

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ
Filozofski fakultet
Beograd

UDC 903.4:911.37"652"(0932)

THE ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY OF ROMAN MINES IN NORTH-WESTERN DARDANIA: A LOST DOCUMENT

Abstract: The reading and interpretation of *ILlvg* 505, a fragmentary Roman inscription from Sočanica (Dardania in Moesia Superior) can be improved upon. It commemorated the erection or restoration, by Caracalla, of a building (a bath?) in the *vicus metalli* which was situated in the immediate neighbourhood of the Municipium Dardanorum. Erected or restored in AD 216, the new building was the Emperor's gift to 'his' *collegia* (*[cor]porib(us) suis*) active in the mining centre on the soil of modern Sočanica. The coexistence of two Roman settlements – a *vicus metalli* and a municipality – within a very narrow area helps us understand some aspects of the process of the 'municipalization' of *territoria metallorum*.

In the volume honouring the outstanding scholarship and exceptional merits of Professor Fanoula Papazoglou, Dardania must not be forgotten. Our honorand has consecrated a series of influential works to the history, geography, onomastics, economy and culture of that Balkan country in pre-Roman and Roman periods¹. Dardanian mining, too, has attracted the attention of this historian whose research never overlooks the fundamental factors of social life. A Severan document concerning the administration of the Sočanica mines and mining town(s) in the Ibar valley² seems therefore to be a suitable subject for the present brief contribution to the *Festschrift* of Professor F. Papa-

¹ See notably *The Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times. Triballi, Autariatae, Dardanians, Scordisci and Moesians* (Amsterdam 1978) 131–269. Dardanian mining and coinage: *ibid.*, 197, 466 ff.

² On the Ibar *metalla* (in the north-west of Roman Dardania; Moesia Superior) see my papers „Aspects of Roman Mining in Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia Superior“ (abbr.: *Aspects*), in: (H. Temporini and W Haase eds.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 6 (Berlin – New York 1977) 72 and 87 f., and „The Organization of Roman Mining in Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia Superior“ (in Serbian with an English summary; abbr.: *Organization*), *Istorijski glasnik* 1–2 (Beograd 1980) 28 f. 50 f. On the Roman mining settlement(s) at Sočanica (modern Serbian village) – uniting, after a date in the late second or early third centuries, a still anonymous *vicus metalli* and the *municipium Dardanorum* (cf. the end of the present article) – see in addition to these two papers E. Čerškov, *Municipium DD at Sočanica* (in Serbian with an English summary; abbr.: Čerškov), Priština – Beograd 1970, and J. Šašel, *Arheološki vestnik* 21/22 (Ljubljana 1970/71) 307–310 (a review, in Slovenian, of Čerškov's book).

zoglou. This is all the more so as the fragmentary inscription to be discussed here touches upon the complex problems of the coexistence of two or more cities or city-like units within the same ancient settlement, problems that have interested Professor F. Papazoglou for many years.

The fragment (h. 0, 54 m, w. 0, 46 m, th. ?), unearthed by peasants in 1963 in the southern part of the Roman composite settlement at Sočanica („close to the bank of the R. Ibar“), belonged to the right-hand side of a slab of dacite; the late E. Čerškov deposited it, together with the other epigraphical monuments and some architectural remains of the site, within building C on the *forum*, but it seems to have disappeared soon after its discovery³. The inscription, „very difficult to read“, has been reproduced and partly restored by the *editor primus* as follows:⁴

	NVS PIVS	[- - - Antoni]nus Pius
	ANN MAX	[- - - Brit]ann(icus) max(imus)
	POTEST XVIII	[- - - trib(unicia)] potest(ate) XVIII
	O COS	[- - - cos. III p.p. pr]ocos.
5	PORIB SVIS	[- - - tem]porib(us) suis
	TIVS TAT	[- - - Ca]tius(?) Tat-
		[- - -

Believing that lines 1–4 contained the names and titles of Antoninus Pius, Čerškov dated (on line 3) the inscription to Pius' nineteenth year of tribunician power, „c. AD 157“ (*debut* 155/6). In his opinion, „the character of the inscription is uncertain“. Both points can be improved upon; however, no exhaustive discussion of the fragment has been published since Čerškov's edition⁵.

Firstly and obviously, the monument should be attributed to Caracalla, not Antoninus Pius, as lines 1 (the place of the attribute *Pius* after the Emperor's cognomen), 2 ([*Brit]ann(icus) max.*) and 4 ([*pr]ocos.*) show beyond any doubt. This attribution implies a date in

³ As Mr. Fatmir Peja, the Keeper of the epigraphical collection of the Museum at Priština, has kindly informed me through Professor P. Petrović and Dr. S. Fidanovski.

⁴ Čerškov p. 66 no. 16. I have not seen the stone, of which no photograph or drawing has been published. Obvious misprints (affecting the use of brackets and the like) in Čerškov's restoration of the fragmentary text have been corrected here.

⁵ Two observations on its text have been made, however, which will be noted in the present article. J. Šašel (*supra*, note 2) 309 was the first to correct Čerškov's dating of the fragment (cf. *ILLug* 505): „the base p. 66 no. 16 was set up in honour of Caracalla; it belongs to AD 216, not 157“. For my part, I have seen that lines 5–6 indicate a building-stone (of the kind of e. g. *ILS* 5337); „hence, [*cor]porib(us) suis* imposes for line 5“ (*Aspects* 88 with note 224; *Organization* 51 with note 344). Neither Čerškov's edition of the fragment nor these two comments have been signalled in the *Année épigraphique*.

AD 216 (line 3: [trib.] potest. XVIII)⁶. Line 3, following the [Brit]ann. max., may be restored rather confidently⁷: [Germ. max. pont. (or pontif.) max. trib.] potest. XVIII, which suggests that the left part of lines 1–4, now lost, was approximately some 18–20 letters long. Though we cannot be quite sure as to the volume of all the abbreviations used there, or even the exact wording and/or arrangement of the text in lines 1–2⁸, this makes an easily acceptable, if tentative, restoration of lines 1–4 quite possible. That fact, in turn, tends to corroborate our estimate of the size of the lacuna in line 3 init.: [Imp. Caes. M. Aur. Antoni]nus Pius /² [Fel. Aug. Parth. max. Brit]ann. max. /³ [Germ. max. pont. (or pontif.) max. trib.] potest. XVIII /⁴ [imp. III cos. IIII p. p. pr]ocos⁹. To judge from the dimensions of the space occupied by (Čerškov's transcript of) lines 3 and 4 fin., the former line will have been comparatively longer, and the latter comparatively shorter, than lines 1 (24 letters ?) and 2 (24 letters ?); that contrast may, but need not have induced the engraver to arrange the inscription symmetrically, i. e. according to the so-called paragraph fashion. If we take that line 3 was indeed comparatively long (32 letters in total ?), its lettering was probably smaller than that of lines 1–2. On the other hand, line 4, numbering some 21 letters altogether, with many slim characters in its left half, could have hardly filled the entire space available at its beginning, unless the items *imp. III, cos. IIII, p. p.*, and [pr]ocos. were markedly divided. In any case, it seems certain that the engraver reserved lines 1–4 for imperial names and titles; he separated them from the rest of the inscription at the cost of leaving a *vacat* at the end of line 4¹⁰.

Second, despite the sceptical attitude of E. Čerškov (who was evidently misled by his restoration of line 5 fin., [tem]porib(us) suis),

⁶ Strictly, Caracalla's *trib. potest. XVIII* began on December 10, 215, but its early days need not be considered here – it seems highly unlikely that the erection/restoration and *dedicatio* of a public building such as that referred in the inscription (on line 5 init. see below) should take place in winter.

⁷ For. *pont.* see e. g. *ILS* 2007 and 5822; *pontif.*, 2335. Analogous variants may be assumed – though with less justification – for the other abbreviations restored in this line (cf. the next note).

⁸ To signal some possibilities disregarded by the restoration just proposed: a line containing the titles *Imp. Caes.* (or *Caesar*) may have been inscribed above the line citing Caracalla's names (in that case, *Aurel(l)ius* was probably unabbreviated and the line 1 [with *Imp. Caes./Caesar*] arranged „paragraphically“ in relation to lines 2 and 3); the *Caes.* (*Caesar*) and the *Fel.* (possibly written *Felix*) may have been omitted altogether; Caracalla's gentile (e. g. *Aurel.* or *Aurel(l)ius*) and the adjectives *Parth.* (e. g. *Part.* or *Parthic.*) and *Germ.* (e. g. *Ger.* or *German.*) may have been given forms different from those printed in our restoration.

⁹ Cf. e. g. the prescript of a military diploma of January 7, 216 (*CIL* XVI 137): [Imp. C]aes. (maiores) M. Aurellius Antoninus Pius Felix Aug. Parth. max. Brit. max. Germ. max. pontif. max. trib. pot. XVIII imp. III cos. IIII p. p. proc.

¹⁰ For two examples of a similar *ordinatio* at Sočanica see *Zbornik radova Narodnog muzeja u Beogradu* (Recueil du Musée National, Belgrade) XVI–1 (1996) 211–6 with Fig. 1 (AD 181 [or 182] ?) and *ILluc* 503 (AD 238–244).

the type of the inscription can be determined. It was not cut on a (honorary) base as J. Šašel once thought¹¹: the names of the Emperor stood in the nominative (line 1: [- - -]nus Pius), and the form of the fragmentary monument has been described as a slab, though its thickness remains unknown. These two material facts, as well as my restoration of an indirect object in line 5, [cor]porib(us) suis – probable in the context, both grammatically and administratively¹² – suggest a building-stone. A less simple inscription, one including a (quasi-)literary expression such as [tem]porib(us) suis, would have presupposed i. a. more space between the preamble (lines 1–4) and the personal name in line 6 than actually available. All in all, there is no reason to alter the essence of my 1977 interpretation of the fragment: it „seems to record a building(?) granted by Caracalla (in AD 216) [cor]porib(us) suis through a certain []tius Tat[]“¹³. It is difficult of course to be precise about the nature of the construction in question as the southern part of the Roman settlement(s) at Sočanica is quite insufficiently known from the archaeological point of view. Epigraphically, lines 5–6 leave several possibilities of restoration. A *balneum* (*thermae*), *scholae* or a *basilica* would appear the most plausible candidates¹⁴. Discovered in the vicinity of the Ibar, the inscription is perhaps likelier to refer to a bath (so important for the life of every *vicus metalli*)¹⁵ than another type of building but the matter must be left open for now¹⁶.

¹¹ Note 5 above. In 1978, A. and J. Šašel (*ILLug* 505) wrote, however, „tabula“, not „basis“.

¹² The use of the term *corpus*, meaning a *collegium* with an official status (cf. e. g. J.-P. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains* (abbr.: Waltzing), I (Louvain 1895) 340 f. and II (1896) 140 f. et passim; *infra*, note 34), has already been attested within mining territories: *Dig.* III 4, 1 (Gaius); *ILLug* 775. *Infra*, notes 17–18.

¹³ *ILS* 5337 (the Latin version; „a. 172 vel paullo post“), then adduced by me as a (random) parallel, runs: *Imp. Caesar M. Aurelius Antoninus [Aug. Germanicus] imp. V cos. III p. p. murum civitati Philippopolis [dedit. C. Pantuleius Gra]ptiacus leg. Aug. pr. pr. faciendum curavit.*

¹⁴ Constructions such as temples, *macella*, bridges et sim. would have benefited the whole community (communities), not only the *corpora*.

¹⁵ H.-Ch. Noeske, „Studien zur Verwaltung und Bevölkerung der dakischen Goldbergwerke in römischer Zeit“ (abbr.: Noeske), *Bonn. Jahrb.* 177 (1977) 289 f.; Cl. Domergue, *La mine antique d' Aljustrel (Portugal) et les tables de bronze de Vipasca* (Paris 1983) 50–53, 79–86 et passim; *Organization* 17 note 59.

¹⁶ Cf. e. g. *CIL* III 12734 (AD 220) and 12376 (AD 274), the building-stones concerning the *balnea* in the mining city of Domavia (East Dalmatia); *CIL* III 12735 will have been a similar case. A bath alluded to in an epigraphical fragment at Ampelum (Dacian *aurariae*), *IDR* III/3, 282? (Epigraphical evidence from Ampelum and Alburnus Maior – furnishing comparative material of primary importance for the history of the whole of Illyrican mining – is referred to here as published in the most recent edition, that of the *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae*, vols. I [the *tabulae ceratae*, in a numbering which is somewhat different from that in *CIL* III and Noeske] and III/3 [other inscriptions]. The lemmata in *IDR* III/3 cite i. a. Noeske's „Inscripfen-katalog“, which groups the same evidence and provides it with useful commentaries.)

My former comments on the identity of the *[cor]pora* and the rank of *[Jtius Tat[]* are a somewhat different case, however. Discussing the *[cor]pora*, I envisaged three possibilities: „associations of (*metallarii*-)*coloni* in various mines of Dardania (in that case, analogous inscriptions will have been set up in other mining centres of the country), associations of (*metallarii*-)*coloni* in possible subdivisions of the Sočanica district or, if it was administratively homogeneous, associations of different types (professional in the first place) and open not only to the lessees, in the same district of Sočanica“. As I understood them in 1977, three inscriptions from the Ljubija *ferrariae* (southernmost part of Pannonia Superior)¹⁷ and a testimony of Gaius¹⁸ tend to „make the third possibility unattractive“¹⁹.

The official position of *[Jtius Tat[]* bears on the problem of the whereabouts and the memberships of the *[cor]pora*. What has been preserved of his *gentile* suffices to show that he did not belong to the number of imperial freedmen procurators. While composing my 1977 study, on the strength of an (erroneous) interpretation of another epigraphical fragment from Sočanica²⁰, I thought that imperial *liberti* managed the Sočanica mines as late as 216, which would indicate that *[Jtius Tat[]* was „a more important person, the governor²¹ or the procurator²² of Moesia Superior, rather than a *procurator metallorum Dardanicorum* (i. e. procurator of mining districts covering most of the Upper Moesian South), a title not met with as yet“²³. (This reason-

¹⁷ *ILLug 775 (Nemes[i] Piae in hono[r]em colle[gi] et Ianuari vil(ici) Ianuaris ex corpore possuit (!)), 777 (Sedato Aug(usto) pro sal[ute] Aureli vil(ici) colleg(ae)(!) v. s. l. m.) and 776 (Sedato Aug(usto) pro sal(ute) Aureli vil(ici) collegius(!) v. s. l. m.)*. A recent epigraphical find has shown that my attribution of the Ljubija *ferrariae* to Pannonia (Superior) has been exact: *Aspects* 64 f. 83; *Organization* 19–21 and 46–48; J. Fitz, *Die Verwaltung Pannoniens in der Römerzeit II* (Budapest 1993) 406–408.

¹⁸ *Dig. III 4, 1: ... ut ecce vectigalium publicorum sociis permissum est corpus habere vel aurifodinarum vel argentifodinarum et salinarum ...* No doubt, this included *ferrariae*, too.

¹⁹ *Aspects* 88, with reference to 85 note 209: „*collegium* (cf. e. g. *IDR III/3, 235: colleg(ium) aurariarum* at Ampelum) and *corpus* in *ILLug 775–777* are obviously synonymous and, with regard to the occurrence of the *vilicus* of the *ferrariae* in these texts, mean the association of the lessees of the mines, cf. *Dig. III 4, 1* (Gaius) ... These *corpora* are not to be confused with professional or religious associations such as *collegia fabrum ... or collegia salutaria*, which also occurred in the mining districts ... but united only some of the *coloni*“. In *Organization* 51 (cf. 48 note 322, citing e. g. *ILS 6152 [infra, note 35]*) I thought rather of the *corpora* uniting the Emperor's freedmen and slaves in each district of a vast area like Dardania or Moesia Superior.

²⁰ Čerškov p. 64 (*Supplementum Epigraphicum* no. 12) = *ILLug 504*.

²¹ For some analogous examples see *Aspects* 91 note 248.

²² For Domavian parallels, *Aspects* 86 note 216.

²³ *Aspects* 88. In *Organization* 51 with note 347, the tentative identification of *[Jtius Tat[]* with Caracalla's legate of Moesia Superior was discarded, and the alternative of a Dardanian dignitary (*procurator metallorum Dardaniae* or a quasi-provincial *procurator* of Dardania – both posts unattested so far) considered with less scepticism than in 1977.

ning was also based on the fact that the popular notion²⁴ of an *equus* and an *Augusti libertus* jointly managing a *metallum* cannot stand a closer scrutiny, at least not when the Illyrican mines of the II and III centuries are concerned²⁵.) If we take that []*tius Tat*[] was really a dignitary of the rank of the governor or provincial procurator, the hypothesis of each of the []*cor*]pora meaning the *ordo* of *metallarii*-lessees in one part of Dardania (or Moesia Superior as a whole) would gain probability. The more so as Caracalla may have had good reasons to intensify the work of his mines (reasons which would naturally lead him to undertake some generous measures within the *fines metallorum* in such areas, extremely rich in minerals, as were most parts of Dardania / Moesia Superior) in order to secure the pay to his soldiers during the Parthian expedition²⁶. At the time, an analogous explanation seemed applicable to two further inscriptions concerning Balkan mining²⁷, though neither their dates nor their contents can be safely connected with Caracalla's financial and war plans of 216²⁸.

Now, tempting as it may appear, my former interpretation of the fragment is contradicted by two considerations. The epigraphical evidence for the hypothesis that the Sočanica mines were headed by an imperial freedman in 216 must be put aside as highly suspicious²⁹. Actually, the position of procurator at Sočanica was probably held by equestrians as early as Septimius Severus' reign if not before, to judge

²⁴ See e. g. Noeske 300 f., with refs.; cf. J. Andreau, *Rev. num.* 31 (Paris 1989) 96 ff.

²⁵ *Aspects* 92; *Organization* 52 note 360; cf. P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris. A Social Study of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves* (Cambridge 1972) 281, and p. 215 (with note 29) of my article referred to in note 10 above.

²⁶ For some references to studies dealing with the „wirtschaftlichen Vorkehrungen des Kaisers für den Partherkrieg“ (mainly on evidence from the eastern provinces) see e. g. G. Walser and Th. Pekáry, *Die Krise des römischen Reiches ...* (Berlin 1962) 13.

²⁷ *Aspects* 87 note 218, of no. 12 in Čerškov's *Supplementum Epigraphicum* (Sočanica) and *IGBulg* III 2, 1859 (Thracian Siderea).

²⁸ Actually, in all likelihood, the Sočanica fragment should be dated to AD 181 or 182 (above, note 10). As to *IGBulg* III 2, 1859, I think now that it is better to put it in 155/6 than 216, though the latter date has also been envisaged by some epigraphists (cf. G. Mihailov's comment, p. 213 f., *ad num.*).

²⁹ The fragmentary base citing an *Amandus [Aug(usti)] lib(ertus) proc(urator)* (i. e. procurator of the local *metalla*) at Sočanica (*ILlulg* 504) was not dedicated to Caracalla (in 216), as suggested by my former restoration of its lines 1–4 (*Aspects* 87 with note 218 and *Organization* 50; cf. above, text and notes 20–27). Its honorand is best identified with Commodus (see the paper cited *supra*, note 10, where – with due caution – the stone is dated to 181 or 182). Consequently, the *terminus post quem* for the replacement of imperial freedmen-procurators by *equites* in the mining districts of Dardania need not be placed as late as 216. (In this connection, we have to reemphasize the fact that the knights did not have imperial freedmen as auxiliary procurators in their mining posts – after the replacement spoken of here, there was no major reason for the freedmen procurators to appear within the *fines metallorum*.) The change will be rather attributed to the complex of administrative innovations so typical of the late Antonines' and Septimius Severus' reigns (Weaver [*supra*, note 25] 265 f.).

from a number of eloquent parallels³⁰. It is therefore the most economical solution to the puzzle of the status of [*Jtius Tat[]*] to see in him an equestrian procurator of the Sočanica district itself. The same conclusion may be arrived at from a different angle, i. e. from an analysis of line 6 init. of the fragment. Though *Tat[]* may have borne a long nomen (Čerškov's restoration [*Ca?*]*Jtius*, if not unattractive, is little more than a conjecture)³¹, the space available in the lacuna at

³⁰ The system of mine management in Illyricum varied with time and place (*Aspects* 93 [line 13 from above, correct „(1)“ to „(2)“, cf. *Organization* 52]; „Late Roman Mining in Illyricum: Historical Observations“, in: [B. Jovanović, P. Petrović, S. Đurđekanić eds.] *Ancient Mining in Southeast Europe*, International Symposium [Donji Milanovac, 1990], Belgrade 1995, 219–225). In that, the process of gradually substituting the *equites* for the *liberti Augusti* (*Augustorum*) in the procurators' posts primarily depended on the importance of the mines concerned: the richer the mine, the earlier knights started being employed – to propose a simplified definition of the imperial policy. So the prosperous *argentariae* in the Drinus valley (Pannonia and Dalmatia) were headed by the *equites* from Pius' reign (if not before) onwards (see e. g. Fitz [*supra*, note 17] 403 ff. 713, 716 ff. [p. 739, no. 423, Cassius Ligurinus, was a procurator of the Šumadija mines (in Moesia Superior, cf. the following lines of the present note), not of the *argentariae Pannonicae et Dalmaticae*]); as a matter of fact, we have no explicit indication of the use of the imperial *liberti* in that particular function as yet. In the Šumadija *metalla* (the north-west of Moesia Superior), an *Aug(usti) lib(ertus) proc(urator)* is attested in the first century or at the beginning of the second (*IMS* I 103, with p. 100 f. [Kosmaj]), and an *eques* by name of Cassius Ligurinus in the early part (c. March, 195 ?) of Severus' reign (*IMS* I 168, Rudnik, cf. p. 215 note 26 of my paper referred to *supra*, note 10). Ligurinus' successors must have been knights, too; of them, note Simplicius (a v. e.) c. AD 287 (*IMS* I 20, Avala-Kosmaj; cf. 172–174 Rudnik; S. Dušanić, *Starinar* XL–XLI (1989–91) 219 note 14; I. Popović, in: (I. Popović, T. Cvjetičanin, B. Borić-Brešković eds.) *Silver Workshops and Mints* (Belgrade 1995) 152–156 and 161). The *aurariae Daciccae* formed the last district of the Illyrican-Danubian area which has preserved evidence of major interest for the present discussion (cf. Noeske 296–301, 347–351). It was managed by freedmen till at least Marcus Aurelius (*IDR* III/3, 347) and by knights from at least AD 183–185 (*IDR* III/3, 281). With regard to the chronological indications and the criterion of the mines' importance which the data listed in the foregoing lines provide, the replacement of freedmen by knights in the Ibar *metalla* is best dated slightly later than for *aurariae Daciccae*, and approximately simultaneous with that of the Šumadija mines, i. e. to the eighties (after AD 181–182) or, rather, nineties of the second century (Cassius Ligurinus will have been the first or one of the first knights in the *fasti* of the procurators of the Šumadija mines). Such a date would well accord with the policies of the late Antonines and Septimius Severus mentioned at the end of the preceding note. It should be remarked that the Ljubija *ferrariae*, after the régime of large lease-holders was discontinued there between AD 201 and 209 (*Aspects* 83 with note 202; *Organization* 47 with note 315), were headed by knights, not freedmen procurators, all the time (attestations in 209, 211–217, 223 etc.). I am inclined now to abandon my previous restorations of the corresponding parts of the Ljubija altars (especially of *ILLug* 157 [AD 209], line 8, where I was obviously wrong to reject the reading of *T* in the second letter-place) and the resulting hypothesis that the procurators named in them were of freedman status till the later 220's.

³¹ The *Catii* are on record in Dardania: *IMS* VI 42 (Scupi) and IV 105 (the Toplica valley; this latter bearer of the nomen may have been connected with mining and even the town of Sočanica itself, if his pontificate is attributed to it, not Ulpijana or Scupi [the other two plausible possibilities]). For a *Catt(ia ?)* at Sočanica, Čerškov p. 64 (*Supplementum Epigraphicum* no. 21).

the beginning of the line is still too large to be filled by a verb like *dedit* which is expected on the hypothesis formulated in my 1977 paper. A restoration like ¹⁵ [*balneum conlabsum* (or: *thermas conlab-sas*) *cor*]porib(us) suis / [*a solo restituit. ±3*]tius Tat/[ianus(?)] *proc. metallorum* (or the like) *ref. cur.*] would sound preferable, despite its vulnerability. If it is accepted, however, and line 6 init. taken to have contained a formula recording the restoration of an old building, the text could not be cited as referring to an imperial initiative of a special sort that benefited a whole series of the Balkan mining districts. Caracalla may have been heedful indeed of his miners in the delicate year of 216, but the reconstruction of a *balneum* (*thermae*) at Sočanica is best described as a local and almost routine affair. Conversely, the [*cor*]pora should be identified as two or more official *collegia* active within one mining region, that of Sočanica, and not representing all the mining regions of a province or a province-like entity which Dardania was before Aurelian.

Would it be possible to define the nature of the Sočanica [*cor*]pora thus qualified as local bodies? The proposal to see in them „associations of *coloni* in the (hypothetical) subdivisions“ of the district is hardly convincing; among other obstacles to it, an official inscription of AD 238–244 reveals that all the *metallarii*-lessees of the Ibar mines were united into one *ordo colonorum*³². On the other hand, the alternative of voluntary associations such as *collegia* of compatriots, cult *collegia*, *collegia salutaria* or even professional *collegia* of a purely private character seems implausible, too³³. It is probable that each of the [*cor*]pora referred to in the fragment rallied together all those inhabitants of the district who shared the same administrative status; only in that case, the use of the technical term *corpus* and of the adjective *suus* (line 5) – alluding to the fact that all the official organizations and functionaries of a fiscal mine belonged, in a way, to the Emperor himself³⁴ – would be fully comprehensible.

³² Čerškov p. 64 (*Supplementum Epigraphicum* no. 11. and T. XIV 3) = S. Dušanić, *Živa Antika* 21 (Skoplje 1971) 247–254 and 260 f. = *ILJug* 503 (cf. *Organization* 44 note 288): *Invicto et super omnes indulgentissimo Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M. Ant(onio) Gordiano nobilissimo principi dedicante Tit[i]jeno Vero v(iro) e(gregio) proc(uratore) m(etallorum) m(unicipii) D(ar)d(anorum) ordo colonor(um) devotus numini maiestatique eius. The l(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) co(lonorum)* in the inscription published by N. Vulić (*Spomenik SKA* 71, 1931, p. 93 no. 217; Sočanica, the precise find-spot unknown) and reinterpreted by A. Mócsy, *Gesellschaft und Romanisation in der römischen Provinz Moesia Superior* (Budapest 1970) 38 (cf. *Aspects* 87 note 222) points to the same: if there were more than one *ordo colonorum* in the Sočanica mines, the formula would have been expressed in a less laconic manner.

³³ Though such associations are well attested in mining territories and *vici*: *Aspects* 85 note 209; *IDR* I p. 192–198 (Dacian *tab. cer.* I) int. 1, lines 4 ff.; ext. 2, lines 7 ff., and 3, lines 16 ff.; *IDR* III/3, 234 f. 385, 401 f., et al.

³⁴ Cf. e. g. *IMS* IV 69–71 (Remesiana): *r(es) p(ublica) sua Ulp(iana)* (cf. S. Dušanić, *Arh. Vestnik* 28, Ljubljana 1977, 177 note 106, citing *ILS* 6870 III as a

At least two categories of such organizations have been recorded or alluded to in the whole of our evidence on the mining of the Principate: *corpus colonorum*, and the *corpus libertorum et servorum Caesaris*³⁵. But there must have been more; it seems legitimate to postulate the existence, *intra fines metallorum*, of the comparable *corpora fabrum*, *corpora negotiatorum* and analogous units³⁶. All three categories may well have functioned in the Sočanica district during the Severan age and later³⁷.

To conclude. The fragment discussed in the present note will have preserved, approximately, one-fourth of the line-length of the original inscription of AD 216. It can be consequently restored in the following way:

[Imp(erator) Caes(ar) M. Aur(elius) Antoni]nus Pius /
[Fel(ix) Aug(ustus) Parth(icus) max(imus) Brit]ann(icus) max(imus)
/ [Germ(anicus) max(imus) pont(ifex) max(imus) trib(unicia)]

sample parallel); IDR III/3, 281: *sumptu fisci sui; procuratore suo* (i. e. of Commodus); the mining provenance and/or fiscal affinities of the Remesianan, the Dacian and the Sočanica inscriptions indicate that the adjective *suus* figuring in them alludes to a closer connection between the Emperor and „his“ men and things than is the case, otherwise, in banal expressions such as *militēs sui* and the like. On the technical usage of the word *corpus*, note 12 above. Of course, that usage should not be postulated in every epigraphical attestation of the word (in contexts referring to public associations); conversely, *collegium* and *corpus* may have been used indiscriminatively in some inscriptions (above, note 17) similar to the Sočanica fragment analyzed here. But the genre of the fragment and, especially, the addition of *suis* (instead of *in vico metalli* or the like) in line 5 fin. forbid us to assume that the [*corp*]porib(us) had less than a technical value.

³⁵ Dig. III 4, 1 (above, note 18); IDR III/3, 284 (dedication to Annia Lucilla, in 165–166, by the imperial *lib(erti) et familia et leguli aurariar(um)*). Cf. *CIL* XIII 1550 (the territory of the Ruteni, Aquitania): *Zmaragdo vilico quaest. magistro ex decurion. decr. familiae Ti. Caes[ar]is quae est in me[ta]llis*. For a *corpus familiae publice* (!) *libertorum et servorum* at Ostia (?) see *ILS* 6152; the use of the term *corpus* is of interest for us here though the *familia* itself belonged to the city, of course, not the *fiscus*.

³⁶ And/or some *corpora* of that kind with more specific names? Cf. e. g. *Lex met. Vip.* I 4–6 (Domergue [*supra*, note 15] 52–55, 86–90, 106–108). The official status of such *corpora fabrum* (*corpora negotiatorum*, et sim.) at the Sočanica *vicus* must have been all the more evident as their memberships were imperial lessees too and, probably, obliged to conform to the *fiscus*' regulations in several important respects (Domergue 106–108).

³⁷ For the Sočanica body of miners-*coloni* see *ILLug* 501 (cf. *Organization* 39 f. note 256 and 50 note 340) and two inscriptions quoted above, note 32. For the *familia Caesaris* (apart from mining procurators) active in Sočanica and its neighbourhood, see *Organization* 50 f. with notes 341 and 343. The *collegia* of *fabri* (et sim.) have not been documented as yet along the Ibar but are on record in another mining district of the same province, that of Kosmaj: *IMS* I 95, cf. 121. See *ibid.*, p. 102 f. and 116, for various indications that the *collegia* attested in such inscriptions had a remarkable part in the economic and legal realities of life *intra fines metalli*, which cannot be reconciled with the popular hypothesis that their „but principal était funéraire“ (Waltzing II 237).

potest(ate) XVIIIII / [imp(erator) III co(n)s(ul) IIII p(ater) p(atriciae) pr]oco(n)s(ul). /⁵ [±16 cor]porib(us) suis / [(?) a solo restituit. ±3]tius Tat/[ianus(?) proc. metallorum (or the like) ±5].

Lines 1–4 The original wording and the choice of abbreviations may have slightly differed from those of the text just proposed³⁸; however, the essence of our restoration is certain, practically speaking. Line 5 init. [*balneum conlabsum* (or: *thermas conlabsas*)] ? Lines 6/7 The most frequent cognomen in *Tat-* is *Tatianus*³⁹; though a spelling *Tattianus* is not a common one, it too must be considered – the more so as *Tat/[tianus]* (?) would give the syllabic division between lines 6 and 7. A very tentative restoration of the first part of the procurator's name-formula would be [*Ca*]tius or [*Cat*]tius⁴⁰. Line 7 []tius Tat[] probably managed the Sočanica mines, not a wider administrative unit. He also may have been styled *procurator argentariarum*⁴¹ or *procurator metallorum (argentariarum) municipii Dardanorum*⁴². All these titles were capable of taking various forms of abbreviation. The inscription obviously ended with an expression such as *ref(iciendum) cur(avit)*.

The [*cor*]pora (line 5) probably presented bodies, officially recognized, of the inhabitants of the Sočanica district, organized according to their professional/ administrative and legal status (*coloni; liberti et servi Augusti*; perhaps also *fabri, negotiatores* et sim.). They must have existed in most fiscal mines in general, especially (when the *fabri* and *negotiatores* are concerned) from the Severan epoch onwards⁴³, but the Sočanica fragment provides so far a unique attestation of their collective rôle. They could not have rallied together certain categories of local population such as simple soldiers⁴⁴. On the other hand, if the [*cor*]pora is taken to mean here three or more associations (which is not improbable)⁴⁵, the likely inclusion of a *corpus fabrum* and a *corpus negotiatorum* (or a joint

³⁸ Cf. *supra*, notes 7–8.

³⁹ Mócsy et al., *Nomenclator*, 283.

⁴⁰ *Supra*, note 31.

⁴¹ Thus e. g. *CIL* III 12736, Domavia (v. e. pro. *argentariarum*).

⁴² Thus Titienus Verus, *supra*, note 32 (*proc. m. m. Dd.*). The short style *procurator* (implying that the closing formula of our inscription was not abbreviated radically or remained completely unabbreviated) does not seem likely, considering the official character of its text. On the other hand, a *v(ir) e(gregius)* may have followed the procurator's cognomen, cf. *IDR* III/3, 292 (Ampelum, AD 215) and *CIL* III 12733 f. (Domavia, AD 218–220) but contrast *IMS* I 168 (Rudnik, c. March 196 ?) and *ILLug* 157 (Ljubija, AD 209), where it does not occur.

⁴³ See e. g. *Dig.* 50, 6, 6, 12. Cf. Waltzing II 251–254.

⁴⁴ *Dig.* XLVII 22, 1 pr. : *ne milites collegia in castris habeant*. Cf. Waltzing I 55 f., 308 ff. et passim.

⁴⁵ If only two were meant, we should have expected line 5 phrased in a different, more explicit, way.

corpus of the two professions) would indirectly attest to the wealth of the Sočanica mines in the early third century⁴⁶, the more so as the dimensions of the inscription preserved through our fragment reveal a large building⁴⁷.

In AD 216, when the building was reconstructed (?), a *municipium D(ar)d(anorum)* must have already been in existence at Sočanica⁴⁸; its perimeter – probably a very short one – cannot be identified as yet with complete confidence but its nucleus is best located in the *forum* of the Roman town of Sočanica⁴⁹. It is interesting to note that the inscription did not refer to the municipality's *cives* as such⁵⁰. There are good reasons to believe that Caracalla's *corpora* were intimately linked to the *vicus metalli*, which, if coexisting with the *municipium*, was nevertheless divided from it, as the status of the terrain differed with such two kinds of settlement⁵¹. Legally and socially, probably also with regard to the respective location of their

⁴⁶ On the frequency of customs stations in Dardania as a symptom of the economic importance of its mines see p. 151 f. of my 1985–1989 paper referred to *infra*, note 52. *Collegia* and the prosperity of the Kosmaj *metalla*, above, note 37.

⁴⁷ The original length of the inscription can be estimated at approximately 2m. By way of comparison it may be noted that the original length of the slab bearing the dedication of Antinous' temple on the (future) *forum* (*ILLug* 501, cf. *supra*, note 37) was some 1. 5 m. The dimensions of Antinous' temple itself are unknown; those of the *forum* temple which inherited it at the end of the third century have been determined as 15. 75 x 14. 25 m (Čerškov p. 22).

⁴⁸ See nos 1, 11 (above, note 32) and 17 of Čerškov's *Supplementum Epigraphicum*; cf. also no. 8 (*m(un.)* or *m(et.) Dard.* ?). The date of birth of the *municipium* should be sought in the period between the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus (S. Dušanić, *Živa Antika* 21 [Skoplje 1971] 251 note 64; Noeske 281, cf. 278 [the parallels of Ampelum and Domavia favour a dating c. AD 200 ?]).

⁴⁹ The construction of the *forum* as unearthed by Čerškov (p. 14 ff. 72 ff. 85–89, cf. Šašel [*supra*, note 2] 308 f.) began late in the third century; the corresponding part of the Sočanica settlement had been destroyed „by a great fire“ at an uncertain date (probably after Gordian III's reign, to judge from the contents and find-place of the base quoted *supra*, note 32). If we are to presume that the *constitutio* of the *municipium* was accompanied by some construction works on the site of the (future, Diocletianic) *forum*, we should note Čerškov's tentative proposal (p. 24) to postulate an inter-phase (i. e. one postdating Hadrian [cf. note 47 above] and antedating Diocletian) in the building history of the *forum*.

⁵⁰ This contrasts with the normal practice of close collaboration between the *collegia* and their city (e. g. Waltzing I 511, II 187 f.). It seems conceivable, and significant for our interpretation of Sočanica affairs in the third century, that the relations between the municipal component of the double settlement and the *corpora* „belonging to the Emperor“ and situated in the other component must have been less intimate. Even the prices for the use of the two categories of bath probably differed.

⁵¹ The circumstance that the soil upon which the *vicus metalli* stood belonged to the *Fiscus* (that of the *municipium* was autonomous, of course) had many important consequences. One of them is alluded to in the Dacian *tab. cer.* IX (*IDR* I p. 226–31) ext. 3, line 27 and int. 2, lines 15–16. Cf. also the *l. d. d. co.* in the inscription referred to *supra*, note 32.

houses, the *vicani* and the *cives* were separated collectivities⁵², though overlapping in some aspects of life⁵³. It is worth stressing that the *municipium* had a large bath of its own in the third century, close to the *forum*, in the east quarter of the town, rather far from the building recorded in our document (which was situated in the south, near the river)⁵⁴. The fort has been found on the hill of Sokoljača, less than three kilometers to the north-east of the town, and a *statio* of *beneficiarii consularis* at Bresje, approximately two kilometers to the south⁵⁵; however, some military posts may have been located in the town itself⁵⁶. In our present state of knowledge, sadly incomplete as it is, the Roman remains of the Sočanica area are of a complex settlement in the third century, combining the elements of a *vicus metalli*, municipality and a military garrison⁵⁷. The modalities of the combination remain largely uncertain. A similar complexity must be postulated, however, for more than one mining centre – notably the centres of the *aurariae Dacicae*⁵⁸ and the *argentariae Pannonicae et Dalmaticae*⁵⁹ of the Severan and later epochs.

⁵² *Živa Antika* 21 (Skoplje 1971) 246 ff.; *Aspects* 89 f.; *Organization* 44 f.; „The Roman Mines of Illyricum: Organization and Impact on Provincial Life“, in: (Cl. Domergue ed.) *Mineria y metalurgia en las antiguas civilizaciones mediterraneas y europeas*. Coloquio internacional asociado, Madrid 1985, II (Madrid 1989) 149 f., all with bibl. On insufficient grounds, in the papers cited here, I tried to show that the Sočanica *vicus metalli* was some two kilometers to the north (north-west) of the Municipium Dardanorum, not so close to (or, in some areas, even intermingled with) that city as our fragment suggests. The twin settlements probably bore different names; for the analogy of Argentaria (*vicus metalli* ?) Domavianum (*municipium*) in the centre of the silver-mines of the Drinus valley see *Aspects* 90 f. with notes 246–247. A map of the Municipium Dardanorum and its neighbourhood can be found in Čerškov's „Prilog 1“.

⁵³ On the composite notion of *metalla municipii Dardanorum* (*supra*, note 32) and the phenomenon of a mine's *contributio* to a municipality see my articles listed in the preceding note. I insist in them upon such a picture of geographical relations between the mine (with its *vicus*) and the municipality which leaves the latter a very small territory.

⁵⁴ Čerškov p. 47 ff. (cf. his „Prilog II“). Still further, on the north-western border of the settlement, a smaller bath was erected (late in the third or early in the fourth century ?): Čerškov p. 50 ff.

⁵⁵ Sokoljača: Čerškov p. 11; Bresje: *ibid.* and *Supplementum Epigraphicum* no. 8 (cf. *Živa Antika* 21, 1971, 253–4).

⁵⁶ A soldier's tomb (3rd – 4th cent. ?) has been reported at the site of Prisoje, between Sokoljača and the *municipium* at Sočanica (Čerškov p. 57 f.). For military *stationes* and *castella* within the *vici metallorum* of some other mining territories, see Noeske 294 f.

⁵⁷ Even *canabae* (cf. the Dacian *tab. cer.* VII [IDR I p. 217–223] int., line 19, and VIII [IDR I p. 223–226] int. 2, line 18; ext. 3, line 17)?

⁵⁸ Noeske 277 f. and 282–5.

⁵⁹ *Supra*, note 52.