

SLOBODAN DUŠANIĆ
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Belgrade

UDC 904:911.372(497.11)

THE PRINCEPS MVNICIPIII DARDANORVM AND THE METALLA MVNICIPIII DARDANORVM

Dedicated to the memory of Borka Dragojević–Josifovska

Abstract: The author reedit and analyses the inscription of an honorary base (Fig.1) from Sočanica/Municipium Dardanorum (in north-west Dardania, Moesia Superior), erected c. Ad 183–191. Its prosopographical data throw an interesting light on the mining history of Roman Dardania and the functions of the *princeps municipii* in Illyricum at large.

I. The Roman remains from the modern Serbian village of Sočanica (north–west Dardania, in the province of Moesia Superior) give an instructive insight into the life and organization of Illyrican mines and the settlements that developed around them¹. This is particularly true of the Sočanica inscriptions, though their *editio princeps*, due to the late E. Čerškov² – a deserving archaeologist who had no special interest in epigraphical studies, leaves much to be desired. The subject of the present note is an interesting document of a prosopographical

¹ E. Čerškov's excavations of the site: id., *Municipium DD at Sočanica* (Priština – Beograd 1970) (in Serbian with an English summary; hereafter: E. Čerškov 1970). Cf. J. Šašel, *Arheološki Vestnik* 21/22 (Ljubljana 1970/1) 307-310 (a critical review [hereafter: J. Šašel 1970/1], in Slovenian, of E. Čerškov's book); A. et J. Šašel, *ILLug* II nos. 501-519 and III nos. 1380-1391; S. Dušanić, "The Administrative History of Roman Mines in North-western Dardania: A Lost Document", *Živa Antika* 47(1997) 31 note 2 [a bibliography]; hereafter: *Adm. History*). If not stated otherwise, the name of 'Sočanica' covers here, as a cumulative label, all Roman settlements situated on the territory of the Serbian village or in its immediate neighbourhood. Notably, it includes the *vicus metalli*, the municipium Dardanorum, the military station(s), and the settlements of the *peregrini*.

² E. Čerškov 1970, 61 ff. ("Supplementum epigraphicum") and T. XIV-XV (photographs of five inscriptions). For recent revisions of, and additions to, his "Supplementum epigraphicum" of Sočanica see the bibliographical data cited in the preceding note; also, M. Milin (*Starinar* n.s. 52 [Belgrade 2002]163-174) and S. Dušanić, "An Imperial Freedman Procurator at Sočanica". *Recueil du Musée National de Belgrade* (= *Zbornik radova Narodnog muzeja u Beogradu*) XVI-1 (1996) 211-216 (hereafter: *Procurator*).

and administrative nature which, incompletely understood by previous editors³, may be elucidated on the basis of comparative evidence from Dalmatia and Moesia Superior. The document concerns the history and epigraphical heritage of Scupi, among other centres, a Roman city our knowledge of which owes so much to the effort and acumen of the late Borka Dragojević-Josifovska.

The Sočanica inscription to be reedited and analyzed here⁴ was unearthed in the centre of the village in 1956. It had six lines, of which two had been erased (line 3 completely and, approximately, two-thirds of line 4 – i.e. all of it except for the last three letters). The inscription covered the face of the upper part of a simply decorated honorary base, a frequent type of monument at Sočanica⁵; the height of the lower part, lost before the inscription was copied and photographed, need not have been important (sufficing, roughly, for two more lines [7 and 8] of text ?)⁶. As the photograph shows, no letters were engraved above line 1. This excludes the possibility of a religious dedication (erected by two men⁷) though, let us note, the historical comments in the sequel would be little affected by a different conclusion about the genre of the inscription. It reads (Fig. 1):

³ E. Čerškov 1970, 65 no. 13; A. et J. Šašel, *ILLug* II no. 511. M. Gabričević's (unpublished) manuscript of the corresponding part of the *Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure* [hereafter: *IMS*], vol. V, follows here the *editio princeps* save for explicitly preferring *priceps* (!) *m*? (*unicipii*) *D*? (*ar*) [*d* (*anorum*)] in line 6 to the alternatives which are based on different identifications of the incompletely preserved sign after *S* (*I* or *L*, see below, text and note 17). Cf. J. Šašel 1970/1 (*supra*, note 1) 309, where lines 1-3 are read, correctly in the main (E. Čerškov did not expand the abbreviated gentile but was right in not postulating that Marcus' names were in the nominative case or that the VS of line 3 init. was extant), *M. N(ovellius) M. f. Qui/rina Montanus* (lines 4-5, *M. No/vel. Eros*, make the *N(ovellius)* of line 1 practically certain); however, Šašel made no comment on the important line 6 (similarly, *ILLug* II no. 511). S. Dušanić, "Aspects of Roman Mining in Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Moesia Superior", in: (H. Temporini – W. Haase eds.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II 6 (Berlin – New York 1977; hereafter: *Aspects*) 75 note 148, read line 6: *priceps* (!) *I D*[] and took it to refer to the *decurio princeps* of coh. I Aurelia Dardanorum (*infra*, n. 16).

⁴ I have not seen the stone itself (preserved at Sočanica or lost, it is impossible to say) but collated its photograph that is reproduced here by permission of the Centre d'études épigraphiques et numismatiques (Faculté de philosophie de l'Université de Beograd). According to E. Čerškov, the dimensions of the fragment are: 0. 57 m x 0. 57 m. x 0. 50 m; note the important thickness of the monument, which is close enough to that of nos. 3 ("0. 46 m") and 11 ("0. 55 m") cited in the next note.

⁵ See e.g. E. Čerškov 1970, 62 no. 3, 64 f. nos. 11 (+ T. XIV 3) and 12 (though E. Čerškov's edition of these three monuments is not completely accurate, it provides sufficient indications to suggest that they were honorary bases, not altars). Cf. *Procurator* (*supra*, n. 2) 211-216 + Fig. 1 (= no. 12).

⁶ Cf. e.g. the dimensions and content of E. Čerškov's no. 12.

⁷ Contra, *ILLug* II no. 511 (cf. J. Šašel 1970/1 [n.1] 309, who read Montanus' names in the nominative: above, note 3).

M. N(ovellio) M. f(ilio) Qui/rina Montan(o) / [[(?) proc(uratori) Imp(eratoris) (?)Com/modi Aug(usti)]] M. No⁵vel(lius) Eros / pri(n)ceps m?(unicipii) D?(ar)[d(anorum)] / [- - -



Fig. 1. Honorary base, AD 183-191? Sočanica
(north-west Dardania, in the province of Moesia Superior).

Lines 1–2: The *Quirina* implies, very probably, that Montan(us) was a Scupian (see below). 2 There are also other, if much less plausible, possibilities for the expansion of the abbreviated cognomen (Montanillus, Montanianus, Montanarius, et sim.)⁸. 3 The erasure contained the title of Montan(us) as an imperial official⁹; according to a practice which was not widely followed, the name(s) and titles of his Emperor had been added¹⁰. The latter underwent *damnatio* or at least *abolitio memoriae*. – With regard to the importance of the Roman mines

⁸ To quote only the cognomina in *Montan-* found in the works of reference (e.g. Kajanto; Mócsy et al. *Nomenclator*).

⁹ Cf. *ILug* II no. 511 (ad ll. 3-4).

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. *ILS* p. 426 (Ind.), citing i.a. no. 2742: *procurator M. Antonini Aug.*

centred at Sočanica and the comparatively high rank of the official's freedman, *proc(urator metalli/metallorum)* seems, by far, the likeliest restoration¹¹, despite the modest quality of the lettering itself. 3–4 In view of a variety of indications, Commodus appears to be the best candidate (*infra*, section II) but several different forms of his nomenclature and titulature can be assumed here. It is interesting to note that the titles *Imp.* and *Aug.* (if my restoration is not wrong) seem to have been erased, too¹². 4–5 Eros obviously shared his gentile with Montan(us)¹³: bearing a Greek cognomen typical of lower classes, he will have been Montan(us)' *libertus* rather than relative. As is well known, *liberti* were eligible to minor municipal magistracies in many cities¹⁴. 6 The spelling *pri(n)ceps* – reflecting a phonetical phenomenon¹⁵ rather than being a mechanical slip – has already been cited from *CIL X 7808*. – Previous editors, notably E. Čerškov, hesitated about the identification of the letter-traces between *S* and *D* (an incomplete *M*, a cursive form of *L* and a simple vertical were envisaged as possibilities) but accepted the (incomplete) *M* as the likeliest reading; they did not think that more than one letter was lost there¹⁶.

¹¹ The *procuratores* of local mines (imperial *liberti* till Commodus, equestrians later on [*infra*, section II]) figure in several inscriptions from Sočanica: E. Čerškov 1970, 61 ff. nos. 11, 12 (*Procurator* [n. 2] 211–216), 14 (?), 15 (the title to be restored in line 5: *Procurator* 216 note 31; the same man may have erected no. 4 of E. Čerškov's *Supplementum epigraphicum* [*Procurator* 216 note 31]). The *CAL* of *Ann. ép.* 1999, 1683 (whose reading and interpretation can be improved upon) *c* will have been an abbreviation of the name of the Domitianic (ibid., *a*) *procurator* of the *MET DARD* (ibid., *b*; obviously an imperial freedman) but the *Met(alla) Dard(anica, -antiae)* in question are difficult to identify: they may have been the mines of the Sočanica district, or another mining area within (the Moesian) Dardania, or (if such a post existed at all) of the Dardanian mines as a whole.

¹² For a parallel see e.g. *ILS* 1420.

¹³ As realized by J. Šašel (*supra*, note 3).

¹⁴ Especially when serving as clerks to their *patroni* who performed senior duties (see e.g. G. Vitucci, "Libertus", *Diz. ep.* IV(1958) 926–928; cf. *ILS* 6580, *AIJ* 180 and the lists of signatories of the pre-Flavian/early Flavian diplomata as analyzed by S. Dušanić, "The Witnesses to the Early 'Diplomata Militaria'", *Sodalitas. Scritti in onore di A. Guarino*, I (Napoli 1984) 279–283), a case similar to the relationship between Novellius Eros and Novellius Montanus (the latter being a Scupian, *patronus* of Eros the *princeps municipii*, procurator of the Sočanica mines ? and a magistrate of the municipium Dardanorum).

¹⁵ G. Mennella, "Il sarcofago caralitano del *princeps civitatis L. Iulius Castricius* (*CIL X 7808*)", in: (A. Mastino ed.) *L'Africa romana (Atti del VI convegno...)*, Sassari 1988, 755–760 (esp. 756).

¹⁶ The regretted deaths of E. Čerškov, M. Gabričević, and J. Šašel make it difficult to clear up the point now. M. Gabričević's (cautious) comment in favour of an *M* (cited above, note 3; cf. S. Dušanić, "Mounted Cohorts in Moesia Superior", in: *Akten des XI. int. Limeskongresses*, Budapest 1978, 244 n. 3 [see also the end of n. 3 above]) is especially instructive for E. Čerškov and himself were the sole editors of the inscription known to have seen the stone, and his epigraphical competence

Indeed, the epigraphical parallels to be listed below, (a-d), sustain (to say the least) the idea of finding a *pri(n)ceps m?(unicipii) D?(ar)[d(anorum)]* in this inscription. – E. Čerškov and M. Gabričević thought that a second *D* was destroyed at the end of the line; if they are right, their reading *m?(unicipii) D?(ar)[d(anorum)]* in line 6 fin. can find convincing analogy¹⁷.

II. For several reasons, the inscription cannot be dated as early as the first century or the age of the early Antonines. The mention of the *municipium Dardanorum* (if the letters in line 6 fin. are well read and correctly supplemented) offers a *terminus post quem*, although an imprecise one: “the date of birth of the *municipium* should be sought in the period between the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Severus”¹⁸. Lines 1-3, referring to a Roman citizen (equestrian, obviously) in his capacity of an imperial mining procurator active at Sočanica (according to an almost inevitable restoration and interpretation of line 3), can give us further help with this little chronological problem. Montan(us)’ procuratorship must have belonged to a time when the management of the Sočanica mines had already been transferred from the imperial *liberti* to the knights; “despite modern contentions to the contrary, the knights did not have imperial freedmen as auxiliary procurators in their *mining* posts”¹⁹. Now, the last so far attested *Augusti libertus* who managed the Sočanica *argentariae* was

certainly surpassed E. Čerškov’s. (Perhaps, the base was collated by J. Šašel too, but his collation could take place only after the publication of *ILLug* II and left no written record of which I am aware.) Namely, without autopsy it is impossible to securely distinguish between real letter-traces and accidental scars in the part of line 6 following the *S*, part whose surface is both variously damaged (damages which reduced the space available for the stone-cutter, making him engrave a rather irregular letter or letters) and full of quasi-letter-traces. If we combine the evidence of the photograph with what M. Gabričević said in his commentary, we are led to conclude that he saw on the stone, immediately after the *S*, two slanting, joining strokes which resembled an *A* (what seems in the photograph to be the *A*’s horizontal bar presents a simple scar); he interpreted them as the first two strokes of an *M*. After them, a diagonal letter-trace is visible (*M*’s third stroke) which led to the top of the *D* (whose vertical served as the fourth stroke of *M*). Consequently, there seems to have been a ligature made by *M* and *D*, whose first part (the first three strokes of an *M*) was engraved irregularly and much wider than usual, owing to the damages and other defects of the stone’s surface in line 6 fin. What made Čerškov speak of an *I* or an *L* in this place is impossible to state with confidence.

¹⁷ E. Čerškov 1970, 62 no.1: *mun. D(ar)d(anorum)*; 63 no. 8: *m(un. rather than – etall.) Dard(anorum)*; 64 no. 11 (cf. *Aspects* [n. 3] 90 with note 238): *m(etall.) m(unicipii) D(ar)d(anorum)*; 66 no.17: *mun. D(ar)d(anorum)*.

¹⁸ *Adm. History* (n. 1) 41 note 48. *Ibid.*: “the parallels of Ampelum and Domavia favour a dating *c.*AD 200?”; but see the end of the present paragraph. For the complex history of the municipal status of Apulum cf. *Ann. ép.*1977, 655 ff.

¹⁹ *Procurator* (n. 2) 215 with notes 26-29.

Amandus, in AD 181 or 182²⁰. This implies a post-182 date for Montan(us)' service in north-west Dardania. The fact that his Emperor's names have been erased narrows our choice significantly. Severus and Caracalla are excluded, while the later princes²¹, most of whom underwent the *abolitio/damnatio memoriae*, seem unattractive candidates in view of the formal characteristics of the text, palaeographical and onomastic; not only does the honorand figure with a developed name-formula but Eros, too, cites his praenomen, which is a rare occurrence in the Sočanica inscriptions during the first half of the third century²². It remains to place Montan(us)' base somewhere between AD 183 and 191; the interval provides, at the same time, a *terminus ante quem* for the constitution of the Municipium Dardanorum which slightly modifies the Marcus Aurelius – Severus dating referred to *supra*.

III. Montan(us)' *origo* has not been registered but the *Quirina* (lines 1-2) points to Scupi, a Vespasianic colony in southern Dardania²³, – certainly not to the Municipium Dardanorum itself, whose foundation must have postdated the Flavians²⁴. To postulate Scupi here is less hazardous than it would appear at first sight. There are no other Flavian cities (i.e. ones belonging to the *Quirina*) in Moesia Superior or the neighbouring parts of south-east Dalmatia²⁵. On the other hand, the epigraphical heritage of Sočanica has preserved some traces of close contacts between Scupi and the Municipium Dardanorum²⁶.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 215 f.

²¹ Two periods in the third century are ruled out for the then procurators of the Sočanica mines are known to have been other people: E. Čerškov 1970, 65 no. 14 (M. Aurelius Asclepiades, *v(ir) e(gregius)* – Severan/post-Severan ?) and 64 no.11 (Titienus Verus, under Gordian III).

²² Contrast E. Čerškov 1970, 62 no.5 (Aurelius Maximinus), 63 no. 8 (Septimius Vitalis), 64 (Titienus Verus).

²³ B. Dragojević-Josifovska, *IMS VI: Scupi et la région de Kumanovo* (Beograd 1982); S. Dušanić, "The Frontier and the Hinterland: The Rôle of Scupi in Domitian's Wars on the Danube", in: (P. Petrović ed.) *Roman Limes on the Middle and Lower Danube* (Beograd 1996) 41-51.

²⁴ Note 18 above. There were no *municipia Flavia* or *coloniae Flaviae* (with the exception of Scupi) in Moesia (Superior), unlike Pannonia: even such important cities as Ulpiana, Singidunum and Viminacium became *municipia* after Domitian.

²⁵ The *municipia Flavia* in further quarters of Dalmatia (at e.g. Skelani or Doclea) should not be considered here.

²⁶ E. Čerškov 1970, 62 no. 3 cites a ?procurator or lessee of the Sočanica mines who was *ornatus ornamentis dec(urionalibus) / col(oniae) Fl(aviae) Scupino/rum et mun(icipii) spl(endidissimi) /^s Ulp(ianae)*; the closing lines run *filio pii(ssimo) / l(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) co(lonorum)*. Recently published (M. Milin, *Starinar* 52[2002] 167 f. no 7), the stele erected at Sočanica by a slave of Atilius T(h)eophas suggests that there were business alliances between the (Hellenophone) Scupian Atilii (cf. *IMS VI* 70, 80 and 90) and the bearer(s) of the same nomen along the Ibar. If J. Šašel was right (and his discussion of the problem certainly deserves our full attention) in

Their rationale should be sought in the economic importance of the Sočanica mines, situated not far from Scupi and connected with the colony (and, further on, with Thessalonica) by a road that could be labelled *via metallica*; it had the obvious advantage of largely using the cheap water-communications (the Ibar, the Axios, the sea²⁷). Rich Scupians would naturally profit from the mines' production of silver and lead, by leasing metalliferous terrains in the first place. Conversely, the State (for which mining was very high indeed on the list of priorities) encouraged them to help the mines in the vicinity. Among other forms, their help consisted in the performance of the duties (increasingly difficult) of *procuratores metallorum*; that collaboration – originally spontaneous, eventually compulsory – between a mine and a municipality in its (relative) neighbourhood is well documented, thanks to the Codes as well as epigraphical sources²⁸. Montan(us) (the Scupian's) procuratorship at Sočanica will have been an example of the same practice, which, if it was needed financially and/or imposed by tradition, may have united several cities in the task of assisting important mines (e.g. Sirmium and Domavia in the case of the *argentariae Pannonicae et Delmaticae*; Scupi, Ulpiana (?) and the Municipium Dardanorum in that of the *Metalla Dardanica*).

IV. The main interest of the dedication resides in Novellius Eros' title, *pri(n)ceps m?(unicipii) D?(ar)[d(anorum)]*. So far, its sole parallels lie in five inscriptions of three *municipia* from Dalmatia and one inscription from Moesia Superior ((a-e + h), listed *infra*) – the fact that we have to deal, here, with no more than two neighbouring provinces and a small number of cities means a remarkable concentration of evidence. Some preliminary notes are necessary to explain and sustain our interpretation of the crucial parts of (a-e + h). A point of method should be stressed at once. Despite the diversity of geo-cultural and developmental detail that characterizes the list (a-

assuming profit from Dardanian mining behind the wealth of the Pontii and the Furi (Opera selecta [Ljubljana 1992] 152-159), we should note the presence of these interconnected families in both Scupi and Ulpiana; the mining centre or one of the mining centres of their activities may have been Sočanica, judging e.g. from the three cities' connections to which no. 3 of E.Čerškov's catalogue alludes. The Pontii, Philippi (?) and mining: *Ann. ép.* 1986, 629 (to be discussed elsewhere).

²⁷ Note e.g. that the find-spot of ingots stamped *MET DARD* (note 11 above) is Caesarea Palaestinae. Dardania – Stobi – the salt of the Aegean: Livy XLV. 29, 13 (cf. Strab. VIII. 389 and F. Papazoglou's comments [n. 91 *infra*] 172-4, 462).

²⁸ *Cod. Theod.* I. 32.5 = *Cod. Iust.* XI. 7.4 (AD 386), cf. S. Dušanić, "Late Roman Mining in Illyricum: Historical Observations", in: (P. Petrović et al. edd.) *Ancient Mining and Metallurgy in Southeast Europe. International Symposium* (Donji Milanovac 1990), Belgrade 1995, 219–225 (inscriptions: *ibid.* 224 note 38).

h) as a whole, it seems advisable to treat its *principes municipii*/*principes* as, essentially, the same phenomenon.

Of the five inscriptions just mentioned²⁹, (a) cites a *princeps municipii* for certain, (b-d) do that very probably. The example of (e), though less explicit, seems nevertheless probative enough, for a variety of reasons; let us note the order of words/terms in lines 4 ff. It is such that the term *princeps* (immediately figuring after the hono- rand's names !) is better associated with the municipium's *ordo decurionum* (lines 5-6; cf. [a, b, c]) and interpreted *princeps (municipii)* than with the body of the *incolae peregrini* (lines 7-8) and interpreted *princeps (incolarum)* as proposed by S. Loma. The *peregrini*'s position was inferior, socially and constitutionally alike, to that of the *decuriones* and the *populares*, a case of inequality influencing i. a. the structure of the honorary text in (e). Of course, the difference between the two definitions of Lupianus' rank – a magistrate of the peregrine community or a municipal dignitary (i.e. member of the municipal *ordo decurionum* who was a *princeps municipii*, too) – becomes less important if we take that Lupianus was active in two bodies simultaneously. According to that description of his duties, though the head of a peregrine organism in the first place, he belonged also to the *ordo decurionum* at the same time – as a senator permanently responsible for collaboration between the city and the *peregrini incolae*³⁰. But this solution of compromise, though attractive in its last element (cf. *infra*, sections VI-VIII), leaves us with a number of difficulties, notably that concerning the social hierarchy of (e), lines 5-8. It was the municipality, not the community of the *peregrini incolae*, which presented the dominant component of the union and as such expected to produce the *princeps (municipii)* with his specific title (gen. *municipii*, not *civitatis* vel sim.), knowledge and duties³¹.

(F) has been reserved for Eros' base itself. Under (g-h), in the Appendix of a sort, two more inscriptions are quoted which seem to refer to related (g: *prin(ceps) col(oniae) m(etallorum ?)*) or identical posts ([h], line 3, if Coba(s)' magistracy is interpreted *princeps (municipii)*, not *princeps* of a different administrative unit). The relevance of (g) for our purpose is evident, for the *princeps col(oniae)* at Naro-

²⁹ Bibliographical references and (when necessary) the most important elements of the *varia lectio* are given in the footnotes.

³⁰ Cf. S. Loma, *Živa antika* 52 (2002) 164 ff.

³¹ T. Kotula, "Les *principes gentis* et les *principes civitatis* en Afrique romaine", *Eos* 55(1965) 347–365; G. Mennella (n.15) 757 ff. (with bibl., 758 notes 12 and 13). Th. Mommsen (*infra*, note 37) justly compared the *principes* of (g) with the *princeps municipii* of (a).

na(?) is likely to have been the equivalent of a *princeps municipii* active elsewhere, viz. a dignitary elected in a city which had not reached the status of a colony or reached it after a protracted municipal phase of life only (in the latter case, the *princeps coloniae* would be the direct heir of the local *princeps municipii*). If the expansion *col(onia) m(etallorum ?)* proves correct in (g), the interpretation of Maximianus' *principatus* just proposed would seem hard to avoid (*infra*).

As to (h), though the deceased had certain connections with the territory of Buba(s) and its *vici* (lines 4 and 7/8), the reader of the inscription is not tempted to see in him a non-municipal *princeps*. On the one hand, Buba(s)' territory was managed then by another man, styled *prae[f](ectus)* and bearing the cognomen of Va<l>ens; it is uncertain whether the constituent *vici* of that *pagus* (or whatever term was used to define it) had a *princeps* of their own – under that title precisely – to assist the prefect in his administrative and other duties. On the other hand, Coba(s) was buried in Singidunum, not within the area of Buba(s)' villages. That significant fact corresponds with Coba(s)' post; also, with the decision of the city to support, financially, an aspect of the funeral of the *princeps* and/or of his family ([h], line 9). As we shall try to show, the foregoing analysis of (h) squares with certain additional elements of the inscription and its context – the rôle of Dotus, the mineral wealth of Buba(s)' territory, and the obviously massive presence of the Thracians in Buba(s)' *vici*.

(a) Rider, II cent. *D(is) M(anibus) / Q. Rutilio / Q. f(ilio) Titiano / IIVir(o) q(uin)q(uennali) /^β et / Q. Rutilio / Q. f(ilio) Proculo / IIVir(o) q(uin)q(uennali) / filio /¹⁰ eius / principi mu/nicipi Ri/ditarum*³².

(b) Rider, III cent. - - - / *dec(urioni) et pr[incipi municipi] / Riditaru[m co(n)iugi ? obse]/quentis(s)imo [qui vi]/xit ann(os) LI[... ? et Pin?]^βso fr[atru eius ? dec(urioni) ? muni]/ci[pi Riditarum - - -] / [- - -]*³³.

(c) Salvium (nr. modern Glamoč), IV cent. [*? Bonit]atis praeci-pu/[ae] magneque(!), in [m]/[ori]bus equo(!) et dile[c(to)], / [c.3 letters]ntio princ(ipi) m(unicipii), [om]^β[ni]bus honorib[us] /*

³² CIL III 2774 = D. Rendić-Miočević, "Princeps Municipi Riditarum", *Arheološki radovi i rasprave (Acta et Dissertationes Archaeologicae)* II (Zagreb 1962) 315-334 (= *Iliri i antički svijet. Ilirološke studije [Les Illyriens et le monde antique]*, Split 1989, 853-869 + T. XV and LXXI [esp. 854]; in the sequel, this reedited version of D. Rendić's 1962 paper will be referred to).

³³ D. Rendić (n. 32) 855, 866 note 15 + T. XVI.

[f]uncto, ex pro[t(ectore), pro]/[c(uratori) m]etallor[um c.4 letters]/
[- -]API[- - -³⁴.

(d) Splonum = Municipium S() ? (inscription found in the territory of gold-mines of Ampelum, Dacia), early III cent. *D(is) M(anibus) / T. Aur(elius) Aper, Delmata, princ(eps) / adsignatus ex m(unicipio) Splono, / vix(it) ann(is) XXX Aur(elius) Sat^stara lib(ertus) patr(ono) optimo p(osuit)*³⁵.

(e) Municipium S() = Splonum ? (nr. modern Pljevlje), later II cent. *Sexto / Aur(elio) Lupi/ano Lupi / filio princip(i) /^s decuriones / collegae et po/pulares et pere/grini incolae / civi optimo ob /¹⁰ merita pos(uerunt). / (Statua) epulo dedi/cata. / L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*³⁶.

(g) Unknown city, perhaps Narona (gravestone found at Salona), IV/V cent. *S(e?)p(timius ?) Maximia[nus] / v(ir) p(erfectissimus) prin(ceps) col(oniae) m(etallorum ?) N() / vivo sibi et co/niugi sue(!)*

³⁴ D. Sergejevski, "Römische Steindenkmäler aus Glamoč" (in Serbian with a German summary, pp. 266 f.), *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine* 39 (Sarajevo 1927) 260 f. no. 9 (Pl. III 9); cf. J.J.Wilkes (n. 37 *infra*) 271 note 4; *Aspects* (n. 3) 85 f. with note 210, and 1990-1995, 220 with note 10; H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 283 note 64. D. Sergejevski and H. Ch. Noeske offered texts and comments which, for the most part, should not be retained; neither should my own proposal (in the paper referred to *supra* [n. 28], 220 with n. 10) to read *princ(ipali ?) M(agnensium ?)* in line 4, instead of *princ(ipi) m(unicipii)* (D. Sergejevski's expansion, followed by J. J. Wilkes [in the form *prin(ceps) m(unicipii)...*] in 1969, as well as by H. Ch. Noeske and me in 1977, and accepted in the present discussion).

³⁵ *CIL* III 1322 = *ILS* 7153 = *Ann. ép.* 1968, 443 = H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 368 f. no. AMP 66 = *IDR* III/3, 345 = S. Loma, "Zur Frage des Munizipiums S. und seines Namens", in: (M. Mirković, S. Dušanić, M. Riel, and P. Petrović edd.) *Mélanges d'histoire et d'épigraphie offerts à Fanoula Papazoglou par ses élèves à l'occasion de son quatre-vingtième anniversaire* (Beograd 1997) 195 -198 no.6; cf. D. Rendić (n. 32) 861, 863. The monogram at the end of the first word of line 3 init. (see Fig. 253 in *IDR* III/3, p. 343) has been commonly deciphered to produce an (ungrammatical) dative, *adsignato* (!) [or pl. genitive, *adsignato(rum)*: S. Loma (n. 30) 168], but, in the present author's opinion, can be read as containing the letters NATVS (i.e. closing the normal nominative *princeps adsignatus*). The editors have hesitated between two interpretations of line 2 fin. (cf. S. Loma (n. 35) 196 f. with note 36). Th. Mommsen was inclined to see in Aper a *Delmata princeps* (= princeps Delmatarum) who was at the same time an *adsignatus ex m(unicipio) Splono* (ad *CIL* III 1322; that possibility was envisaged, but not adopted (cf. p. 861), by D. Rendić, too (n.32) 857 with n. 22 (on p. 867) and 863), most others dissociated the *Delmata* (pure ethnic) from the administrative formula *princeps adsignatus ex m(unicipio) Splono*. As the parallels attesting to the *principes municipii* show, the latter interpretation is preferable. It has also the advantage of not presupposing the untechnical synonym *Delmata princeps* for a "princeps Delmatarum". I am inclined, however, to modify it somewhat and read *princeps (municipii Ampeli) adsignatus ex m(unicipio) Splono*.

³⁶ Ably edited and commented upon by S. Loma (n. 30 *supra*) 143 – 179 (with a photograph) .

*dulcis/sime(!) posuit qui(!) ¹⁵ vicsit(!) annis LXV / depo(si)tus die III Nonas Feb(ruarias)*³⁷.

(h) Singidunum, II/III cent. *D(is) O(?) [M(anibus)] / Semp<r>[o]nio Co/bae principi vixit / an(nis) <L>. Vici Bubae et Do²tus Pii Cae(saris servus) Daizini{s} / uxori eius et filiis eo/rum p(osuerunt)(?). A[urelius ?] Va<l>ens [Bu]/be(!) prae[f(ectus)] e<x>[pecun]/ia [Singidu]n<e>nsi[um]/[- - -*³⁸.

V. In a paper from 1962³⁹, D. Rendić–Miočević made a number of observations on (a), (b), and (d); he missed (c) as well as (h) and probably misread the crucial abbreviations of (g), while (e) and the Sočanica inscription (to repeat, it is labelled here (f) for the sake of convenience) were unknown at that time. Rendić's observations, if widely followed⁴⁰, nevertheless suffered from his choice to study the functions of the *princeps municipii* in the context of what he called *Principes Illyrici* and to ignore, practically speaking, constitutional variations that depended on epoch and geographical conditions; he assumed that the *princeps municipii*, *princeps civitatis peregrinae*, *princeps castelli*, and *princeps coloniae*(?) were comparable posts, typical of the Illyrian world, collegiate at that and more or less reserved for the indigenous aristocracy. (Actually, as noted *supra*, only the *princeps municipii* and its equivalent in some colonies, the *princeps coloniae* (g), should be treated as closely related magistracies.) Insisting upon his (indiscriminate) *rapprochement* of the *principes civitatis peregrinae* with the *principes municipii/coloniae*, Rendić went so far as to see in the body of the *principes* of a municipium a traditional Illyrian institution – the name of which was altered somewhat under the Romans but which was given neither real power nor concrete responsibilities.

³⁷ *Eph. ep.* IV 297 = *CIL* III 9540 = R. Egger, "Der altchristliche Friedhof Manastirine", *Forschungen in Salona* II (Wien 1926) 77 no. 89; cf. D. Rendić (n. 32) 861 and J. J. Wilkes, *Dalmatia* (London 1969) 423 note 5. Line 2 fin.: "videtur appellari hic vir perfectissimus princeps coloniae, ut princeps municipii est (*CIL* III) n. 2774" (= our (a)); "sed MN (signum interpositum non videtur littera fuisse, sed punctum quoddam) quid significet nescio" Th. Mommsen; "fortasse *m(o)n(umentum)*" A. v. Domaszewski; *col(oniae) M(artiae) ? N(aronae) ?* R. Egger, D. Rendić et al.; *col(oniae) M(artiae) <I(uliae) V(aleriae)> [S(alonae)]* S. Loma (n. 30) 163 n. 83 (with reserves).

³⁸ *CIL* III 1666 = *IMS* I 32 = (a revised edition, followed here) S. Dušanić, "The *Vici Bubae*. Notes on the Administrative History of the North-West of Moesia Superior" (in preparation).

³⁹ Cited above, note 32.

⁴⁰ See e.g. J. J. Wilkes (n. 37) 241 with notes 5 and 7, et passim; H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 369 and note 462; G. Mennella (n. 15) 758 n. 12.

Let us say at once that the hypotheses of the collegial character of the *principes municipii* (so far unattested as a collectivity belonging to a single city), as well as of their being deprived of politico-administrative competence, have very little to support them – the rarity and geographical concentration of the *principes* speak against them clearly enough⁴¹. The same conclusion is suggested through analysis of certain details in the (a-h) list. In this connection, S. Loma has justly stressed the prosopographical interest of (a)⁴². To judge by their names, Rutilius Titianus and Rutilius Proculus, *principes municipii Ridentarum*, were no scions of the Ridentane aristocracy; they probably came to Rider from Salona. Still less can they be ascribed a local peregrine origin consonant with Rendić's theory that the *principes civitatis peregrinae* transformed into the *principes municipii* when the corresponding territories became *municipia* from administrative units of a lower rank. Moreover, as argued below, the source-material at our disposal actually suggests that the *principes municipii* (one man in a *municipium* at a given period of time but not given the competences analogous to those of the *principes senatus* in Rome) were instituted and maintained by the Romans for precise legal, political, and economic purposes. There may have been, in the process of the magistracy's birth, certain elements of continuity with the pre-Roman and early Roman state of affairs, centred on the term of *princeps* itself and the *principes*' task to manage the peregrine communities (after all, in an analogous manner, the nomenclature of magistracies and the constitutional structures in the early Italian *municipia* retained much of their pre-Roman heritage). However, the impact of such elements tended to lose its strength in the Illyricum of the Principate. They underwent important changes during II-IV centuries – especially those following the gradual recession of the *civitates peregrinae* and/or their transformation into predominantly economic organisms. As an indication of the complexity of these changes and, in general, of the geo-constitutional variations affecting the phenomenon of the *principes municipii* we shall note again the contrast between (f), where the procurator's freedman figures as a *pri(n)ceps m?(unicipii)* (with regard to his obviously humble position, Coba(s), (h), may be described as a similar case), and (b), (c), (e ?), and (g), where the local senators are recorded in their capacity of *principes municipii/coloniae*.

⁴¹ To raise one point only, if the Illyrican *municipia* had bodies of *principes* we should have expected to find more than one magistrate of that kind mentioned in (a-e), (f), (h). The plurality of *principes* would have made their management of certain mining activities unduly complicated rather than efficient; contrast e.g. *IGBulg* III-2, no. 1859, lines 5–8 (with comm., p. 213; below, n. 80).

⁴² S. Loma (n. 30) 164, 177.

However, Rendić was undoubtedly right in treating the magistracy of the *princeps municipii* (the *princeps coloniae* of [g] being, exceptionally, a comparable case) as something peculiar to Illyricum. It may have been, perhaps, something originally peculiar to the tribe of Delmatae themselves, owing to the tribe's ties with Roman mining and the related fact that its populace were the frequent victims of deportation. As we have tried to show with reference to (f) and (h), the institution of the *principatus municipii/coloniae* – originally typical of Dalmatia, the Delmatae, and the native aristocracy may have been accepted in the province's neighbourhood also, within the circle of inferior classes, including the *liberti*. That is, it may have occurred in some parts of Moesia (Superior) whose cities had similar conditions of existence, speaking of natural resources (the minerals) and the ethnic situation (the massive engagement of peregrine diggers, including the Delmatae) as the cities of Roman Bosnia. This process of spreading the *principes* to the mines situated outside Dalmatia, though, was not intensive; the very absence of *principes* in the epigraphical heritage of numerous *municipia* in the western parts of the Empire betrays its limitations.

VI. There is a striking feature of (a-h) which helps us understand the basic nature of the *principatus municipii/coloniae*.

To begin with, (c), (d-e), (f-g) and (h) tend to connect (explicitly or implicitly) their *principes* with Roman mines in the neighbourhood (not necessarily immediate) of the corresponding *municipia (coloniae)*. The mining aspect of these cities' activities formed a remarkable, if widely neglected nowadays, characteristic of the legal, political, and economic rôles of the *principes* that have just been listed.

In the *cursus* of (c), [- -]*ntius* figures as both the *princ(eps) m(unicipii Salvii ?)* and the mining procurator (? of the *aurariae* situated in the near-by central Bosnian area⁴³). Here as well as in (g), line 2, I have also envisaged a reading *princ(ipalis)/prin(cipalis)* but found it unattractive with regard to (e), (f), and (h), among other documents. To equate the *principes municipii* studied in the present paper with the *primores municipii* – i.e. assimilate the former with the *principes/principales coloniae*, distinguished socially though not politically – would prevent us from understanding (d), (f), and (h),

⁴³ For the (controversial) identifications of [- -]*ntius*' municipium and mines, *Aspects* 85 f. note 210, 90 note 241; the article referred to *supra*, n. 28, 220 with note 11.

where we find *principes* whose social position was not high but whose career implies that they had concrete duties connected with the specific *principatus municipii* (~ mining administration and related obligations).

Thanks to the abbreviation *m(etallorum ?)* in line 2, (g) may be interpreted as a case similar to (c), though the *m(etalla ?)* referred to in (g) seem to have been dependent on a colony, not a *municipium*. On the analogy of *CIL* III 12728-29 (AD 251-253)⁴⁴, recording the *col(onia) m(etallorum) D(omavianorum)*⁴⁵, line 2 of (g) may be read in a way which has, among others, the advantage of eliminating the previous editors'/commentators' (*col.*) *M(artia)*⁴⁶; that attribute appears quite implausible in the context as the *M(artia)* is not only unattested for Naronā (probably, Maximianus' *patria* [see below]) but would also have contrasted with the lateness of the inscription and its pronounced Christian character⁴⁷. Maximianus' colony, which (like Domavia) will have had *m(etalla)* in its immediate or less immediate vicinity, cannot be identified as yet; its probable location was in the metalliferous parts of Dalmatia or southern Pannonia.

There are two possible explanations of the colonial status of Maximianus' city. It may have come into being – through the promotion from a *municipium* – somewhere in post-Severan times, when the foundation of such titular colonies became a rather frequent phenomenon, even in backward areas. The promotion would naturally imply the rephrasing of the title *princeps municipii* ([g], line 2). Alternatively, (g) may be taken to mention a city having the colonial rank since the late Republic/early Principate, e.g. *col(onia) m(etallorum ?) N(aronae ?)*. If the restoration *N(aronae)* proves correct, the *metalla* in question, administered by the colony, should be sought somewhere in the central Bosnian area, too. This metalliferous region is rather distant from Naronā but it (or part of it) may have been linked to Naronā in late Antiquity, when the cities situated closer to the central Bosnian mines lost their economic and/or demographic importance. On the other hand, there were a variety of connections, many of them

⁴⁴ S. Dušanić, "The Roman Mines of Illyricum: Organization and Impact on Provincial Life", in: (C. Domergue ed.) *Mineria y metalurgia en las antiguas civilizaciones mediterraneas y europeas* (Coloq. int. asoc., Madrid 1985), II (Madrid 1989) 149.

⁴⁵ Of course, the expansion *m(etalli) D(omaviani)* also remains possible, if less probable with regard to the complex topography of mines dependent on Domavia.

⁴⁶ Cf. note 37 above: the punctuation mark between M and N does not recommend Domaszewski's *m(o)n(umentum)*, which is anyhow implausible.

⁴⁷ Line 1 shows a Christogram.

the fruit of private initiatives, between Illyrican mining and the Naronenses at all periods of Roman occupation⁴⁸. That circumstance may have inspired or facilitated the decision of the provincial authorities to make Narona function as a *col(onia) m(etallorum)*. To judge from *Cod. Iust.* XI.7.4 (AD 386), the title of *col(onia) m(etallorum)* – if justly assumed in Maximianus' case – may have been revived late in the fourth century as an element of the imperial programme to reform Illyrican *res metallica*⁴⁹. In any case, Maximianus' being a *vir perfectissimus* squares with his colonial and mining posts as well as with the putative post-Constantinian date of his monument⁵⁰.

(D) was discovered at Ampelum, centre of the gold mines of Dacia. Th. Mommsen's comment on the formula *princeps adsignatus ex m(unicipio) Splono* (it would be wrong to dissociate the term *princeps* from the following words and punctuate “, *Delmata princeps*,”⁵¹) is certainly accurate: “*adsignatum esse Aprum ex Splono ita accipio eum deductum esse Splono Ampelum iussu imperatoris...*”⁵². There are sufficient reasons to believe that Aper's “*adsignatio*” was part of an officially organized immigration (deportation, where the common people were concerned) of the Dalmatians – many *Delmatae* included, no doubt⁵³ – into those mining districts of Dacia which were in sore need of man-power⁵⁴. Septimius Severus, the probable initiator of the measure⁵⁵, is known for his care of mining and metallurgy and, on

⁴⁸ Cf. J. Šašel, *Opera selecta* (Ljubljana 1992) 158 (on M. Lusius Severus); S. Dušanić, “Roman Mining in Illyricum: Historical Aspects”, in: (G. Urso ed.) *Dall' Adriatico al Danubio. L'Ilirico nell' età greca e romana*. Atti del convegno int. Cividale del Friuli, 25 – 27 sett. 2003 (Pisa 2004) 267 (Narona as the port of Dalmatian mines).

⁴⁹ Text and note 28 above.

⁵⁰ Cf. the occurrence of a *vir perfectissimus* in a similar context and slightly earlier time, as attested by *IMS* I 151 (lines 3/4). The inscription was made by a dignitary who was simultaneously a magistrate of col. Singidunum (lines 2/3: [c]/ol., cf. no. 153: *principal.*) and the *procurator* of the Kosmaj mines (in the mid-fourth century). S. Dušanić, “Notes on Late Roman Mining in Šumadija” (in Serbian with an English summary), *Starinar* n.s. XL-XLI (Beograd 1989-1991) 217-224, where the colonial aspect of *IMS* I 151 has not been recognized, however.

⁵¹ Th. Mommsen's proposal (note 35 above).

⁵² *Ibid.* S. Loma (n.35) 196 f.

⁵³ H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 323 with n. 282, et alii.

⁵⁴ In addition to the inscriptions collected and examined by H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 347 ff. and I.I.Russu, O Floca, and V. Wollmann (*IDR* III/3), see the material published by V. Wollmann, “Un *lucus* la Alburnus Maior”, *An. Inst. ist. și arh. Cluj-Napoca* 27(1985-86) 253-295. According to the kind communication by Professor D. Benea (November, 2001), Romanian colleagues have recently discovered an important group of epigraphic documents erected by Illyrians (Dalmatians) in the mines of Dacia which are still inedited.

⁵⁵ See e.g. H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 323, 357, and 368-note 460, 369 note 462. Cf. S. Loma (n. 35) 198 f.

the other hand, for his efforts to (re)organize Dacia⁵⁶. Additional motives may have been in play, too, notably the Emperor's wish to weaken and punish the notoriously mutinous populace of some regions in Dalmatia⁵⁷. Aper had obviously served as a *princeps municipii* first at Splonum, whose municipal status is well attested⁵⁸, before being transferred to the north-east of the Empire, where he possibly became a *princeps* of the municipium Ampelum⁵⁹. Though the redactor of the inscription did not expressly qualify the *princeps* (line 2) by a *municipii Ampeli*⁶⁰, the parallels of (a-c), (e) and (h) are rather suggestive. This interpretation of (d) implies no chronological difficulty since the *constitutio* of the municipium Ampelum has usually been dated in the first years of Severus' reign⁶¹.

(E) is variously related to (d). As the municipium S(), near modern Pljevlja, seems to have borne the name of Splonum – the identification is still disputed but the arguments *pro* are very strong⁶² – and presented the very city of Aper's origin⁶³, Lupianus' title of the *princeps (municipii)* throws an indirect light on lines 2-3 of (d). In other words, the two brachylogical formulae of (d) and (e) concerning the *principes* tend to complement each other. They support the thesis of existence of the *principes municipii* in the nomenclature of the city aristocracy in east Dalmatia. From (e), lines 3-5, we even learn (not unexpectedly) that Lupianus the *princeps* was a member of the local

⁵⁶ Severus and mining: *Aspects* (n. 3) 83 and note 202; *IMS* I 168; *CIL* III 12726 (J.J. Wilkes [n. 37] 279 with note 4); *Dig.* XLVIII. 19.8.5 (cf. U. Täckholm, *Studien über den Bergbau der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Uppsala 1937, 132) etc. – Severus and Dacia (the formation of the *municipium Ampelensium*) e.g. S. Loma (n.35) 198; *Ann. ép.* 1977, 655 ff.

⁵⁷ Mining in Illyricum and Roman political attitudes to the natives: Florus, *Epit.* II 25 (*infra*). Cf., for Macedonia in 167 BC, Livy XLV 17-18 (O. Davies, *Roman Mines in Europe* (Oxford 1935) 10 f.). The *metallarii* and the native resistance in Dalmatia: J. J. Wilkes (n. 37) 86 f.; S. Dušanić, *IMS* I p. 105 note 8 and “Army and Mining in Moesia Superior”, in: (G. Alföldy – B. Dobson – W. Eck edd.) *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley* (Stuttgart 2000) 347 ff.

⁵⁸ *CIL* III 2026, 8783. S. Loma (n. 35).

⁵⁹ The career of P. Celsenius Constans (IDR III/3, no. 350 [Ampelum]) is comparable: *dec(urio) col(oniae) Delmatiae Cl(audia) Aeque item dec(urio) col(oniae) Dac(icae) (Ul)biae Traianae*.

⁶⁰ In a similar way, the *municipii S()* is understood here.

⁶¹ H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 277 f., 323 and 357; notes 18 and 55 *supra*.

⁶² S. Loma (n. 35).

⁶³ i.e., if it is taken that there were two Splaunums/Splonums in Dalmatia, one in the western (cf. Cass. Dio LVI. 11), the other in the eastern (cf. *CIL* III 8308) part of the province, the Splaunum/Splonum of (d) must be the city whose traces have been discovered near modern Pljevlje.

senate, probably a relatively young man⁶⁴ who derived his influence from his father's position⁶⁵. With regard to (e), it is all easier now to take that Aper's career began with the post of a *princeps municipii Sploni*. More to the point, there were Roman mines of silver and lead in the vicinity of the municipium S()⁶⁶ – i.e. of Splonum, if the preceding identification is correct. They seem to have provided the economic basis for the remarkable progress of that interesting city. Some of their procurators seem to have been recruited among the magistrates of Splonum(?)⁶⁷, according to the standard practice of the

⁶⁴ T. Aurelius Aper, who was to become *princeps (municipii Sploni)* immediately or shortly after Lupianus, died in his thirtieth year. Note also that (a) does not cite Proculus' wife or children.

⁶⁵ Both Aper and Lupianus are likely to have been sons of Roman citizens of the first generation; H. Ch. Noeske's hypothesis (1977, 369) that Aper was the first of his clan to become a *civis Romanus* creates i.a. serious difficulties of a chronological order (S. Loma [n. 35] 197 f.). As to the *cursum* of (a), Proculus' *principatus* is best taken to have antedated his father's death; his becoming a *duumvir* to have followed it immediately. On (a), (e) and (f) – a freedman was like a son, in a sense – it may be assumed that the *principes municipii* were considered to have been close though junior collaborators of the *duumviri* such as were necessary for the clerical work (cf. note 14 above).

⁶⁶ The mine of silver and lead at Čadinje (Kolovrat, some 30 kms to the east of the municipium S()) has left Roman galleries, furnaces, slag-heaps and (at Čadinje itself or close to it) characteristic inscriptions (a dedication to Silvanus by an *argenti actor*; a dedication to Diana by an *eq(ues) R(omanus)*; an altar erected by an *Aug(usti) lib(ertus) AT* [= *a(rgentariarum) t(abularius) ?* or *a(gens)/ a(ctor) T(erritorii) ?* vel sim.] or [the simplest reading] *TA[B] = tabularius*; *ILug* 1817, etc.): *Aspects* 68 and *Istorijski glasnik* (Beograd) 1980, 23; M. Mirković, "Zur Geschichte des Limtales in römischer Zeit" (in Serbian ["Iz istorije Polimlja u rimsko doba"]) with a German summary, p.105-108, *Godišnjak CBI* 12(1975) 105–106; I. Bojanovski, "Gornje Podrinje dans le système des communications romaines" (in Serbo-Croat ["Gornje Podrinje u sistemu rimskih komunikacija"], with a French summary, p. 172-174), *Godišnjak CBI* 23(1987) 99–100 + Prilog II; M. Popović, "Kasnoantičko nasleđe u Polimlju – problemi istraživanja", *apud* B. Borić-Brešković, "Kulturni identitet Polimlja", *Zbornik Matice srpske za klasične studije* (Journal of Classical Studies, *Matica srpska*) 3 (Novi Sad 2001) 171-172; S. Loma (n. 36) 144 note 5. – The wider area of municipium S(), to the west and the south, had a number of other ancient mines (V. Simić, *Istorijski razvoj našeg rudarstva*, Beograd 1951, 140 [Fig. 38; cf. *TIR* K 34, III-IV b-c]; S. Dušanić 2004, 254 f.). Of them, we should signal those in the complex of the Tara-Piva-Drina-Čehotina valleys (e.g. the mine of Šuplja Stijena) as well as those in the upper Tara valley (Brskovo, famous for its very important production in the Middle Ages). The Lever Tara dedication (see the following note) by a *proc(urator) [Au]g(usti) or [ar]g(entariarum)* is best connected with the Tara mines of copper and argentiferous lead; however, the choice of its precise site may have reflected the vicinity of the municipium S() – Risinium road (S. Loma (n. 35) 186 n.3). – For the Pljevlja cinnabar, S. Dušanić, *Starinar* 45-46 (1994 – 1995) 32 f.

⁶⁷ The Mithraic relief at Lever Tara of AD 270 (*CIL* III 13849, revised by Mrs. S. Loma (n. 35) 186 note 3 and 189 with note 13) will have been dedicated by a dignitary of the municipium S() who managed the local mines of the Tara area.

mine/city collaboration which has been alluded to several times in the present analysis.

As an honorary base erected probably for a *procurator metallorum* by a *princeps municipii* (the introduction of both titles into the text seems quite justified, practically speaking, despite the *rasura* of line 3 and the poor state of preservation of line 6 fin.) in the centre of the rich *argentariae* of Sočanica, (f) displays evident mining aspects. Despite important similarities which link it to (a-e), (f) differs from those five inscriptions on a notable point: it reflects the administrative realities of Moesia Superior, not those of the tribe of Delmatae or the province of Dalmatia at large⁶⁸.

Finally, let us examine (h), which also comes from Moesia Superior – an area near the northernmost part of the Moesian-Dalmatian boundary, to be exact. The find-spot of the inscription, long lost, is Železnik (“the town of iron” in Serbian), which was famous in medieval and later times for its quarries and, especially, its iron-mines⁶⁹. It is tempting to see in Dotus, *Cae(saris servus)*, an imperial *procurator* or *vilicus* managing these works (lines 4-5). An analogous explanation may (but need not) be proposed for the presence, at approximately the same place, of a certain Claudius Valentinianus, who seems to have been an *eq(ues) R(omanus)* and a municipal *d(ecurio)* simultaneously (*IMS* I 76). Also, it seems certain that the *vici Bubae* (line 4) formed a complex of settlements of immigrant Thracians⁷⁰. The probable reason of their compulsory deportation to Železnik would be that their original home was in one of the districts in the province of Thrace having remarkable mines of iron and skilful *metallarii*, capable of activating the metallurgy of Železnik⁷¹. In the

⁶⁸ But see *infra*, text and notes 91 ff.

⁶⁹ See e.g. V. Simić, *Zbornik radova* (Rudarsko-geološko-metalurški fakultet i Institut za bakar u Boru) XVI (Bor 1974) 156; Ćirković – Kovačević-Kojić – Ćuk (n. 66) 156 (*ibid.* 45: in XV-XVI cent., the area of Železnik produced some silver and lead in addition to iron).

⁷⁰ The *[Bu]/be* (! ; the line-division is uncertain) *prae[ff(ectus)]* recalls B. Gerov, *ILBulg* I 16 (Oescus) *prae[ff(ecto)] saltus* (below, text and notes 109 ff.) and *IMS* III/2, 31 (Timacum Minus) *prae[ff(ectus)] te(r)rit(orii)*; for the latter *praefectura* see my article cited in n. 57 above, pp. 354 f.; M. Mirković, “Military Diplomas from Viminacium and the Settlement of Auxiliary Veterans: City or Countryside?”, in: (G. Alföldy – B. Dobson – W. Eck edd.) *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. Gedenkschrift für Eric Birley* (Stuttgart 2000) 372 note 32. A variety of *territoria* (*regiones*, *saltus* et sim.) are on record in the Danubian inscriptions and other sources (S. Dušanić 1985-1989 [n. 44], 150 with note 25); not all of them had to serve the needs of the army. For a mining *territorium* in the immediate neighbourhood of Boubas’ see *IMS* I 46 with S. Dušanić 2000, 355 f.

⁷¹ Thus S. Dušanić (n. 38). Cf. O. Davies (n.57) 229 f.; *IMS* I p. 108 note 25. *Septimius Bubas* as a Thracian name: *RMD* IV App. I. 3, n. 3.

light of what has been noted *supra* on the *principes municipii* and the collaboration between the mine and the neighbouring city in general⁷², Sempronius Coba(s)' title (lines 2-3) of *princeps (municipii ?)* would perfectly correspond with the realities that led Dotus, Claudius Valentinianus, and the Thracian immigrants⁷³ to appear in the north-west of Moesia Superior. To put it explicitly, all this points to the *ferrariae* as the common denominator of constitutional and other features, specific enough, of Roman life around Železnik. The same might be said of the fact that (h) cites both the prefect of the territory of Buba(s) (lines 7-8, referring to the entire Železnik region ?) and the material aid the (municipium) Singidunum⁷⁴ provided for the funeral of Coba(s) and/or his family (lines 8-9). No need to emphasize, the Železnik *ferrariae* will have served well the *fabricae* of the Roman army in the area of Singidunum – especially that of the leg. IV Flavia itself.

(A) and (b) remain, which display certain similarities of form and contents with (e) but for all we know of the history and economics of Rider cannot be directly connected with mines, whose existence is not attested in the territory of that city or its immediate vicinity. With good reason, S. Loma has assumed that the anonymous honorand of (b) may have been the head of the peregrine community living in a part of the municipal territory, part which enjoyed certain aspects of autonomy and economic privilege⁷⁵. In my opinion, Lupianus (c) presented a similar case. And the function of Rutilius Proculus as a *princeps* (a) was more or less the same; his comparatively early date explains his successful career – the *civitates peregrinae* in the first half/middle of the second century AD were still an important factor of life in many provinces, politically hard to manage, well populated, and as such demanding rather authoritative magistrates to perform the duty of the *principes municipii* in the cities which collaborated with them. Conversely, the numbers of *peregrini* in the communities of (f) and (h) must have been modest, which in turn explains the low social

⁷² Section III.

⁷³ On the toponym *T(h)rac(es)* in south-east Pannonia(?) see my article referred to above, note 38. – The Thracian immigrants in the Kosmaj district: *IMS* I p. 108 with nn. 19 and 22-26 (esp. 25). — For some earlier cases of deportation (of the Bessi to Dobrugia, of the Dacians to Moesia), comparable with ours if not immediately connected with the needs of mining, see e.g. U. Laffi, *Adtributio e Contributio. Problemi del sistema politico-amministrativo dell Stato Romano* (Pisa 1966) 73.

⁷⁴ Singidunum was a municipium from Hadrian(?) till Gordian III (*IMS* I p. 31 f.), i.e. during the period which saw the erection of Coba(s)' monument.

⁷⁵ S. Loma (n. 35) 164 ff. (with nn. 97 and 100).

status of Eros and Coba(s) respectively. From that point of view, (b) seems to reflect a transitional state of affairs.

VI. It would be wrong to distinguish sharply (a-b) from (c-h) on the basis of whether the corresponding cities' area was famous for its mineral wealth or not. That distinction would find only a partial support in the evidence examined in the foregoing section. The two classes of *principes* (a-b versus c-h) were linked, essentially, by the factor of the local *peregrini*; in the economic, populational, and political development of Illyricum, however, this factor came to form diverse connections with mining, some of which transcended the criterion of the ore distribution. The evidence is complex, and can be elucidated here in some elements only.

The mining aspects of (c-h) seem to have resulted from the engagement of peregrine population in mining works, works both difficult and demanding (for certain mineralogical and metallurgical purposes, if not for simple digging) a measure of specialist knowledge⁷⁶. Such an engagement is well documented in Illyricum – Dalmatia and the Delmatae included⁷⁷. It usually attests to the existence of a peregrine unit within the territory of a municipium (the birth of a municipium involved an important share of the indigenous people) which exploited the (previously tribal) mines in the vicinity; owing to the interest of its mining, that unit enjoyed material and other forms of assistance from the municipium itself⁷⁸. As stressed *supra*, section III, the Roman authorities favoured the practice of collaboration between the town and the mine; they shaped it through a variety of regulations. The *principes municipii*'s connection with the *res metallica* which can be deduced from most items of the list compiled above will have been part of the system. Even the choice of the term *princeps* for that magistracy may have reflected its roots in the position as well as nomenclature of the chieftains managing the *civitates peregrinae* though, of course, the *principes civitatis peregrinae* and the *principes municipii* were largely different dignitaries, regardless of their (probably) common origin⁷⁹. No need to say that the local population

⁷⁶ On which, Amm. Marc. XXXI. 6.6 (*sequendarum ...venarum periti*); S. Dušanić 1985-1989, 148 (metallurgy).

⁷⁷ See e.g. the oft-cited testimony of Florus, *Epit.* II 25.

⁷⁸ *Supra*, text and n. 28; cf., generally, *Dig. L.* 6.6.11 (Callistratus); *Cod. Iust.* II. 12.20 (Diocletian). S. Dušanić, *Aspects* 90 and 1985-1989, 153 with notes 64–65.

⁷⁹ As already noted here, the *principes municipii* were obviously expected to have administrative, even clerical, duties, and their social position was not always very distinguished; on both points, the *principes civitatis peregrinae* differed.

working in Illyrican mines was not strictly indigenous everywhere. There are clear signs mentioned in the foregoing pages of the deportation of *peregrini* from distant countries to the *territoria metallorum* in Dacia and elsewhere⁸⁰.

VIII. Now, the peregrine factor appears in (e) explicitly, in the form of a separate unit, or units, within a city: the *incolae peregrini* join the Senate and the *populus* of the municipium S() in honouring Sextus Aurelius Lupianus. The topography of the municipium and its neighbourhood, including the mines, would square with a certain bipolarism of the area: the municipium situated near Pljevlja, the mines (together with the *vicus metalli* and a settlement of the peregrine *metallarii*) at (modern) Kolovrat, some 30 kms to the east⁸¹. Other, more distant, mines of the district may also have been worked by the natives and connected with the municipium S()⁸². This interpretation of topographical facts and indications provided by the mountainous relief and Roman traces in it remains hypothetical, however. We should point out, nevertheless, S. Loma's onomastic analyses of the peregrine strata of the inscriptions from the municipium S() and its territory. They imply that the municipium was formed by immigrants coming from those parts of the province which were inhabited by the Delmatae – to be precise, from the area around the (original) Splaunum, probably in the neighbourhood of Salona⁸³). Such a state of affairs tends to assimilate aspects of (d-e) with (a-c), i.e. the three inscriptions concerning the *principes municipii* in the Delmatae's land.

A man whose status was that of a (*peregrinus*) *incola* – a definition suggested by his name-formula – is recorded as originating *ex muni[c]ipio Salvi[o]* in the mid-second century⁸⁴. Before becoming an auxiliary soldier, he may have lived in a quarter of Dalmatia's territory depending on the municipium Salvium and possessing mines – perhaps the same mines which were managed by []ntius two centuries later (c). Analogous arrangements concerning Narona(?) and Rider versus the auriferous and argentiferous areas of central Bosnia

⁸⁰ Kosmaj, Sočanica, Boubas' territory, etc. (*supra*). On an *arxas* of the "Greek" (= Anatolian ?) settlement within the domain of the Malko Trnovo *ferrariae* (AD 155-156 ?) and these *ferrariae*'s connection with a *polis* in the area see L. Robert, *Hellenica* XI-XII (Paris 1960) 288 ff.; *IGBulg* III/2, no. 1859 (cf. 1863, lines 9 and 22).

⁸¹ Note 66 above.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Cf. S. Loma (n. 35) 152 f. 165 (with n. 97), 170, and 177 f. on Rider and *CIL* III 3202.

⁸⁴ *CIL* XIII 6538 (Mainhardt). J. J. Wilkes (n. 37) 271 with note 2.

may be assumed behind (a-b, g), if we take that these two cities controlled certain distant peregrine communities⁸⁵ in the north (termed *pagi*[?], later on *territoria*[?] et sim.), whose population worked in the mines. In any case, Narona's *conventus* and the large quantity of native personal names found at Rider attest to the importance of the indigenous element in the life of these two cities⁸⁶. But while (g) cites a *col(onia) m(etallorum ?)*, we cannot be absolutely sure that mining caused the occurrence of the *principes municipii* in Rider (a-b). These *principes* may indirectly attest to some other economic interests of the State, e.g. agrarian, in what may be termed (see below) their city's *territoria attributa/contributa*. A *territorium attributum/contributum* of Rider will have been centred at the near-by (modern) Vrlika, probably identical with ancient Bariduum⁸⁷. Alternatively, the *principes* of (a-b) may have had something to do with the fact that the local natives were deported to the mines of Illyricum and other provinces – in other words, the rôle of the *principes* of (a-b) may have resembled that of T. Aurelius Aper, (d). A number of Baridustae were certainly transferred from Dalmatia to the *aurariae* of Alburnus Maior, probably under Septimius Severus⁸⁸. The second and third centuries may have seen more than one wave of such transfers, to different mining destinations.

IX. A status similar or identical to that of the Baridustae⁸⁹ was given to many peregrine communities – Illyrian and non-Illyrian (mostly Anatolian) – working the *aurariae Dacicae* and having

⁸⁵ Corresponding to the *incolae contributi* mentioned in the *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae*, ch. CIII (on the problem of the *incolae contributi*, e.g. U. Laffi [n.73] 128 ff.)? See below, Section X (nn. 102 ff, on *CIL* III 14370, 10: *territ(orium) contributum*). Cf. (e): Lupianus (a *decurio* of the *municipium S()*) was held a (*con*)*civis* of i.a. the *incolae peregrini* of that city. G. Alföldy (n. 96 *infra*) 179 and 193 nn. 82-83 must be right in assuming that, among the Delmatae, the peregrine communities were linked to the *municipia* situated in their neighbourhood (and commanding, as Lupianus' case shows, certain political, economic, and territorial aspects of the peregrine *civitates*' life) by a relationship identical or similar to that of *attributio/contributio* (aliter, S. Loma [n.30] 163 n. 81).

⁸⁶ For the Narona *conventus* (89 *civitates* in the late first century BC) see Plin., *NH* III. 142 (cf. J. J. Wilkes [n. 37] 163 ff.). The personal names in Rider and the problem of its status (a *municipium* with the *Ius Latinum minus*?): S. Loma (n. 35) 165.

⁸⁷ J. J. Wilkes (n. 37) 244; B. Gabričević, *VAHD* 1953, 103. *Aliter*, I. Bojanovski, *Dolabellas Strassensystem in der römischen Provinz Dalmatien* (in Serbo-Croat with a German summary, pp.251-256), Sarajevo 1974, 58

⁸⁸ H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 377 f. (ALB no.5) = *IDR* III/3, no. 388 = S. Loma (n. 35) 196 note 34.

⁸⁹ See *IDR* III/3, nos. 383, 388, and 422, with comm.

organizational forms of their own⁹⁰. As already noted, one of these communities, constituted obviously by the Delmatae too, was led by T. Aurelius Aper (d). Neither did the complex of the Municipium Dardanorum and the Metalla Municipii Dardanorum (f) have an essentially different population. It was also distinguished by a considerable percentage of *peregrini* – Dardanian (whose presence has been assumed on the basis of the toponym itself) and Anatolian (Bithynian and Phrygian mostly)⁹¹. To judge from the parallels of other Upper Moesian mines (Kosmaj⁹², the mines of the Timok valley⁹³, and the regions of Remesiana⁹⁴ and Kuršumlija⁹⁵), a large group of Dalmatians, even of the Delmatae themselves, may be sought at Sočanica as well. Owing to their presence, the rare post of the *princeps municipii* may have been introduced into a non-Dalmatian place (~ d). But we should note the social and ethnic differences that existed between Novellius Eros and the *principes municipii* of (d-e, h). Like the Rutilii, (a)⁹⁶, he does

⁹⁰ H. Ch. Noeske 1977, 315 ff.; V. Wollmann, “Nouvelles données concernant la structure socio-ethnique de la zone minière de la *Dacia Superior*”, in: (C. Domergue ed.) *Mineria...* II (Madrid 1985 – 1989) 107–118, and “Un Lucus la Alburnus Maior”, *An. Inst. Ist. și Arheol.* XXVII (Cluj – Napoca 1985-1986) 253–295.

⁹¹ S. Dušanić, “The Antinous Inscription at Sočanica and the *Metalla Municipii Dardanorum*” (in Serbian with an English summary, pp. 260 f.), *Živa Antika* 21(1971) 241 – 259 (the *temple* of Antinous in the Sočanica forum; the dedications to Anatolian deities in the neighbouring parts of Dardania). Of the “Anatolian” personal names (i.e. names best known from Anatolian inscriptions if not necessarily created by Anatolian peoples) attested at Sočanica note *Nanfeaj* (E. Čerškov 1970, 62 nos. 5 and 26) or *Manfija* (M. Milin, *Starinar* 52, 2002, 168 f. no. 9), and *Maes* (gen. *Mael[i]*), no. 29; cf. L. Zgusta, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen* (Prag 1964) 279, on *MAMA* III 233). Other Greek/Oriental anthroponyms (e.g. Telesphorus, nos. 4 and 15; Hesperis, no. 9; Asclepiades, no. 14; Tigris, no. 23 [corrected by S. Loma]; Atalante and Menander, no. 28; [Epi]caris, no. 29) are of limited interest there, either because they as such had less marked connections with Asia Minor or because they belonged to mining officials, whose origins may have differed from those of the main groups of the *populus fundi*. See also F. Papazoglu, *The Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times. Triballi, Autariatae, Dardanians, Scordisci and Moesians* (Amsterdam 1978) 230 f. no.33, 233 no. 52.

⁹² *IMS* I pp. 108 f.

⁹³ S. Dušanić, “Two Notes on Roman Mining in Moesia Superior” (in Serbian with an English summary, pp. 178 f.), *Arheološki Vestnik* 28 (Ljubljana 1977) 174 note 47; 178,

⁹⁴ Cf. Proc. *De Aed.* IV. 4. (p.123, 18 Haury), *Dalmatas* (the name of a castellum obviously derived from that of a village of the immigrant Delmatae). S. Dušanić, *Aspects* 74 note 137, and 1985-1989, 148 note 3.

⁹⁵ S. Dušanić, “Epigraphical Notes on Roman Mining in Dardania”, *Starinar* n.s.45–46(1994-95) 27-30.

⁹⁶ G. Alföldy (*Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*, Budapest 1965, 97 and 121 note 4) as well as S. Loma (above, text and note 42) have postulated, with good reason, that the Rutilii were no Illyrians but came to Rider from the Salonitan region, where rather numerous families of Italians are on record.

not seem to have been of a local origin, and (as a *libertus*) he certainly was not an Illyrian (ex)-aristocrat introduced among the local municipium's *decuriones*. Perhaps the fact that the *peregrini* at Sočanica were of mixed origins permitted, or demanded, the choice of a transnational *princeps*.

It may be taken that the introduction of the *principes municipii* into the ruling structure of Dalmatian cities was due to the importance, political and economic, of the natives (their number, their mutinous and greedy mentality, their engagement in agriculture and mining) with whom the *principes* will have had to collaborate. Owing to the specific combination of these factors in Dalmatia, the *principes municipii* appeared in that province much more frequently than elsewhere. Politically speaking, their rôle is easier to understand in the light of Florus' reference (*Epit.* II 25 [Bellum Delmaticum]) to Augustus' measures concerning the Delmatae and the province's mines: *sed Augustus perdomandos (Delmatas) Vibio mandat (c. AD 10), qui efferrum genus fodere terras coegit aurumque venis repurgare; quod alioquin gens omnium cupidissima eo studio, ea diligentia anquirat, ut illud in usus suos eruere videantur*⁹⁷. With time, economic considerations seem to have become predominant however. In most cases of which we are informed the influence as well as the long existence (cf. the late dates of [c] and [g]) of the post of the *princeps municipii/coloniae* in Illyricum mainly depended on the exceptional wealth of Illyrican mines; also, on the traditional readiness of Rome – typical of her *laissez-faire* – to act conservatively. In other words, the Romans tended to exploit the mines with the aid of local manpower or, at least, of the expert *peregrini* transferred from other provinces⁹⁸.

Indeed, Rutilius Titianus' cognomen (a) *may* be taken as a sign that he was adopted into the gens Rutilia, his natural father belonging to the very large group of the Titii ("thirty-seven persons including two legionary veterans", according to J. J. Wilkes' documentation, [n. 37] 302) that lived in the capital of Dalmatia. Such a connection of Proculus with Salona would make him, though ultimately of Italian origin, a suitable candidate for the post of the *princeps municipi Riditarum*. If the *princeps'* task (as we think) really was to mediate between a Roman city and the *peregrini* in its territory, this obviously must have demanded some knowledge of local conditions and the vernacular; Proculus will have been able to acquire the essence of both while staying in the Salonitan area, despite the distance that separated the area from Rider itself.

⁹⁷ *Epit.* II 25 (Bellum Delmaticum). Cf. text and notes 57 and 77 above.

⁹⁸ Of course, such transportations were not restricted to the province complex of Dalmatia, Pannonia, Moesia, Thrace, and Dacia, nor were inevitably connected with mining. Let us note G. Alföldy's opinion (*Noricum*, London – Boston 1974, 21) that some gold-washers of Dalmatian origin were active around Wiesenau.

In view of the tendency just alluded to and with focus on the administrative aspects of the mining processes, the following tentative reconstruction of the early history of the *principatus municipii* will be proposed; some four phases may be pointed out. (α) In the pre-Roman epoch, the mine belonged to, and was exploited by, the free tribe, headed by the council of *principes*. One of them will have been in charge of the management of mining itself. (β) After the Roman occupation, the mine became a fiscal property while the tribe was organized as a *civitas peregrina*. The digging in the mine frequently remained the obligation of the natives in the vicinity, forming a privileged unit within their *civitas* that was probably put under the joint control of the ‘mining’ *princeps* and the Roman army officer who took care of the *civitas*. (γ) When the municipium was constituted in the tribal territory, the (fiscal) mine remained separated from the *ager* of the city just founded but was still worked by certain *peregrini*, themselves organized as a body of *incolae* within the municipal territory. As the exploitation of the mine partly depended on the aid of the newly-born municipium in the neighbourhood (the dependence increasing gradually and finding its expression in a number of inscriptions⁹⁹), the municipium needed someone to mediate between itself and both the mine and the community of the native *metallarii*. The task of mediation was normally assumed (continued, to be exact) by the ‘mining’ *princeps*, who had usually been accepted into the city’s *ordo decurionum*; the majority of his former co-*principes* remained the dignitaries of the peregrine body whereas he himself was distinguished by the title and position of a *princeps municipii*. (δ) Finally, owing to a variety of social, economic, ethnic, cultural and legal innovations¹⁰⁰, – innovations making i.a. the miners’ parts of the peregrine separate lands transform into *territoria* and unite with the *territoria metallorum*¹⁰¹ – some of the *principes municipii (coloniae)* ceased to be recruited among the descendants of the neighbouring tribe’s *peregrini*. Instead, they were recruited among the members of the municipal aristocracy of all ethnic origins. With time, even lower classes became eligible (the *principes* of [f, h]). Regardless of these changes, the later *principes*’ title and duties remained generally the same, if bearing on the economy rather than the problems connected

⁹⁹ See note 28 above for references to municipal magistrates leasing the *putei* of the neighbouring mines and/or performing the duties of the *procuratores metallorum*. These occurrences may have gone together with the *contributio* of the mine’s area to the city in its vicinity; for its part, the *contributio* probably favoured the creation of such onomastic formulae as the *metalla municipii Dardanorum*.

¹⁰⁰ Notably, the Constitutio Antoniniana.

with citizenship. It hardly needs to be stressed, more than one aspect of the process just delineated should be looked upon as highly hypothetical.

IX. A whole nexus of parallels, however, sustains the essence of the preceding comments. To quote a rather explicit example, the Regensburg inscription of AD 270 records the *contr(ibutio)* of a mining/metallurgical *territor(ium)* to the *k(anabae) R(eginenses)*, a quasi-city settlement¹⁰². In addition to the similarity between the Regensburg document and the Illyrican realities concerning the ‘contributed’ status of the metalliferous soil, there was a similarity concerning their administrative mechanisms. The *territor(ium)* and the *k(anabae)* shared the same *aedil(is)*, probably not the highest official in the hierarchy of both communities, in a way which recalls the *princeps municipii*’s genesis from the native *civitas* and his task to mediate between the city and the mine with its peregrine workers¹⁰³.

To repeat, the Roman authorities’ basic reason for insisting upon the city-mine bipolarism spoken of here was their need to promote the metal production in a politically and economically efficient manner; Florus’ testimony quoted *supra*, section IX, is instructive from that point of view. But the modalities of bipolarism must have been both complex and varying in accordance with time and local conditions. They combined differences of personal status with those of the status of the terrain. In the Sočanica area, the traces of the latter are visible even in the most urbanized part of the central Roman town: there is clear epigraphical evidence of co-existence of the *coloni*’s land in the settlement and the land belonging to the citizens and/or the municipality itself¹⁰⁴. Thence, I think, the name of the Sočanica mine ran *M(etalla)* (or *M(etallum)*) *m(unicipii) D(ar)d(anorum)* under Gordian III and, obviously, for some time before¹⁰⁵. The double formula probably attests to such close connections between the city and the

¹⁰¹ Cf. *infra* (text and nn. 109 ff.), for the cases of the “Tricornenses” and the “Triballi”.

¹⁰² *CIL* III 1430, 10, erected by *Aur. Artissius, aedil. territor(ii) contr(ibuti) et k(anabarum ?) R(eginensium)*. For the mining aspects of Artissius’ territorium and inscription (dedicated to the god Vulcanus, on the day of the Vulcanalia !) see S. Dušanić 1985-1989, 149 and notes 18–23.

¹⁰³ Probably, the mediation concerned the celebration of the Vulcanalia in the present case. But Artissius may also have been responsible for building activities, as the *aediles* frequently were. It is well-known that the city was generally obliged to help its mine when it came to the public works.

¹⁰⁴ S. Dušanić 1971 (n. 91), 241–261 and 1997, 31–42, esp. 41 f.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, on *ILlug* 503.

mine as had remarkable administrative aspects; even the possibility of *contributio* of the latter to the former should be admitted on the strength of the parallel, just signalled, of the Regensburg inscription. An analogous situation must be assumed for the Drinus mines, where, from the citizens' point of view, the double formula ran (in the mid-third century again) *col(onia) m(etalli)* (or *m(etallorum)*) *D(omaviani)* (*D(omavianorum)*)¹⁰⁶. The Municipium Domavianum (later on, colonia Domavia) co-existed there with the *vicus metalli* probably called Argentaria¹⁰⁷ but some mining affairs and services were evidently taken from the *vicus* by the city, as both epigraphical and archaeological evidence show. Along the Drinus, Ibar and, doubtless, in many other places, the community (*ordo*) of the *coloni* preserved its geographical and organizational individuality vis-à-vis the neighbouring *municipium/colonia* even after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, though the *coloni* may also have inhabited certain parts of the *ager* of the *municipium/colonia*, and benefited from the city's administrative and economic potentials¹⁰⁸.

In the final analysis, that complex state of affairs must have reflected the importance of the mining factor. Practical considerations demanded a special magistrate – belonging to the *municipium/colonia* itself – to coordinate the cooperation between the city and the mine or (less frequently) other useful *territoria*, possessing quarries, *salinae* or fertile arable land. The administrative modalities varied, no doubt, according to the time and place. Two instructive parallels deserve to be noted in conclusion.

The relationship of Ulpia Oescus and the Triballi's near-by *civitas*, of which we have reliable Diocletianic evidence¹⁰⁹, should be envisaged under the same heading as the *colonia metallorum Domavianorum* since the Triballian *civitas* (*peregrina*, in early times) possessed a *territorium* with important quarries¹¹⁰. It is not, perhaps, by a simple coincidence that we find a *praefectus saltus* (by name of Titius Maximus) in the epigraphical legacy of Oescus' colonial

¹⁰⁶ CIL III 12728 f. *Aspects* 90 and note 239.

¹⁰⁷ Tab. Peut. VII 1.

¹⁰⁸ S. Dušanić 1997, 38–42.

¹⁰⁹ *Cod. Iust.* VIII 48. 5 (Dec. 4, AD 291): *Triballis* (note the survival of the ethnic !). Cf. Th. Mommsen, "Über die Zeitfolge der Verordnungen Diocletians und Seiner Mitregenten" *Abh. Ak. Berlin* 1860 (Berlin 1861) 404 and 428; S. Dušanić, "Cupiditas aedificandi" (in preparation).

¹¹⁰ B. Gerov, *ILBulg* I 180 (*Vicus Trullensium*), cf. 183.

dignitaries of the highest rank¹¹¹. His *praefectura* may have been of a similar type to that of Valens (above, (h), lines 7-8), and implied the existence of a subordinate, viz. a *princeps coloniae Oesci*, with the concrete task of mediation between the territory of quarries and the offices of the city¹¹². Even Titius Maximus' *patronatus fabrum* at Oescus may indirectly attest to his connection with the industry of the *saltus*¹¹³.

The case of Singidunum and the *Tricornenses* – i.e. the *coloni* working the Kosmaj mines¹¹⁴ – will have been related to that of Oescus and the *Triballi*. Both Danubian *civitates* retained their individualities after AD 212 (under the name of *territoria* ?), as far as sixth century¹¹⁵ perhaps, owing to their economic rôle and inherited administrative structure¹¹⁶. This last, to sum up the preceding observations, was likely to be under the control of the city's *princeps* in some constitutional aspects¹¹⁷.

¹¹¹ B. Gerov, *ILBulg I 16* (Oescus, II cent.): *M. Titio / M. fil. Pap. / Maximo / (duum)virali /⁵ iter. q(uin)q(uennalicio) / col(oniae) fla(mini) per(petuo) praef(ecto) saltus /¹⁰ patr(ono) fabr. / Narcis(sus) actor.*

¹¹² The *princeps ordinis col(oniae) Oesc(ensium)* of *ILS 7178* = B. Gerov, *ILBulg I 18* should not be equated with such *principes municipii/coloniae*.

¹¹³ Cf. e.g. J. – P. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, I, Louvain 1895, 440 f.

¹¹⁴ *IMS I p. 104* (with note 53) and no. 153; S. Dušanić 1985–1989, 149 notes 9–12 and 151; 1991, 219–221 and 224. The inscription of a *v(ir) e(gregius)* at Ritopek (= Tricornium) may be attributed to a mining procurator (*IMS I 79*). Also, the brick stamps of the *Classis Flavia (CLASIS (!) Ff j)* from the Kosmaj finds (*IMS I p. 104* note 2) will have reflected the assistance the *classici* of Tricornium provided to the river transport of the Kosmaj lead.

¹¹⁵ *Territoria*: Nov. Iust. XI 5. *Chorai*: Proc. *De Aed.* IV 4, p. 123 et passim.

¹¹⁶ In the case of the “Tricornenses” and the “Triballi” we lack very late evidence analogous to that referred to in the preceding note but the Kosmaj find of a brick stamped *TRIC* (*IMS I p. 104* note 2: fourth century ?) is eloquent enough.

¹¹⁷ The author is indebted to Mrs. S. Loma, who has kindly read the manuscript of the present article and made valuable comments.