceres (*ad oedem Cereris*).

In cases of more serious offenses, such as usury and hoarding of goods, they prosecuted offenders and rendered judgments before the

¹ -Aedilis, a Roman official in charge of the municipal police, the supply of Rome, the control of markets, the organization of certain games (*cura ludorum*) and the preservation of archives. During the reign of Caesar, two new positions were established, namely the aediles cereales, in charge of supplying Rome.

people. The aedile would preside over the assembly (*Comitia Tributa*), while others addressed the plebeian council (*Concilia Plebis*) (Balsdon, 1960 : 57-60).

2. Finally, the fines collected were deposited into a special fund managed by the aedile, allocated either to public games or projects of general benefit (Balsdon, op.cit : 57-60).

However, as Rome expanded, the aediles became unable to handle the increasing complexity of their duties. In 44 BCE, Julius Caesar appointed two new officials to manage the *Annona* exclusively. These officials were chosen from the plebeian class and were designated as the **Aediles Plebei Ceriales** (Plebeian Grain Aediles) (Jannier, 1960).

Regarding their judicial responsibilities, disputes related to grain distribution were assigned to two newly appointed *Judges of Grain* (*iudices frumentarii*), who were appointed at the same time as the Grain Aediles (Sabbatucci, 1955 : 294-301).

The aediles also had key assistants, including provincial governors who were entrusted with specific tasks related to food supply management. Another crucial figure was the **Quaestor Ostionensis**, responsible for overseeing goods arriving by sea.

Alongside the aedile, the *Comitia Tributa* (People's Assembly) played a role, and in emergency situations, special commissioners were appointed for temporary and specific missions related to city supply.

For this reason, the historian Titus Livius (*Tite-Live*) used the term **Curatores Annonae** to describe the administration of food supply (Smith, 1978).

Expansion of Authority Beyond Rome

The jurisdiction of the aediles was limited to Rome itself, and they lacked the authority to take supply measures in the provinces. This necessitated the appointment of new officials known as **Praefecti Annonae**. These officials were sometimes appointed by the Senate and, at other times, through a public referendum. They were selected from among the most distinguished figures of the Republic.

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

A notable early example was **Minucius Augurinus**, who was appointed in 440 BCE to protect Rome from famine. He made large grain purchases in Umbria and Sicily, and after successfully averting the crisis, he resigned from his position. Later, in 57 BCE, **Pompey** was assigned the same responsibilities for five years. He was granted fifteen senatorial assistants and given broad discretionary powers, including control over all public treasury resources, the authority to outfit fleets, and the ability to direct naval forces even above their appointed commanders.

After the assassination of Caesar in 44 BCE, **Brutus and Cassius** were granted similar powers. Finally, **Augustus** was entrusted with these duties by the people and retained them for some time. To assist in food distribution, he appointed two former praetors.

Four years later, Augustus established the **permanent position of Prefect of the Annona (*Praefectus Annonae*)**, who operated under his direct authority. This office was supported by four former praetors elected through popular vote.

II. The In-Kind Tax System in Rome During the Late Imperial Era

The *Annona* administration during the Republican era functioned as a form of dictatorship, endowed with extensive powers granted by the people during times of famine. However, over time, particularly in the Imperial era, this role evolved into a permanent institution with clearly defined responsibilities.

1. Strategy for Distributing Food Supplies Among Roman Provinces

During the reign of Augustus, Rome received approximately **60 million modii** of grain annually (Gaffiot, 2001: 467). According to Aurelius Victor, Egypt alone supplied **20 million modii**, ensuring the city's grain supply for four months, while the remainder was provided by Africa.

Out of this total, **12 million modii** were allocated for free distribution, benefiting **200,000 recipients**, each receiving **60 modii** per person.

In an effort to prevent famines caused by poor harvests or delays in the arrival of supply fleets, Emperor **Septimius Severus** reformed the *Annona* administration by stockpiling enough grain reserves to last for seven years. However, this measure proved excessive, as large quantities of wheat spoiled, while the remaining stock was either sold at a loss or extravagantly distributed by his successors, particularly to the Praetorian Guard (Besnier, 1973).

Most of the wheat allocated for Rome's supply was transported directly to the city, while approximately **300,000 modii** were delivered to the bakers of Ostia. These bakers produced the well-known **Ostian bread** or **tax bread** (*panis fiscalis*), which was sold at low prices by the *Annona* administration. After several price fluctuations, Emperor **Honorius** fixed the price at one bronze denarius and prohibited any future increases (Mommsen: 197)

2. Strategy for Distributing the Quantity of Wheat

Emperor **Octavius (Augustus)** and his successors established a comprehensive and detailed registry known as the **Imperial Census** (*Rationarium Imperii*), which recorded the tax contributions of each province towards Rome's grain supply (Auelius, 1975).

Before each tax collection cycle, the emperor personally reviewed the overall economic situation and determined the grain quotas required. This data was then used to compile additional, more specific records managed by the **treasury officials of the Praetorian prefect**. These documents were sent to all provinces well in advance to allow local governors to prepare for tax collection (Préaux, 1947 : 338). For instance, the grain distribution lists for Egypt were published two months in advance to prevent tax collectors from demanding more than what was legally required.

Finally, in each city, the **local elites (Primates)** compiled distribution tables based on the amount of land owned by each individual. Notably, in-kind taxation and additional levies were imposed not on the farmers who cultivated the land but on the **landowners** who employed them.

Similar to the **Capitatio Terrena** (land tax), the *Annona* system was directly tied to land ownership and applied to **all property**

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

owners, regardless of their social or political status. Even senators who owned estates in the provinces, particularly in Africa, were required to appoint **representatives** responsible for paying taxes on their behalf (Guerin, 1873).

To prevent tax fraud, provincial governors were instructed to submit an annual report listing any unpaid dues. Additionally, **special officials** such as **census officers** (*Censitores*), **inspectors** (*Inspectores*), and **treasury officials** (*Peraequatores*) were appointed to ensure the fair distribution of tax burdens among all taxpayers.

In addition to ensuring Rome's annual grain supply through the implementation of distribution laws, emperors were also consistently concerned with preventing **devaluation and potential shortages**. Any form of compensation or **cash buyback** (*adoeratio*) for grain tax obligations was strictly prohibited.

This prohibition, reinforced by emperors such as **Theodosius, Valentinian, and Honorius**, was later expanded to all **in-kind tax payments** until the reign of **Justinian**. The *Theodosian Code* (*inspectiebus inferi tribut*) was not reintroduced in its entirety, but even Justinian upheld the ban on redeeming grain payments in cash.

Moreover, **imperial decrees took precedence over any private exemptions** that conflicted with public interest. Not only were such exemptions declared null and void in advance, but heavy **penalties were imposed on those who requested them**, as well as on governors who granted them.

3. Tax Reductions

Although **imperial governors** were forbidden from granting preferential tax reductions, they could authorize adjustments upon **official request** for properties burdened with excessive taxation (Gabriel).

Tax Relief for Abandoned Lands

As certain **regions became depopulated and neglected**, emperors occasionally appointed **inspectors and treasury officials** to assess the situation. Based on their reports, **provinces and cities could petition for tax relief**. However, these inspections were often feared rather than welcomed, as they frequently led to increased

scrutiny and additional financial burdens (Gabriel). A **land tax reduction** was permitted only under specific conditions:

1. **If an estate had been completely abandoned** and left uncultivated.

2. **If the estate included both fertile lands (*opimi fundi*) and barren lands**, in which case the tax burden of the barren lands was **redistributed** onto the fertile lands. This legal mechanism, known as **adjection**, ensured that the total tax quota remained unchanged (Piganiol, 1880).

Furthermore, all lands within the same **estate** or **inherited property** were considered part of a single tax unit, whether acquired through **purchase or inheritance**.

Over time, however, this **distinction eroded**, leading to increasingly **burdensome policies**:

- **Owners of fertile lands** were required to pay taxes **not only on their own land but also on neighboring abandoned lands**.

- **If these lands were not cultivated**, owners risked **forfeiting their entire property**.

If no buyer was available, the land was **forcefully transferred to local provincial councils**, which were then responsible for its tax obligations (Pliny the Elder, 1829).

Such measures were ultimately **ineffective and oppressive**. They discouraged agricultural investment, leaving **large rural areas uncultivated** while **failing to generate the expected tax revenue**.

Even in **the Eastern Roman Empire**, similar policies persisted, as evidenced by **Article 166 of the Justinian Code**. This law mandated that **tax reductions on barren fields** had to be offset by additional taxes on other lands within the same estate, whether in cash or in kind.

The enforcement of these tax obligations followed a **strict hierarchical order**, ensuring that landowners bore the financial burden, even at the cost of economic stagnation and widespread rural abandonment.

If a taxpayer failed to meet their obligations, the state enforced payment in the following order:

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

1. **Other properties owned by the same taxpayer** that originated from the same inherited estate.
2. **If insufficient**, properties of **co-heirs** from the same inheritance.
3. **If still insufficient**, properties acquired by other individuals from the same inheritance source.

Priority was given to **the closest co-heirs**, and if multiple heirs or stakeholders existed, the tax was distributed proportionally among them based on the properties they owned from the same estate.

This approach **reflected the Roman legislator's focus on securing tax revenue** rather than considering the **land's productivity or the financial burden on landowners**. The long-term impact of these policies became evident during the **Late Imperial period**, as economic and agricultural decline worsened.

III. Governor of the In-Kind Tax

1. Privileges

From the early **Imperial period**, Augustus consolidated his power as **the first magistrate of the people**, granting himself **unlimited authority**. He permanently removed **control of grain distribution** from the **aediles** and **praetors** (who had been assigned by Julius Caesar) (Pliny the Elder, 1829) and assumed direct control, with authority equal to **Pompey**. However, Augustus soon delegated some of these responsibilities: (Pliny the Elder, 1829)

- Initially to **two praetorian officials**
- Then to **four officials in 18 BCE**
- Finally, to **two consular officials** in charge of grain distribution

These officials were called:

Curatores ou praefecti frumenti dandi / frumenti dividundi (*Supervisors or Prefects of Grain Distribution*).

Due to the **success of this system**, Augustus **formalized these roles between 8-14 CE**, transforming them from **temporary positions** into **permanent offices** with **expanded powers**. The official overseeing this system became known as the **Prefect of the Annona (Praefectus Annonae)**.

The **term of office was not fixed**, which was common under the imperial system, where positions lasted **as long as the emperor desired**—often for extended periods.

2. Honors and Privileges

From the reign of Augustus to **Constantius**, the Prefect of the Annona was regarded as one of the **most prestigious figures in the empire**, ranking **immediately after the consuls and the urban prefect**.¹

However, with the shift of the empire's political center to **Constantinople**, the role **lost much of its influence**, as control over grain distribution was **transferred to the Urban Prefect**. The Prefect of the Annona then became a **subordinate** rather than an independent authority.

3. Legal Responsibilities of the Supply Governor

- The Prefect was **always selected from the equestrian class**.
- He had **his own staff**, separate from the Urban Prefect's administration.
 - He had **personal attendants and guards**.
 - By the **3rd century**, he received prestigious **titles**, including:
 - **Spectabilis** (*Illustrious*)
 - **Perfectissimus** (*Most Perfect*)
 - **Clarissimus** (*Most Renowned*)

In **360 CE**, Emperor Constantius granted him the **right to bear arms (ius gladii)**, symbolizing judicial and military authority (Cracco Rugyim, 1870: 284-471).

Additionally, the Prefect of the Annona was **exempt from all guardianship and curatorship obligations**, whether **past or future**, which was a rare and highly valued privilege.

Despite these **honors**, the Prefect's real power diminished over time, ultimately becoming a **bureaucratic figure under the Urban Prefect's control**.

The **Prefect of the Annona** was responsible for the **entire supply chain of grain** in Rome, including:

- Hershvik counted twenty-eight governors from the year 8 AD to 534 AD.¹

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

- **Procurement**
- **Transport**
- **Storage**
- **Distribution**
- **Supervision and accounting**

A. Procuring Grain Supplies

The Prefect determined **the annual grain requirements of Rome** (*canon frumentaire*) and coordinated procurement with **provincial governors**, initially communicating **directly** and later through the **Praetorian Prefect**.

In the provinces, he supervised:

- **Curatores Annonae (Supervisors of Annona)**
- **Adjutores (Assistants)**, responsible for **purchasing additional grain** in case of shortages.

The **largest portion of Rome's grain supply** came from **Africa** (especially from modern Tunisia and Libya). Because of its **vital role**, an **independent Prefect of the Annona** was stationed in **Carthage** to oversee **shipment and delivery**.

This African Prefect reported to **the main Prefect in Rome**, providing updates on **collection status and departure schedules**. He also had to ensure the **timely dispatch** of shipments.

In case of **unexpected delays**, the African Prefect reported **not to his direct superior**, but to the **Urban Prefect** or even the **Emperor**. If necessary, the Emperor could dispatch an **official from his court** to expedite the fleet's departure, as **even minor delays could trigger panic in Rome**.

B. Ensuring Safe Arrival at Rome

Once the fleet reached **Ostia**, the Prefect of the Annona would:

- Personally **inspect** the arriving shipments.
- Verify **shipping documents**.
- Oversee **customs procedures**.

All cargo **had to be inspected within five days** by the **Urban Prefect**, ensuring there were no shortages or theft. ¹

¹ - Waltzing. (Jean-Pierre). Historical study on the corporations

C. Overseeing Distribution

The Prefect ensured that:

- The **weight and quality** of both **grain and bread** met the required standards.
- The **Annona registry** was maintained accurately, preventing **fraud and corruption**.

Later, when the **Notitia Dignitatum** (*List of Imperial Offices*) was compiled, responsibility for ensuring Rome's grain supply was transferred to the **Praetorian Prefect**, who directly oversaw the **Annona Prefect in Carthage**. The **Annona Prefect in Rome** was left with **only supervisory and distribution duties**.

4- Judicial Responsibilities of the In-Kind Tax Governor

Due to the **heavy burden** of ensuring Rome's food supply, **any mistake or negligence** by the **Prefect of the Annona** could lead to **famine and public unrest**. To strengthen his authority, emperors granted him **broad judicial powers**, making him one of the most **powerful administrators** in the empire.

His **jurisdiction** extended over the **entire empire**, covering **all legal matters related to food supply**. However, his **decrees and regulations** could be appealed first to the **Urban Praetor**, and from the **3rd century onward**, to the **Urban Prefect**.

In addition to his **judicial** authority, he had **policing powers** over all **professional guilds** involved in food supply, including:

Bakers' Guild (Collegium Pistorum) (Vignaux, 1885).

- **Sailors' Guild (Collegium Naviculariorum)**

He ensured that these workers **fulfilled their duties properly**, preventing **corruption or evasion of responsibilities**.

A. Civil Jurisdiction (Judicia Privata)

The Prefect of the Annona handled **civil disputes** related to:

- **Sailors, grain measurers, and bakers**
- **Grain traders**
- **Payment disputes and compensation for food supplies**

He had **full authority** over these cases, and **his rulings were final**, with **no appeal to the Emperor** - a rare privilege in the Roman legal system.

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

B. Criminal Jurisdiction (Judicia Publica) (Meiggs and all, 1875).

His **criminal powers** were initially **limited**, as he was originally an **administrator**, not a **magistrate**. However, over time, his role expanded to include:

- **Investigating and punishing minor offenses** committed by his subordinates.

- **Enforcing regulations on grain trade and food supply.**

- **Preventing market manipulation**, including:

- **Food hoarding**

- **Price-fixing**

- **Illegal monopolies**

For **serious crimes**, such as **economic conspiracies** or **large-scale fraud**, the Prefect could **only investigate**. The final decision was made by the **Urban Prefect**, who had **supreme jurisdiction** within Rome and a **10-mile radius** around the city.

In **Italy and the provinces**, similar judicial powers were exercised by:

- **Praetorian Prefects** (for the rest of Italy)

- **Provincial Governors**

Their rulings, however, could still be **appealed to the emperor**.

III- The High Official of the In-Kind Tax

1- City Governor

The **Urban Prefect** was the **direct superior** of the **Prefect of the Annona**, holding **supreme oversight** over the **food supply system** in Rome. His authority extended to :

- **Supervising professional guilds** related to food supply.

- **Overseeing members and assets** of these guilds.

- **Maintaining jurisdiction over Rome and its surrounding areas up to 100 miles.**

Beyond this **100-mile radius**, jurisdiction belonged to the **Praetorian Prefect**. However, it appears that **Praetorian Prefects** only became actively involved in **food supply matters** during the reign of **Constantine I (306–337 AD)**.

Conflicts Between the Urban and Annona Prefects

There were frequent **conflicts** between the **Urban Prefect** and the **Prefect of the Annona** regarding **authority over subordinates**. Eventually, the **Urban Prefect was relieved of his powers** over food supply officials, which led to **administrative disputes**.

To resolve these tensions, **Emperor Valentinian I (364–375 AD)** issued a **decree**:

- **Both Prefects were to operate independently** but must **consult each other** in decision-making.

- **The Prefect of the Annona was required to obey** the Urban Prefect.

- **The Urban Prefect was instructed to treat his colleague with respect.**

- **No new regulations** could be enacted without mutual consultation.

Example of Joint Responsibilities

Roman legal codes contain **multiple laws** illustrating the **shared responsibilities** of these two officials. One example is a **law issued by Emperor Valentinian I**:

- **Warehouse workers** were required to **use older grain stocks** before distributing new supplies.

- **Old grain was to be mixed with high-quality grain** to avoid financial losses for the state.

- **Both Prefects were tasked with enforcing this regulation.**

2- The Role of the Urban Prefect in Food Supply Management

A- Administrative Duties of the Supply Governor

As the **direct superior** of the **Prefect of the Annona**, the **Urban Prefect** had **broad oversight responsibilities**, while also holding **exclusive powers** in some areas:

Supervision of Professional Guilds:

- He had **direct authority** over **grain weighers (mensores)**, **manual laborers (saccarii)**, and **Tiber River boatmen (caudicarii)** assigned to the food supply system.

- He was responsible for their **employment**, **inheritance matters**, and **property transfers**.

1. Inspection of Meat Supplies:

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

◦ He had **exclusive authority** to inspect and supervise **meat distribution** in Rome.

In times of **famine**, he was responsible for: (Laboulay, 1845).

- **Raising additional taxes** to support food distribution.
- **Supervising the labor force** to ensure fair distribution.

2. Grain Storage Regulations:

◦ The Urban Prefect had to **ensure that no grain** was removed from **public warehouses** until the **entire annual wheat stock** was accounted for.

3. Religious Duties for Safe Navigation:

◦ During the **arrival seasons** of the **African grain fleet (navicularii)**, the Urban Prefect traveled to **Ostia**.

◦ He performed **sacrifices at the Temple of Castor and Pollux** to invoke **favorable winds** for safe maritime transport, as navigation at the **Tiber's mouth** was particularly difficult.

B- Judicial Duties of the City Governor Regarding the In-Kind Tax

1. Civil Jurisdiction:

◦ The Urban Prefect handled **appeals** and disputes related to **registration on the free grain distribution lists**.

2. Criminal Jurisdiction : (Gustave, op.cit: 85)

◦ He served as the **appellate judge** for **all offenses handled by the Prefect of the Annona**.

◦ He had **exclusive authority** over legal matters concerning:

- **Tiber River boatmen (caudicarii).**
- **Grain weighers (mensores).**
- **Severe violations** related to food supply regulations.

3. Severe Punishments:

◦ In addition to standard penalties, the Urban Prefect had the power to **ban convicted merchants from trade**, either:

- **Temporarily or permanently.**
- **Within Rome or across his entire jurisdiction.**

Exception when discovering thefts, extortions, and other crimes against provisioning (grain supply) on ships arriving at Ostia: the city governor did not have the authority to determine if the accused were ship suppliers (*navicularii*). He had to refer them to the judge of the district from which the ship's cargo originated. In fact, the district from which these criminals came, along with the losses caused by their actions, had the right to try them itself. The same procedure applied when a similar incident was discovered during a stop: the praetorian governor in charge of the stop port would act in the same manner.

2- Praetorian Governor (*):

The powers of the praetorian governors in their dioceses regarding provisioning matters were almost identical to those of the city governor in Rome.

A-Judicial Responsibilities:

Like the city governor in Rome, the praetorian governor had punitive authority over all offenses committed against provisioning within their jurisdiction and against any governor or official not fulfilling their duties in this matter. Specifically, they were required to strictly punish any betrayal of duties related to the collection of wheat revenues, as well as the monopolies and speculations of grain merchants aimed at raising prices.

B- Administrative Responsibilities

In administrative matters, the praetorian governor was responsible for ensuring the distribution, collection, and transportation of taxes, particularly provisioning taxes, and for not permitting or allowing their agents to agree to any reductions or repurchases (*adaeratio*) of wheat revenues. In other words, they opposed any changes or substitutions in the usual amounts of wheat revenues.

To facilitate the collection process and prevent fraud, the praetorian governors would provide various agents and officials under their command with a table for the distribution of in-kind payments required from those under their jurisdiction. They also had full administrative and judicial powers over professional associations assigned to provisioning matters within their rule. These powers

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

included the hiring and monitoring of ship suppliers, overseeing both their persons and their property, regulating shipping in ports, constructing and distributing ships for transporting public grain, requisitioning private ships in urgent cases, loading and dispatching convoys at the appropriate times, and investigating cases of shipwrecks. These were the main powers of the praetorian governors, and in this regard, they were similar in all respects to the powers of the city governor within Rome.

In addition to overseeing the regular provisioning affairs (grain supply), the praetorian governors were also responsible for supervising all additional wheat purchases (*publica compiatrio*), which were made based on orders from the Senate or the emperor for the benefit of either Rome or other cities. They had to ensure that no taxpayer was exempted from this compulsory sale, and on the other hand, they had to ensure that no one was deprived of the wheat necessary for their livelihood by the tax collectors.

To assist them in these numerous tasks, the praetorian governors had key assistants, called *vicaire* (deputies), one in each district. Additionally, the governors of provisioning in major cities like Alexandria and Carthage had duties similar to those in Rome.

Furthermore, the praetorian governors were in direct contact with the city governors regarding joint interests. They had to submit an annual list of citizens in Rome who owned property within their jurisdiction, indicating the amount of property subject to provisioning taxes.

IV- Officials Responsible for Supply Management:

The Governor of Provisioning was at the head of a critical service in the empire, responsible for supplying a vast city. As mentioned earlier, the Governor of Provisioning had a threefold task: 1- Collecting and transporting the wheat intended for him. 2- Ensuring its storage. 3- Managing its distribution.

However, this was an extremely heavy responsibility for one individual, and it would have been impossible to carry out without the support of a real army of officials and officers, who we will now discuss.

The Governor of Provisioning had at his direct disposal an office (officium), a sort of ministry, whose positions were filled by clerks, accountants, and issuers, as well as cashiers (Zugostane, fabularit, chritologic) responsible for carrying out his orders. Additionally, there were other special assistants, small officials (agentes rebus, compulsores, apparitores), who carried his orders to the farthest reaches of the empire.

At the head of this group of officials was an assistant (adjudicator) or deputy governor (subpraefectus), typically from the equestrian class, a position apparently established by Septimius Severus. To face the costs associated with such a large staff and the expenses of his duties, the Governor of Provisioning had a special treasury known as the Provisioning Treasury (fiscus frumentarius), managed by a steward (dispensator) or cashier (tabularii). These individuals, along with others, were under his direct supervision.

As for the remaining assistants, we will discuss them gradually as we study the different aspects of provisioning, to avoid unnecessary repetition (Daremberg et Saglio : 1650).

General Conclusion

The Roman **Annona system** was a crucial administrative and economic structure that ensured the stability and sustenance of the empire, particularly for the urban populations. Its origins date back to the Republic, but it became highly sophisticated during the Imperial period, evolving into a well-organized bureaucracy responsible for food supply and distribution. The annona primarily focused on grain (especially wheat), which was the staple food for Roman citizens, particularly in the capital. This system relied on an intricate network of **taxation, transportation, storage, and distribution mechanisms**, involving multiple administrative officials such as provincial governors, urban prefects, and financial officers. Provinces, particularly North Africa and Egypt, played a fundamental role in supplying Rome with grain, reinforcing the empire's dependency on its vast territorial resources. The state managed logistics through specialized transporters like the *caudicarii*, who ensured the safe shipment of grain from key ports such as Ostia to Rome. This strategic

The In-Kind Tax System in Rome Before the Early Imperial Era

supply chain was essential in maintaining public order, as food shortages could lead to **social unrest, political instability, and even revolts.**

Furthermore, the **legal and administrative framework** of the annona was meticulously structured to prevent corruption and mismanagement. Imperial decrees, such as those found in the *Codex Theodosianus*, regulated grain production, taxation, and distribution, ensuring that sufficient supplies reached Rome and other major cities. Officials responsible for the annona, such as the *praefectus annonae*, enjoyed significant authority and were often accountable directly to the emperor. Additionally, emperors such as Augustus and Constantine introduced policies to refine and expand the system, making food supplies more reliable for the growing urban population. The Roman government often subsidized bread to keep it affordable for the lower classes, a policy that contributed to maintaining social peace and political stability. However, despite these efforts, the annona system was not immune to crises, including grain shortages caused by **wars, economic downturns, and logistical failures.** The reliance on external provinces also made Rome vulnerable to disruptions in supply, especially during periods of political instability.

In conclusion, the annona system was not just a logistical or economic institution but a **political and social tool** that played a pivotal role in the administration of the Roman Empire. It demonstrated the empire's ability to manage vast resources, control large populations, and integrate distant provinces into its economy. The success of the annona contributed to the **longevity and stability** of Rome, ensuring that the capital remained the thriving center of the empire. However, its eventual decline—coinciding with the weakening of Roman administrative control, economic pressures, and external invasions—exposed the empire's vulnerabilities. The annona system remains a historical testament to the significance of **state-controlled food distribution** in maintaining the power and influence of a civilization. Its legacy continues to be relevant in discussions on **economic governance, food security, and political stability in large states and empires.**

References

- Abun-Naser, J. (1971). A History of the Maghreb. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Albertini, E. (1970). Roman Africa. *Presses Universitaires de France*.
- Bethmam Hollweg. (n.d.). [Title] (Vol. III).
- Bouchard, L. (n.d.). [Title].
- Cagnat, R. (1916). The Annona of Africa. *Memoirs of the Academy of Inscriptions and Fine Letters*.
- Calza, G. (1939). Africa as a Supplier of the Annona of Rome. *Rome*, 15(9).
- Cassiodorus. (n.d.). *Variae*, VI in *Formula Praefectia*.
- Chilver, G. E. F. (1949). Principes and Frumentationes. *American Journal of Philology*, 70(2).
- Theodosian Code. (n.d.). [Legal Texts on Taxation and Grain Distribution].
- Cracco Rugy, L. (1870). Professional Associations in the Romano-Byzantine World. *Weeks of Study of the Italian Center for Early Medieval Studies*, 18(1).
- Durant, W. (1949–1950). The History of Civilization (Vol. 8). Payot.
- Durliat, J. (1990). From the Ancient City to the Byzantine City: The Problem of Supplies. *Rome*.
- Hirschfeld, O. (n.d.). On the Annona. *Philologus*, 29.
- Liebenam, W. (1900). Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire. *Denker and Humblot*.
- Montesquieu, C. (1845). Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline. *Paris: Hachette*.
- Meiggs, R. (1973). Roman Ostia. *Oxford University Press*.
- Pavis d'Exurac, II. (n.d.). The Prefecture of the Annona: Imperial Administrative Service from Augustus to Constantine. *B.E.F.A.R.*
- Picard, G. H. (1956). Nero and the Grain of Africa. *C.T.*, 4.
- Tacitus. (n.d.). *Annals* (Vol. 1, 7).
- Waltzing, J. P. (n.d.). *Historical Study of the Corporations*.