

**Renata Kamińska**

The Cardinal Wyszyński University in Warsaw

ORCID: 0000-0003-3357-1734

***PROCURATORES* – IMPERIAL AGENTS  
OR CURATORS' ASSISTANTS?**

The period of the Principate was characterised by a number of changes in nearly all areas of public life, i.e. in the political, economic, social and religious sphere. These occurred as an unavoidable, and in some cases absolutely natural result of systemic transformations. The new model of government, initiated by Augustus, where power was in the hands of the ruler with little involvement of other state authorities, required appropriate principles to be introduced for the functioning of both the office of Princeps and other co-governing centres. Although Augustus sought to abandon the republican order, he was well aware of the fact that he would only succeed if his power was secured within the frames of this system<sup>1</sup>. Hence, he maintained Plebeian Assemblies and the Senate, as well as most of the clerical positions, although he divested all of those bodies of many of their previous powers. This was particularly clear in the case of the magistrates whose functions he assumed himself or delegated to offices which he established<sup>2</sup>. The principles in accordance with which these were exercised differed in almost every respect from the models existing in the Republic. This applied in the same way to rotation in office, collegiality, gratuitousness and eligibility. Different rules were also followed in selecting candidates for the specific positions. Seeking to limit the power of the Senate, Augustus decided to establish a counter-measure for this body by filling imperial offices mainly with representatives of *Ordo Equester*<sup>3</sup>. Hence, prefectures were reserved for *equites* (except for urban prefect, a posi-

<sup>1</sup> R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 2002, Polish translation: A.M. Baziór, *Rewolucja rzymska*, Poznań 2009, p. 318.

<sup>2</sup> Suet., *Aug.* 37; M. Beard, *SPQR. A History of Ancient Rome*, New York 2015, Polish translation: *SPQR. Historia starożytnego Rzymu*, Poznań 2016, p. 339.

<sup>3</sup> H.H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero. A History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68*, London–New York 2007, p. 219.

tion to which senators were appointed<sup>4</sup>), while representatives of *ordo senatorius* were designated for offices of *curatores*. Given the essence of the functions exercised by them, prefects were more like officers of central bodies, while the tasks performed by curators reflected a local nature of these offices. Their responsibilities were basically linked with ensuring proper functioning of the specific components of the urban infrastructures, i.e. *cura urbis*<sup>5</sup>. There were rather large disproportions in the scope of duties delegated to prefects and curators, which leads to the question about the reasons for this division of powers. One of these may possibly be linked with the Emperor's desire to limit senators' influence in the governance of the state. Notably, however, today the role and position of prefects is viewed in a different way compared to how it was perceived by Romans, who most possibly did not regard them as high-ranking officials. Indeed, it may have been just the opposite. This opinion was expressed e.g. by Adam Ziółkowski, a historian of Antiquity, who pointed out that prefects' role was mainly linked with maintenance of public order. On the other hand, even if we assume, in line with the theory prevailing today, that they actually were highly influential, it is obvious that this did not happen at the beginning of the Principate, but much later<sup>6</sup>. Meanwhile, the curators' role and scope of duties from the start were impressive, which inevitably contributed to the increased importance of this office in the political scene. The first to emerge were curators in charge of temples and public buildings (*curatores aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum*<sup>7</sup>) and those responsible for matters related to public water (*curatores aquarum*<sup>8</sup>). These collegial bodies were established in Augustus' times. Another commission, designated to manage the Tiber and its banks, i.e. *curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis*, was created by Tiberius<sup>9</sup>. Beyond the limits of Rome, there were also *curatores viarum*<sup>10</sup>, whose responsibilities were linked with construction and management of suburban roads.

---

<sup>4</sup> S. Ruciński, *Praefectus Urbi. Strażnik porządku publicznego w Rzymie w okresie wczesnego Cesarstwa*, Poznań 2008, p. 48 et seq.

<sup>5</sup> T.R. Martin, *Ancient Rome – From Romulus to Justinian*, Yale 2012, Polish translation: *Starożytny Rzym od Romulusa do Justyniana*, Poznań 2014, p. 168.

<sup>6</sup> A. Ziółkowski, *Historia Rzymu*, Poznań 2004, p. 378, 426.

<sup>7</sup> Historical sources contain conflicting information regarding the origins of this collegiate body. It emerged either during the reign of Augustus, as suggested by Suetonius (Suet., *Aug.* 37) or in the early period of the reign of Tiberius (CIL IX 3305/6 (=ILS 932).

<sup>8</sup> Suet., *Aug.* 37.

<sup>9</sup> Tac., *Ann.* 1,76; G.S. Aldrete, *Floods of the Tiber in Ancient Rome*, Baltimore 2007, p. 163, 201.

<sup>10</sup> This collegiate body probably existed in the Republic, but it grew in importance during the times of Augustus and then Tiberius. See: R. Kamińska, *Ochrona dróg publicznych przez urzędników rzymskich*, „Zeszyty Prawnicze” 2008, vol. 8, no. 2, p. 90; *idem*, *Ochrona dróg i rzek publicznych w prawie rzymskim w okresie republiki i pryncypatu*, Warszawa 2010, p. 96–97; *idem*, ‘Augustus nova officia excogitavit’ (Suet. *Aug.* 37). *Oktawian August twórcą ‘cura urbis’?*, „Miscellanea Historico-Iuridica” 2013, no. 12, p. 21.

As a rule, commissions of *curatores* did not comprise many members; they usually consisted of a few officers appointed and dismissed by the Princeps. Initially they operated independently. The earliest source information about assisting services designated to work with them are related to the late forties and early fifties of the first century A.D. This is when *procuratores aquarum* appeared in the political scene, to be followed by *procuratores operum publicorum* introduced one hundred years later<sup>11</sup>. They were recruited among imperial freedmen and were designated to assist curators. Some information related to them is provided by the treaty *De aquaeductu urbis Romae* by Sextus Julius Frontinus.

Front., *De aq.* 105,2: *Procuratores autem primus Ti. Claudius videtur admovisse, postquam Anionem Novum et Claudiam induxit.*

The above passage suggests that *procuratores aquarum* were appointed by Emperor Claudius after Anio Novus and Aqua Claudia aqueducts were built<sup>12</sup>. Unfortunately, the work by Frontinus does not mention the purpose for which these offices were created. From the broader context of the above quotation, one may only presume they were intended to provide support for curators. In this case procurators were to aid *curatores aquarum*, who had significantly more duties after the two new water supply systems were built. However, a more puzzling issue here is related to the selection of individuals designated as candidates for procurators. As mentioned earlier, they were selected among imperial freedmen, which definitely was not by coincidence. After all these individuals had no expertise in management of the infrastructures. Hence, it can be assumed that the actual reason for Claudius to appoint *procuratores aquarum* was different than the one reported officially, i.e. to ensure support for curators in their duties. One of the Emperor's major political objectives was to weaken the position of the Senate. Starting from the time the first Princeps was in power, the role of this body was being diminished, but the Senate still held an important role as a centre of authority, and members of *ordo senatorius*, by decision of Augustus, held some offices, such as curator's office<sup>13</sup>. It was Emperor Claudius who decided to put an end to this. One of the measures adopted by him involved assignment of assisting functionaries for curators; these were recruited among imperial freedmen who were fully dependent on and controlled by the ruler. In fact, this approach was perfectly

---

<sup>11</sup> J.E. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy: An Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*, Cambridge 1927, p. 226.

<sup>12</sup> Front., *De aq.* 13. The aqueducts were launched on 1 August of year 52, i.e. on Claudius' birthday. See: M. Hainzmann, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung der stadtrömischen Wasserleitungen*, Wien 1975, p. 121; H.B. Evans, *Water Distribution in Ancient Rome. The Evidence of Frontinus*, Michigan 1994, p. 115.

<sup>13</sup> Ch. Bruun, *Imperial Power Legislation, and Water Management in the Roman Empire*, „Insights” 2010, vol. 3, no. 10, p. 11; *idem*, *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 93)*, Helsinki 1991, p. 219; R. Kamińska, *Cura aquarum w prawie rzymskim*, „Zeszyty Prawnicze” 2010, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 102.

in line with Claudius's policy aimed towards strengthening the position of the imperial court as the main centre of power, and at minimising the role of the Senate<sup>14</sup>. The means enabling Claudius to achieve that included the office of *procuratores*, as in accordance with the Emperor's intentions, formally, they were to provide support to curators, but actually they were to monitor their operations<sup>15</sup>. As a result, a relation of a specific nature developed between curators and procurators; a critical comment regarding that was made by Frontinus.

Front., *De aq.* 2,1: *Neque enim ullum omnis actus certius fundamentum crederim, aut aliter quae facienda quaeque vitanda sint posse discerni, aliudve tam indecorum tolerabili viro, quam delegatum officium ex adiutorum agere praeceptis, quod fieri necesse est, quotiens imperitia praepositi ad illorum decurrit usum; quorum etsi necessariae partes sunt ad ministerium, tamen ut manus quaedam et instrumentum agentis.*

He insisted there was nothing more inappropriate for a dignified man than to exercise the office entrusted to him by following instructions of his subordinates. The latter is unavoidable whenever, due to his ignorance, the superior calls for the services of people who, although their involvement in the performance of the function is necessary, are seemingly the hand and tool of the person performing the function.

Hence, Frontinus clearly criticised the relation existing between curators and their assistants, i.e. procurators. The severity of this criticism seems to be even more emphasised by the fact that the above words were placed by the author of the treaty at the very beginning. This may most of all reflect the gravity of the problem and show how important this issue was for Frontinus. This is not surprising; after all, Frontinus himself held the office of *curator aquarum* during the reign of Emperor Nerva so he experienced these problems personally<sup>16</sup>. At first glance one might get the impression that the criticism expressed by him related to procurators who were merely auxiliary functionaries, yet they elbowed their superiors down into this position<sup>17</sup>. However, one could blame both sides, and therefore also the curators, who partly caused this situation because of their lack

---

<sup>14</sup> J. Ramón Robles, *Magistrados, Jueces y Árbitros en Roma. Competencia civil y evolución*, Madrid 2009, p. 90.

<sup>15</sup> This way, according to C. Kunderewicz, *O akweduktach miasta Rzymu. Frontinus*, Warszawa 1961, p. 57–58 (Prace Zakładu Archeologii Antycznej IHKM PAN, vol. 19), p. 104, the Princeps managed to delegate the actual performance of the function to his freedmen, without a necessity to eliminate the position of *curator aquarum*.

<sup>16</sup> D.R.Blackman, A.T. Hodge, *Frontinus' Legacy. Essays on Frontinus' de aquis urbis Romae*, Michigan 2001, p. 142, 144.

<sup>17</sup> C. Kunderewicz, *O akweduktach...*, p. 77, note 7. According to L. Homo, *Rome impériale et l'urbanisme dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1951, p. 193 the rationale for subordinating curators to procurators may have been linked with the fact that the latter had more expertise, because generally they were constantly in touch with the practical side of aqueduct operation, therefore they had far more experience than curators.

of knowledge and adequate skills. Otherwise, they would not have needed services of subordinate officers, or at least not to the extent as it occurred in reality. This relationship of apparent subordination to procurators must have been even more disagreeable for curators, or perhaps even humiliating and hard to accept, because they came from the community of senators, while procurators represented imperial freedmen (at least in the period in question). This, however, did not happen by coincidence; it was a result of a planned and deliberately conducted political game of the imperial court which aimed to minimize the role of the senate in the state. This was reflected by the fact that more and more members of equestrian order were appointed to offices previously reserved for *ordo senatorius*<sup>18</sup>. In fact, during the period in question this happened occasionally, nevertheless it clearly showed there were attempts to build official apparatus based on representatives of *ordo equester*.

The process of these changes, initiated by Vespasian, was systematically continued by Domitian, however the final shape of public administration based on equestrian order was instituted by Trajan and his successors Hadrian and Antoninus Pius<sup>19</sup>. These changes were also gradually introduced in the administration sector in charge of public water management, although that may have taken place a bit later. This may be presumed, based in the available sources; indeed, the first references to equites holding the office of *procurator aquarum* come from the times of Trajan (98–117)<sup>20</sup>. On the other hand, it seems puzzling that although generally this office was entrusted to equites, sometimes imperial freedmen were also appointed. Traces of their activity are preserved for instance in inscriptions dating from Hadrian's times; these can be seen on measuring nozzles (*fistulae*) which they supervised<sup>21</sup>. Hence, there are grounds to assume that from the second half of the second century equites also monopolised this office<sup>22</sup>. Interestingly, the fact that the office of curator generally was delegated to equites did not mean that imperial freedmen could no longer hold the position<sup>23</sup>. This led to an extraordinary, or really perplexing situation where equivalent positions were held at the same time by citizens of higher social rank and individuals with a status of *libertini*. This immediately raises a question how that could have happened, or whether the fact that an equite's colleague in office was an imperial freedman was in accord with the *dignitas* of the former? These issues, for a long time, have been seen

<sup>18</sup> L. Homo, *Rome impériale...*, p. 193; Ch. Bruun, *The Water Supply...*, p. 219.

<sup>19</sup> E. De Ruggiero, *Lo stato e le opere pubbliche in Roma antica*, Torino 1925, p. 136.

<sup>20</sup> K. Geißler, *Die öffentliche Wasserversorgung im römischen Recht*, Berlin 1998, p. 69; Ch. Bruun, *Il funzionamento degli acquedotti romani* [in:] *Roma imperiale. Una metropoli antica*, ed. E. Lo Cascio, Roma 2000, p. 148.

<sup>21</sup> CIL XV 7308; XV, 7310.

<sup>22</sup> CIL XV, 7299; T. Ashby, *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1935, p. 23.

<sup>23</sup> More about collaboration between libert Augusti and Equite procurators, See: K. Kłodziński, *Officium a rationibus*, Toruń 2017, p. 108 et seq.

in the literature as controversial, and the phenomenon is, in fact, referred to with specific terms, i.e. “dual procuratorship”, “Pseudokollegialität” and “collegialité inégale”<sup>24</sup>. Two issues seem to be particularly interesting, and also most problematic. Firstly, what was the purpose for creating this model for the office of *procurator aquarum*, and secondly what was a reasonable justification for this duality of the office and the glaring disproportion of the social ranks?

In the doctrine, there is a belief that this disproportion may seem smaller if one assumes that the procurator-freedman was only an assistant to the procurator-equite. This explanation however is not fully satisfying because it does not provide sufficient rationale for designating *libertum Caesaris* for the office of *procurator aquarum*. This issue was investigated by Ch. Bruun<sup>25</sup>, and the results of his research allow to hypothesise that for the Princeps this approach was linked with two goals. The first and foremost, from the standpoint of the policy adopted by the imperial court, was a possibility to ensure continuous control over equites’ operations. Another reason was connected with efforts to increase effectiveness of the work performed by equestrian procurator, who for this purpose was assigned with an imperial freedman as an assistant<sup>26</sup>. This explanation is additionally supported by the fact that, as a rule, imperial offices were performed by single individuals.

It is equally difficult to determine the duration of the term of *procurator aquarum* office. According to Ch. Bruun<sup>27</sup> it was two years long at the most. The scholar reached this conclusion as a result of calculations based on inscriptions. He counted all the procurators whose names were immortalised on waterpipes, and compared that number with the time period they were in office. His findings show that during the reign of Domitian, in years 83–96, there were at least seven procurators, which means that the term in office in each case did not exceed two years. This indeed seems puzzling. There appear to be at least two explanations for that. Firstly, it is likely that the emperor wanted to increase the control over the curators. The rotation of the procurators supervising them did not allow for closer cooperation to be started; that would have at times posed a disadvantage from the standpoint of the emperor’s policy. By making it impossible for the officers to start closer relations in the performance of their duties, greater objectivism was ensured in the assessment of curator’s operations by procurators; after all, evaluation and supervision of the former presumably were the unofficial reason why *procuratores aquarum* were appointed. The second probable reason

---

<sup>24</sup> H.G. Pflaum, s.v. *Procurator*, RE 23, 1957, kol. 1278; Ch. Bruun, *The Water Supply...*, p. 220.

<sup>25</sup> Ch. Bruun, *The Water Supply...*, p. 220.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 217, calling this an “unheard of” concept (“The existence of colleagues in administrative sectors led by imperial freedmen and equestrian procurators is almost unheard of”).

<sup>27</sup> Ch. Bruun, *The Water Supply...*, p. 216. According to K. Geißler, *Die öffentliche...*, p. 72, as a rule the term of *procurator aquarum* office was to continue for one year, however in reality it happened that it was even 20-year long, as shown by the example of Alypius who remained in office from year 83/84 until year 102 AD. Cf. Iulianus, *Epistulae et leges* 404B.

why Domitian shortened the term of office for these functionaries to two years may have been connected with this emperor's assessment of the operations performed by procurators from the time the office was established until his time. Seeing how frequently and severely they abused their authority, the ruler may have decided to end this by reducing the duration of their term in office. This way he may have wanted to prevent collusion and offensive cooperation between them and private individuals, and perhaps curators, as well.

Hence, it is necessary to ask another question, of key importance for these considerations; did Claudius and his successors manage to achieve the goals associated with *procuratores aquarum*, and consequently did this office fulfil its role? It is worthwhile to precede the response with a brief reflection on the competences of these functionaries, which is possible owing to Frontinus' records.

Front., *De aq.* 105, 4–5: *Procurator calicem eius moduli, qui fuerit impetratus, adhibitis libratoribus signari cogitet, diligenter intendat mensurarum quas supra diximus modum et positionis notitiam habeat, ne sit in arbitrio libratorum, interdum maioris luminis, interdum minoris pro gratia personarum calicem probare. Sed nec statim ab hoc liberum subiciendi qualemcumque plumbeam fistulam permittatur arbitrium, verum eiusdem luminis quo calix signatus est per pedes quinquaginta, sicut senatus consulto quod subiectum est cavetur.*

The passage from his treaty describes the role played in the process of awarding water related concessions by *procuratores*, i.e. functionaries responsible for overseeing the technical side of using public water. Their role started when the interested person reported to the curator (*curator aquarum*) with a letter from the emperor, confirming a concession awarded to them. The curator designated a procurator who was to connect the property of the concession holder to the water supply system. The officer was to stamp the public installations supplying water, and then to oversee the way the person exercises their rights<sup>28</sup>. Hence, each time someone was granted a concession, a procurator was to mark the *fistula* of a size matching the volume of water awarded, and then to supervise the sizes and locations of the specific nozzles.

The scope and substance of the duties performed by *procuratores aquarum* created many opportunities for them to commit various offenses. What is more, the tone of the comment made by Frontinus suggests that these occurred frequently. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that he had a negative attitude towards these functionaries. In fact, whenever *De aquaeductu urbis Romae* mentions procurators they are criticised and rebuked, although, as pointed out earlier, the author of the treaty did not spare the curators, either. However, generally he blamed the latter for a lack of expertise and experience, while procurators were accused of numerous fraudulent acts which they committed during and in connection to their work. The essence of these offences is described in the following passage.

---

<sup>28</sup> K. Geißler, *Die öffentliche...*, p. 74.

Front., *De aq.* 112,2–3: *Ampliores quosdam calices quam impetrati errant positos in plerisque castellis inveni et ex iis aliquos ne signatos quidem. Quotiens autem signatus calix excedit legitimam mensuram ambitio procuratoris qui eum signavit detegitur.*

According to Frontinus, the most common misdeeds included installation of alternative connecting elements to waterpipes. Unlawfulness of such an activity was linked with the fact that outgoing bronze pipes (*calices*) installed in distribution tanks (*castella*) were larger in diameter than allowed under the concession granted to a given entity<sup>29</sup>. Such insidious acts, as they were described by Frontinus, were carried out by supervisors of aqueducts, i.e. *aquarii*, and their superiors, that is procurators. Indeed, it was their duty to stamp each new *fistula*, then why would it have posed any problem to them to mount nozzles of a different size than prescribed? Since they directly handled the water-conveying installations, they could mount larger *fistulae* and mark them as matching in diameter defined in the concession. What is more, there were cases when no marking was applied. As a result, the volume of water received unlawfully for private use increased along with the number of recipients. Therefore, it is not surprising that Frontinus mainly blamed both *aquarii* and procurators of insidiousness and negligence.

There may also be other reasons for the harsh criticism of *procuratores aquarum* conveyed by Frontinus. It should be remembered that the author of the treaty, as mentioned before, held the office of *curator aquarum* during the reign of Emperor Nerva, that is in the times when equites were already often appointed for the position of procurators in charge of water. Meanwhile, his criticism is aimed at procurators-freedmen. By appraising them in such negative terms, Frontinus may have wanted to show more explicitly how big a mistake it was to appoint people from this social group to this position. By pointing out all their misdeeds he wanted to publicly demonstrate his disapproval for the functioning of *procurator aquarum*'s office in such a form.

*Procuratores aquarum* definitely were not the only officers playing an auxiliary role in management and supervision of urban infrastructures in the period of Principate. Claudius is credited for appointing the first *procurator Augusti ad ripam Tiberis*, who was responsible for coordinating and supervising works ordered by the Princeps related to the construction of an artificial harbour in Ostia<sup>30</sup>. However, it is likely that this office no longer existed after the Emperor died. This may be reflected mainly by the lack of any source information dating from the later times.

---

<sup>29</sup> The essence of illicit operations of *aquarii* was the fact they established *calices* which were 13.5% larger or 20% smaller than they should have been. As a result the volume of water in the tank was higher, and aqueduct keepers could illegally supply water to additional unauthorised people. For that the latter were required to pay tax, however the money ended up in the pocket of the *aquarius* rather than in the state treasury.

<sup>30</sup> CIL XI, 6337 = ILS 1422; CIGr. X, 797; Plin., *Nat. hist.* 9,14; 16,202; Seut., *Claud.* 20; L. Homo, *Rome impériale...*, p. 242; E. De Ruggiero, *Lo stato...*, p. 139.

Hence, it is possible that the motivations underlying Claudius's efforts to establish the offices of *procuratores aquarum*, in fact, were primarily political in nature. With their help he wanted to assume control over the operations of officers from senatorial order, and later to further reduce their involvement, small as it already was, in the exercise of authority in the state. Yet, as it turned out, neither this emperor nor his successors managed to achieve this goal. This is because freedmen appointed to the office of imperial procurators quickly got the gist of their role and were able to skillfully use it for their gain. Due to this, before long the ruler lost control over their actions, which, to make things worse, were more and more in conflict rather than in conformity with the interest of the state and its population. As a result, in history *procuratores aquarum* are remembered as dishonest and negligent officers who abused their position for quick and easy profit. Therefore, seeking an answer to the initial question whether these officers met the emperor's expectations and fulfilled their mission as supervisors of curators, it can be concluded that to some extent it indeed was so. Unfortunately, the stealth and desire for gains that dominated their work cast a shadow over the entire activity of procurators, whether as assistants to curators or even as their unofficial inspectors.

## Bibliography

- Aldrete G.S., *Floods of the Tiber in Ancient Rome*, Baltimore 2007.
- Ashby T., *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1935.
- Beard M., *SPQR. A History of Ancient Rome*, New York 2015, przekład polski: *SPQR. Historia starożytnego Rzymu*, Poznań 2016.
- Blackman D.R., Hodge A.T., *Frontinus' Legacy. Essays on Frontinus' de aquis urbis Romae*, Michigan 2001.
- Bruun Ch., *Il funzionamento degli acquedotti romani [in:] Roma imperiale. Una metropoli antica*, ed. E. Lo Cascio, Roma 2000.
- Bruun Ch., *Imperial Power Legislation, and Water Management in the Roman Empire*, „Insights” 2010, vol. 3, no. 10.
- Bruun Ch., *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 93)*, Helsinki 1991.
- Evans H.B., *Water Distribution in Ancient Rome. The Evidence of Frontinus*, Michigan 1994.
- Geißler K., *Die öffentliche Wasserversorgung im römischen Recht*, Berlin 1998.
- Hainzmann M., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung der stadtrömischen Wasserleitungen*, Wien 1975.
- Homo L., *Rome impériale et l'urbanisme dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1951.
- Kamińska R., *Ochrona dróg publicznych przez urzędników rzymskich*, „Zeszyty Prawnicze” 2008, vol. 8, no. 2.
- Kamińska R., *'Augustus nova officia excogitavit' (Suet. Aug. 37). Oktawian August twórcą 'cura urbis'?*, „Miscellanea Historico-Iuridica” 2013, no. 12.
- Kamińska R., *Cura aquarum w prawie rzymskim*, „Zeszyty Prawnicze” 2010, vol. 10, no. 2.
- Kamińska R., *Ochrona dróg i rzek publicznych w prawie rzymskim w okresie republiki i pryncypatu*, Warszawa 2010.

- Kłodziński K., *Officium a rationibus*, Toruń 2017.
- Kunderewicz C., *O akweduktach miasta Rzymu. Frontinus*, Warszawa 1961 (Prace Zakładu Archeologii Antycznej IHKM PAN, z. 19).
- Martin T.R., *Ancient Rome – From Romulus to Justinian*, Yale 2012, przekład polski: *Starożytny Rzym od Romulusa do Justyniana*, Poznań 2014.
- Pflaum H.G., s.v. *Procurator*, „RE” 1957, no. 23, kol. 1278.
- Ramón Robles J., *Magistrados, Jueces y Árbitros en Roma. Competencia civil y evolución*, Madrid 2009.
- Ruciński S., *Praefectus Urbi. Strażnik porządku publicznego w Rzymie w okresie wczesnego Cesarstwa*, Poznań 2008.
- De Ruggiero E., *Lo stato e le opere pubbliche in Roma antica*, Torino 1925.
- Sandys J.E., *Latin Epigraphy: An Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*, Cambridge 1927.
- Scullard H.H., *From the Gracchi to Nero. A History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68*, London–New York 2007.
- Syme R., *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 2002, przekład polski: A.M. Baziór, *Revolucja rzymska*, Poznań 2009.
- Ziółkowski A., *Historia Rzymu*, Poznań 2004.

## Summary

For the first time *procuratores aquarum* were nominated by Emperor Claudius. Their main task was to help curators to perform their duties. Together with them, prosecutors supervised the distribution of public water in Rome. In fact, the real purpose of establishing the office of *procuratores aquarum* was to exercise control over the activities of *curatores aquarum*. This was due to Claudius' attempt to limit the role of the Senate whose representatives held the *procuratores* offices. However, Frontinus in his treatise *De aquaeductu urbis Romae* as a rule accused them of fraud and various abuses they committed during the mandate. This shows that Claudius' aim for this office was not fully realized. *Procuratores* were more likely to be remembered as public water thieves than curators.

*Keywords: procuratores aquarum, curatores aquarum, public water*

## **PROCURATORES – CESARSCY AGENCI CZY POMOCNICY KURATORÓW?**

### Streszczenie

Po raz pierwszy *procuratores aquarum* zostali powołani przez cesarza Klaudiusza. Ich głównym zadaniem było pomaganie kuratorom w wypełnianiu przez nich ich obowiązków. Wraz z nimi prokuratorzy nadzorowali dystrybucję wody publicznej na terenie Rzymu. Jednak prawdziwym celem utworzenia urzędu *procuratores aquarum* było sprawowanie przez nich kontroli nad działalnością *curatores aquarum*. Wynikało to z dążenia Klaudiusza do ograniczenia roli senatu, którego przedstawiciele sprawowali urzędy prokuratorские. Jednak Frontinus w swoim traktacie *De aquaeductu urbis Romae* oskarżał ich o kradzieże i różne inne nadużycia, które pełnili w czasie kadencji. To pokazuje, że cel, jaki nadał temu urzędowi Klaudiusz, nie do końca został zrealizowany. Prokuratorzy bowiem dali się raczej zapamiętać jako złodzieje wody publicznej niż pomocnicy kuratorów.

*Słowa kluczowe: procuratores aquarum, curatores aquarum, woda publiczna*