EPIGRAPHIC CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE
NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NIŠ

In the present article we shall publish some so far unknown Roman inscriptions of major interest from the epigraphic collection of the Museum of Niš. As far as it has been possible, the inscriptions have been set in chronological order, except the military diploma of 222 which is described at the end. Beside the text of the inscriptions and the usual details, a brief indispensable commentary has been added.

1. (fig. 1) Central part of a tombstone slab of greenish sandstone, mutilated on all sides on the occasion of its adaptation for secondary use. Found in 1961 not far from the citadel of Niš, inv. no. 130. At the top of the slab traces of a wreath wrought in carved, slant, parallel dashes which start upwards and downwards from a circular line. Dimensions: H. 0,97 m., W. 0,31 m., Th. 0,17 m., letters 0,06 m. The inscription reads:

```
TICLADIVS  VALERIVS  VETCOHR
IC RETVM
5 DOHERAB  VIXANLX  E MANXXXII

Ti. Claudio Valerius vet(erus) coh<o>r(tis)
I Cretum
do(mo) H<erab(ynta?)
vix(it) an(nos) LX
em(eruit) an(nos) XXXII
```

L. 1 The both Ts of the line, and all the others in the inscription, are tall. Cladius (cf. ThLL, Onomasticon II 473,18sq.) instead of Clau­dius is not an oversight of the engraver, but a rather frequent vulgar phenomenon of reducing the diphthong au to a in the initial syllable (as agustus instead of augustus, auscultare instead of auscultare). Our example, among others, confirms the view1) that here we have to deal with a dissimilation au — u — a — u, and not with a change connected with the accent, as generally assumed2). This reduction appears early,  

2) H. Mihäescu, Limba latină în provinciile duminăre ale imperiului roman, București 1960, 79; an attempt (I. Venedikov, Fonetika na latinskite nadpisi ot bălgarskite zemi, Izvestija na sem. pri Ist. filol. fak. na Sof. un., I, 1942, 231) to separate the change au — a from dissimilation must be regarded as unsuccessful: the alleged probative examples like Arellia are derived from reduced forms where dissimilation has already taken place (Arellius etc.).
already at the beginning of our era\(^3\), and so far it has been attested in Moesia Superior only in two examples: a\(<u\>g(ustus), on the coin of colony Viminacium from 251/2\(^4\), and Pa\(<u\>lina in the inscription from Makreš belonging presumably to the fourth century\(^5\).

L. 3 Coh\(<o\>r(tis):

a well known case of the contraction of the two vowels between which the \(h\) had been elided and preserved merely as an orthographic reminiscence in the incorrect place\(^6\). A punctuation-mark at the end of the line.

L. 4 The numeral is extant only in its lowest part, but it is not questionable. It is also certain that two or more verticals never stood in this place.

L. 5 According to our opinion, the proposed restoration of this difficult line is preferable. The only Cretan locality which can be taken into closer consideration for the supplement is Hierapytna\(^7\)), though even this name does not agree completely with the quite clear lettering. \(H\(<i\>erab(ytna)\) would be, probably, a vulgar form. The change \(i\)__\(\rightarrow\)\(e\) is well attested in post-classic Greek\(^8\), the oscillation between \(\pi\) and \(\beta\) does not represent an isolated case\(^9\).

L. 6 The first numeral is taller than the common characters of its line. A punctuation-mark at the end.

---

\(^3\) Mihăescu, \textit{op. cit.}, 79.

\(^4\) \textit{Num. Vijesti} XII (1958), 32, var. V.

\(^5\) D. Dimitrov, \textit{Nadgrobnite ploči ot Rimsko vreme v Severna Bălgaria}, Sofija 1942, 33, no. 43.

\(^6\) Cf. Väänänen, \textit{op. cit.}, 57.

\(^7\) For some details about the not unimportant life of this town in the Roman period, see R. Paribeni, \textit{Creta}, Diz. ep. II, 1274; Bürchner, \textit{Hierapytna}, RE VIII (1912), 1407.


\(^9\) Mayser, \textit{op. cit.}, 175 and 185; Mihailov, \textit{op. cit.}, 59.
L. 7 In spite of the badly damaged end of the line, the reading of the number is certain. The deceased remained in service for a considerably longer time than usual.

Starting from the name of the deceased and from the particulars about his age and his years of service, we see two possibilities for the chronological attribution of our inscription. Namely, Ti. Claudiu Valerius may have received his citizenship after having served for 25 years, and so the inscription would not be older than the second half of the sixth decade of the first century, and probably not later than the first half of the ninth decade. In such a case, Cheesman’s opinion10) that the cohors I Cretum was raised in pre-Flavian epoch would have been even explicitly confirmed, and, moreover, we should have to place the date of its formation not later than the beginning of the reign of Claudius. On the other hand, if the deceased had entered the service already as a Roman citizen (which did not happen rarely in Flavian-Trajanic epoch11), our inscription would have had no proper value for the history of the cohort, and most likely would not have antedated the beginning of the second century. Taking into consideration that the precise dating is of such importance, we shall deal in detail with all the elements of the text and of the monument which could be of use in this respect. The phonetic features of the text have already proved as useless for the purpose.

The way in which the preserved part of the wreath in the field above the inscription has been wrought, being engraved, is not a common one, and we have come across only two similar cases in Moesia Superior, both of them of a later date and typologically rather distant12). It is most probable that such a technique was applied in the production of cheaper monuments; so we find also on some roughly made tombstones from Pannonia ornaments encarved in the field above the inscription13). The wreath in our monument may have figured as a mark of distinction — corona, considering the fact that the tombstone referred to a military man14), but it is quite possible that there was a merely decorative wreath

11) K. Kraft, Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau, Bern 1951, 77.
12) A graveostone of a very primitive workmanship found at Srednje Kojnare near Skopje (N. Vulić, Antički spomenici naše zemlje, Spomenik XCVIII, 1941—1948, 227, no. 449) shows in the field above the inscription traces of an ornament which is to be understood as three very stylized wreaths, each made of two concentric circular lines. The second example is a Christian tombstone from Prahovo (Vulić, Antike Denkmäler in Serbien, JOAI XIII 1910, Bbl. 199, no. 3 = Spomenik XLVII, 1909, 110sq., no. 4) which is decorated with a rather complicated engraved, wreath containing the name of the deceased and being surrounded itself by an engraved hexagon. This monument was carefully executed and resembles (to a degree) the discussed one only with regard to the technique of the elaboration of the above-mentioned hexagon.
13) A. Schober, Die römischen Grabsteine von Noricum und Pannonien, Wien 1923, 45, no. 95; 46, no. 96; 47, no. 99.
with a rosette in the middle\textsuperscript{15}). Besides, we can suppose that the wreath contained the letters DM\textsuperscript{16}), which we do not find in other parts of the monument; on the other hand, it does not seem plausible to reconstruct the whole decoration as a wreath containing the protome of the deceased (in such a case, the relief part has not been architecturally separated from the part with the inscription, as we know from analogies from Dacia Superior\textsuperscript{17}). In any case, the appearance of the wreath which, judging from its size and style, did not frame a bust of Ti. Claudius Valerius, makes possible for our province a date not later than the first decades of the second half of the first century. Namely, the majority of the similar monuments from Pannonia belongs to the second half of the same century and the corresponding type expanded as far as Ratiaria and Novae at the end of the century\textsuperscript{18}). An early date for our monument with its uncommonly situated wreath is the more so possible, since this motive could be of eastern provenance\textsuperscript{19}).

The palaeography of the inscription is also a matter of interest. Its engraver worked rather unsteadily and inaccurately, except in the case of two first lines, and used very strong serifs, obviously as stop marks. One should notice the use of the tall I in all cases and, besides, some other interesting letter-forms: A with the right stroke slightly curved in the bottom (11. 1, 2 and 5); L with its horizontal very short and unserifed (1. 2); R the second stroke of which seems to unite the strokes 2 and 3 of a normal R, and the cross-bar of which resembles that of A (11. 3, 4 and 5); S the stroke 3 of which is slanted up noticeably (11. 3 and 4); T with the bar rising in its right side (11. 3 and 4). The tall I figures in the inscriptions of Moesia Superior only in isolated cases which, however, cover the period from the first up to the third centuries\textsuperscript{20}), and cannot be attributed either to a certain chronological context, or to a certain local school. In a similar manner, the interesting forms of A, L, R, S, T described above, which appear in Italy in the first half of the first century at the latest\textsuperscript{21}), have not been accepted by the Moesian artistic tradition, and one can conjecture that our stonecarver was influenced either by his reminiscences from abroad, or by a pattern not used otherwise in this province.

The formula of the inscription is also uncommunicative for a preciser dating. The lack of the dedication To Di Manes would indicate an early date, at least not later than the end of the first century, but it

\textsuperscript{15}) Cf. e. g. Schober, \textit{op. cit.}, 58, no. 125; this is the case with the majority of gravestones from the North of Bulgaria, Dimitrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 73sqq.
\textsuperscript{16}) Hofmann, \textit{op. cit.}, 17.
\textsuperscript{17}) Gr. Florescu, \textit{I monumenti funerari romani della „Dacia Superior“}, Eph. Dacorum. IV (1926—1927), 97sq., nos. 35—37.
\textsuperscript{18}) Schober, \textit{op. cit.}, 50sqq.; Dimitrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 73.
\textsuperscript{19}) Cf. Dimitrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 75.
\textsuperscript{20}) Cf. Vulić, \textit{Spomenik XCVIII} (1941—1948), 213, no. 420 from Bardovce near Skopje (the tall I in IMP, PII).
\textsuperscript{21}) See J. and A. Gordon, \textit{Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions}, Berkeley and Los Angelos 1957, under these letters.
is not quite certain that the letters DM did not stand in one of the lost parts of the slab, e.g. in the wreath, as it has been already mentioned. On the other hand, the name of the deceased containing a cognomen excludes a dating to the very beginning of the empire; similarly, the fact that there is no mention of a tribe makes it less probable, though not impossible, for us to accept a date earlier than the end of the first century. The details about the age and the service of the deceased are not presented in the genitive, but it is not a symptom of later times for Moesia, moreover, both the designation of Valerius’ origin and the expression em(eruit) would speak for an earlier period.

As we have seen, the form of the monument and the character of its lettering, the phonetic features of the text, and the formula of the inscription, offer no reliable terminus post quem. In the same manner, we do not possess anything similar to a terminus ante quem. This is the reason why it is difficult to choose one of the suggested alternatives for the dating. As for us, we should prefer the first alternative, with regard to the probable Cretan origin of the deceased, and the early date of the passing over to the local recruitment.

Finally, it is not superfluous to summarize in short what we know about the cohors I Cretum. This unit was sagittaria, as has been proved by a diploma from 110, and as could anyway be expected considering that Creta was famous for her archers. It was raised in pre-Flavian era — not later than the beginning of the reign of Claudius, if we adopt our first dating of the inscription published here. In all probability, it was encamped immediately in Moesia, where it was mentioned in military diplomas of 93 and 100. Many bricks with its stamp on Moesian limes or in its immediate neighbourhood have been found. In order to secure the conquered territory and to stabilize the new created conditions, this cohort passed some time after the second Dacian war of Trajan in Dacia, together with a great number of other auxiliary units, as testified by the diploma of 110. Its further stay in Moesia Superior is confirmed by the diploma from 159/60, as well as by a newly disco-
vered votive tablet dedicated by the same unit to *Iuppiter Dolichenus* not before the third century, judging by its letter-forms\(^{30}\). This inscription originates from a little sanctuary of the deity, placed in Brza Palanka, so that we are able to trace the camp of the cohort in Egeta. The fact that the monument published here was found in Niš should not be taken as something uncommon; a great part of the auxiliary soldiers of foreign origin after their discharge used to retire to greater centers of the province where they had served\(^{31}\).

2. (fig. 2) Two complementary fragments of the upper part of an altar of white marble. Found in 1953 (the bigger fragment) resp. in 1956 (the smaller fragment) in the citadel of Niš, inv. nos. 54 and 68. Dimensions (both fragments together): H. 0,59m., W. 0,39m., Th. 0,28m.; letters 0,04m. (1.1) and 0,05m. (11.2—4). The inscription reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INVICTO DEO} & \quad \text{Invicto deo} \\
\text{PRO SALIMP} & \quad \text{pro sal(ute) imp(eratorum)} \\
\text{MAVRANTQ} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
M. Aur(ellii) Anto-
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{NINI AVG[.]} \quad \text{[L. Aur(ellii) Veri]}
\]

\[
\text{[aug(usti)]} \quad \text{[aug(usti)]}
\]

\(^{30}\) We were able to examine the inscription (*ex ectype*) thanks to the kindness of D. Vučković-Todorović who communicated the whole find on 28th May 1962 in the Archaeological Institute in Beograd. (cf. *Arheološki pregled* 4, 1962, 208sqq.).

\(^{31}\) A. Mócsy, *Die Bevölkerung von Pannonien bis zu den Markomannenkriegen* Budapest 1959, 89.
L. 1 Inscribed in the top of the altar.

L. 2 The last letter in the line has been damaged, but it is not questionable. It was not erased intentionally.

L. 3—5 The most probable completion among the several possible. There is, however, no doubt about the choice of the emperors.

A very similar inscription from Ravna has been published by Vulić, on the basis of communication of A. Nenadović; it runs as follows: Invicto deo /pro sal(ute) imp(eratoris) /M. Aur(elii) Anto(nini) aug(usti). As Vulić could not offer any closer details about this monument, today we are not able to find out whether our inscription is identical with that from Ravna cited above. Namely, it is not impossible that the data about the provenance which accompany inv. nos. 54 and 68 might be incorrect, and that the altar we are dealing with originates from Ravna. From there it may have been brought to the citadel of Niš and broken and got lost during the air raids of the Second World War; subsequently its fragments may have been rediscovered and included in the collection of the Museum. It is, however, possible that, in spite of great similarity in the text and its line division, we have to deal here with two inscriptions. In any case, our reading differs noticeably in 1.2 and deserves to be published.

Among the numerous Mithraic monuments from Moesia Superior (temples, inscriptions, reliefs) this one (from 161—169) is the earliest which can be dated with certainty. One must take into consideration, however, that two dedicatory inscriptions addressed, most probably, to the same deity (one of them from Drmno near Požarevac

---

33) The angle bracket of the supplement aug[usti], which we see in the text as published in Spomenik, is obviously a misprint.
34) For a catalogue of the monuments of Mithra’s cult in Moesia Superior see Vermaseren, op. cit., II, 339sqq., nos. 2201sqq. Unfortunately, Vermaseren’s important Corpus in this part is loaded with various defects: it is incomplete, it inserts into Moesia Superior a great number of finding-places from the neighbouring provinces (no. 2210 and 2213, nos. 2325—2246), some inscriptions have been included in the Corpus in an incorrect form, its bibliography is deficient and very negligent etc. To Vermaseren’s Corpus we should add, beside the monuments cited in the notes 35, 36 (it is surprising that this relief is not included into the Corpus, though Vermaseren knew it from the summary that had appeared in Glasnik Srp. Ak. X, 1958, 86 — cf. Vermaseren, op. cit., II, 7) and 38, also a fragment of a relief (G. Seure, Musée de Belgrade. Reliefs votifs inédits ou disparus II, REA XXVI, 1924, 48, no. 10 (= Starinar III ser., I, 1922, 275, no. 10), the provenance of which (Paraćin), which remained so far uncertain, can be regarded as very probable, according to the personal communication of Lj. Zotović. One should notice that Vermaseren has not taken into account R. Marić’s reading (Antički kultovi u našoj zemlji, Beograd 1933, 110 n. 43) Invicto O(nnipotentem) M(ithrae) S(oli) N(abarze) s(acrum) of the beginning of a dedicatory inscription from Beograd, which is, it is true, not very plausible.

We express our thanks to Lj. Zotović who has allowed us to consult the still unpublished material from her catalogue of Mithraic monuments in Jugoslavija.
belonging to the altar erected by P. Aelius Hermes\(^{35}\), the other inscribed on an interesting relief found, perhaps, in Ražanj\(^{36}\), are older than the one we are dealing with, judging by the character of their letters. The first of the two mentioned is Roman, and it does not seem to be later than the middle of the second century; the second is Greek and according to the opinion of R. Šalabalić\(^{37}\) it surely antedates the third century, originating perhaps even from the end of the first century or the beginning of the second. If we add to this, on the one hand, that we know of the existence of a dedication to Mithras from the most north-eastern part of Moesia Superior that does not postdate the second century\(^{38}\), and, on the other hand, that in the quite opposite part of the province a customs officer, Apolionides, had to restore in 211 the temple of Mithras ruined by age\(^{39}\), then the conclusion as to the broad extension of Mithraic cult in the province as early as the beginning of the second century seems to be quite probable\(^{40}\).

3. (Fig. 3) Altar of white limestone, unearthed in 1959 in Ravna, inv. no. 126. A depression for receiving libations (0,10m. in diameter) in its upper surface. Dimensions: H. 0,41m., W. 0,26m. (at top and base) and 0,20m. (elsewhere), Th. 0,21m. (at top and base) and 0,18m. (elsewhere); letters 0,025m. The inscription reads:

\[\text{Fig. 3}\]

\(^{35}\) Vulić, Spomenik XCVIII (1941—1948), 146, no. 314.


\(^{37}\) Ib., 209.

\(^{38}\) B. Gerov, Romanizmat meždu Dunava i Balkana II, Godišnik na Sof. un., Ist. filol. fak., XLVIII (1952/53), 369, no. 196.

\(^{39}\) Vermaseren, op. cit., II, 342, no. 2208.

\(^{40}\) Cf. Marić, op. cit., 83sq., with some general chronological data and observations concerning the cult of Mithras within the territory of our country.
Diane Avg

Taelemcica

Nvsettvlilia

Coiexvotp

5 ettemfeca

Dian<ae> aug(ustae)

T. Ael(ius) Mucianus et Tullia

co<n>lux ex vot(o) posuerunt

5 et tem(plum) fec(erunt).

L. 1 The monophthongization ae>e, one of the earliest and best attested phenomena of vulgar latinity of inscriptions 41), occurs in more than 60 epigraphic texts of Moesia Superior. The line is situated at the top of the altar.

L. 2 It is difficult to say whether the letters COI reflect the wellknown weakening of the nasal before a sibilant, or if they represent but a radical abbreviation. A point after T.

L. 3 A point after NVS.

L. 4 A point before all the abbreviations except COI.

L. 5. The letters are smaller in size and rather careless in execution. Perhaps the line has been engraved subsequently. A point before FEC.

4. (fig. 4) Altar of whitish limestone unearthed in the same place as no. 3, inv. no. 110. The upper part considerably damaged. As the precedent one, the altar contains a depression for libations (0,09m. in diameter). Dimensions: H. 0,40m., W. 0,24 m. (at top and base) and 0,19m. (elsewhere), Th. 0,20m. (at top and base) and 0,17m. (elsewhere); letters 0,02m. The inscription reads:

Taelemcica

Nv[.]tTvllia

[Diannae aug(ustae)?]

T. Ael(ius) Mucianus et Tullia

41) Cf. Mihăescu, op. cit., 75 sqq.
S. Dušanić — P. Petrović

**AVGVSTAEX**  
**VOTPOS**  

*Augusta ex  
5 vot(o) pos(uerunt).*

L. 1 We can conjecture that the dedicatory formula was the same as in no. 3 and that it stood in the upper part of the monument, now lost.

L. 2 A point before and after AEL.

L. 5 A point between the abbreviations.

5. (fig. 5) Left upper part of an inscriptive block of white marble, with high margin, unearthed in 1934 in Ravna, in the site where „a temple had been excavated“, not far from the finding-place of nos. 3 and 4, inv. no. 56. Dimensions: H. 0,25m, W 0,31m, Th. 0,17m.; letters 0,04 m. The inscription reads:

**DIAN**  
**PRO**  

*Dian[<a>e august<a>e?]  
pro [salute]  
[———]*

L1. 1—2 The supplements are uncertain and they start from 1.2 which, judging by the empty place at its beginning was shorter than 1.1 and obviously symmetrical with it. We think it very probable that this slab stood on the façade of Diana's temple mentioned in the inscription no. 3, and therefore we have chosen such a reading of 1.1, though the phonetic irregularities could have been avoided and the symmetrical relation of the lines retained, if a shorter attribute of the goddess (e.g. *regina*) had been assumed in 1.1, or a wider interspace between the words *pro* and *salute* in 1.2. The restoration *Dian[ae aug(ustae)] pro [sal(ute)]* would have left the block with too small a width.

Taking into consideration the character of the lettering, the inscriptions nos. 3, 4 (both cut, most probably, by the same hand) and 5 are to be dated to the second half of the second century, though the
last one was executed with more care and precision. T. Aelius Mucianus and his wife we know already from a monument published by Vulić. The attribute *augusta* of Diana, which occurs in the first of the three above inscriptions, and which presumably stood also in the other two, is a common one. In all likelihood, we have to deal here with the actual Roman goddess, and not with the *interpretatio Romana* of an autochthon deity, in spite of the probable Thracian origin of Mucianus. Generally speaking, traces of the cult of Diana coming from Moesia Superior seem for the time being to be free of indigenous elements, contrary to the neighbouring provinces of Dalmatia, Thracia, Moesia Inferior and Dacia. They are not too numerous and are restricted to dedicatory inscriptions and reliefs. The temple mentioned in our monument no. 3 is the first temple of Diana in this province the existence of which is quite certain, though we can assume that two Moesian *castella Zanes* (hybrid *gen. loci* with the assimilated *di*<sup>2</sup>) spoken of by Procopius owe their name to a temple of Diana. If the block we publish under no. 5 comes from the temple of Diana, judging by its supposed width, the dimensions of the temple were moderate.

6. (fig. 6) Lower part of an altar of white marble, excavated in 1933 in the citadel of Niš, inv. no. 53. Dimensions: H. 0,49m., W. 0,40m. (at top and base) and 0,33m. (elsewhere), Th. 0,25m.; letters 0,04—0,05m. The inscription reads:

```plaintext
OSVERVNT
IDIBĀVGPM
PEIANOETPÄENIO
COS

[ ]

osuerunt
idib(us) Aug(ustis) Pom-
peiano et Paenio
5 co(n)s(ulibus).
```

---

45) Cf. Marić, *op. cit.*, 57sq. It is understandable that this conclusion cannot be valid as to the remnants of Diana’s cult in the whole area of our country, as Marić wanted it.
47) For the evidence about the monuments of Diana’s cult in the Yugoslav part of Moesia Superior known till 1933 see Marić, *op. cit.* 101n. 36 (the only finding-place Kostolac); since then one more dedication to Diana and Apollo, found at Katlanovo near Skopje, has been published (Vulić, Spomenik XCVIII, 1941—1948, 221, no. 437). The evidence about the monuments of Diana’s cult in the Bulgarian part of the province has been collected by J. Mladenova, *Dva epigrafski pametniki ot Severozapadna Bālgarija*, Izvestija na Arheol. inst. XXIV (1961), 266 n. 9 (the finding-places Sinagovci, Bela).
48) Skok, *De l’importance des listes toponomastiques de Procope pour la connaissance de la latinité balkanique*, RIEB III (1937), 54; cf. Mihaescu, *op. cit.*, 125sq.
49) Procop., *De aed. IV* 6,6,8; *IV* 4 (p. 124, 31 ed. Haury). To these names we have been kindly referred by Miroslava Mirković.
L.2 It is not certain whether O stood in the preceding line, though there is room for it in this one. The line has been preserved only in its lower part.

L.3 A point before and after AVG.
L. 4 A point before and after ET.
L. 5 The letters are of smaller size and are partly off the surface of the inscription.

The second consul of the two through which our inscription has been dated, Paenius, is otherwise, as far as we know, not attested. To judge by the form of its letters, the inscription is not more recent than the third century, nor is it older than the beginning of the second. Out of this period several Pompeiani are known as consuls — and so were ordinarii for 231 Claudius Pompeianus and T. Flavius Sallustius Paelignianus⁵⁰), and it is not impossible that the lettering of our altar contains the corrupt form of the cognomen of the second of these two dignitaries. Beside the former, only one of these two men could be taken as a colleague of Paenius: T. Claudius Pompeianus who may have been consul already before 167⁵¹), or another Pompeianus who held the post of the governor of Moesia Superior in 195⁵²). If we are allowed to suppose that under Paenius a vulgar resp. corrupt form of Paetus is concealed (with the parasitic nasal and possibly incorrectly copied I instead of T), one should bear in mind that we do not know the colleague of T. Prifernius Paetus Rosianus Geminus, the consul at the times of Hadrian⁵³). Finally, one should allow the possibility of an erroneous combining of two consuls of different years, the more so since the dating with suf-

---

⁵⁰) A. Degrassi, I fasti consolari dell'impero romano, Roma 1952, 64.
⁵¹) Ib., 47. The same person was given the consulate for the second time in 173.
⁵²) Ib., 54.
⁵³) Ib., 134.
fecti in the province, at such a time, and in such a monument would have been something exceptional54).

7. (fig. 7) Tombstone of whitish marble, broken in several places of its inscriptional part, unearthed in 1956 in Ravna, inv. no. 85. The upper edge of the monument is horizontal. A semicircular gable contains three busts: Aurelia Cristina between her husband and her brother. The arch of the gable is laid on two low pilasters. Above the arch palmettes in both corners. The framings of the inscriptional and of the base part are not ornamented. The field of the base is decorated with a crater from which vines with leaves sprout. Dimensions: H. 1,77m., W. 0,63m., Th. 0,19m.; panel of inscription: H. 0,59m., W. 0,32m.; letters 0,04m. — 0,05m. The inscription reads:

FLBITHOAD COHIÄVRDAR MARITOETAVR HERMOGENI 5 DECCOHSS FRATRIAVREIACRISTINAPOS

L.1 A punctuation-mark after FL.
L.2 O is of a smaller size. A punctuation-mark after the numeral and after AVR.
L.3 A punctuation-mark before ET and after AVR.
L.5 A punctuation-mark after the first S.
L. 6 The second I is short.

This kind of gravestone, with such a decoration and with representations of the deceased in the niche under a semicircular gable, occurs very frequently in Moesia Superior, and appears to be especially popular in Ravna, in the circle of members of this cohort. The majority of these monuments belongs to the end of the second century and to the whole of the third century, which corresponds to the period of the greatest expansion of the type in the neighbouring provinces55). As far as its rude workmanship allows, our monument could be dated more precisely with regard to the characteristic form of beard of the deceased and to coiffure of Aurelia Cristina. The representations of Flavius Bithus and Aurelius Hermogenes show a kind of short, low beard that appears in the portraits of emperors from Gordian I and II56) to Constantin's epoch. Hair of Cristina herself, we may conjecture, is highly raised letting the ears free and knotted in a long plait carried up the

56) See B. M. Felletti Maj, Iconografia romana imperiale da Severo Alessandor a M. Aurelio Carino, Roma 1958, no. 103 (pl. XI, 37) and 133 (pl. XI, 38).
Fig. 7
back of the head, besides, it is waved and parted at the middle. The fashion of the coiffure (with the plait of this sort) which does not cover the ears, begins with Tranquillina and lasts till Magnia Urbica. However, Severina introduces in it a novelty: the end of the plait approaches to the front, a thing which we do not see in the representation of Cristina. The coiffure of Cristina resembles especially some heads of Otacilia Severa and Etruscilla. Taking into account also a possible conservatism of fashion, we find it plausible to narrow the chronological limits of the tombstone discussed to the third quarter of the third century. This date is comparatively very early for Moesia Superior if we take that this is a christian monument, which is suggested as probable, but not certain, by the cognomen Cristina and by the lack of dedication to Di Manes.

The full name of the cohort to which Flavius Bithus and Aurelius Hermogenes belonged was cohors II Aurelia Dardanorum milliaria equitata; it was encamped in Ravna and probably partly in Praesidium Pompei. Among the rather numerous monuments which remained behind it, mainly from the end of the second and from the third centuries, this one is the first to mention the presence of a Thracian in the unit—a striking event for the cohort of Dardanians. It can be ascribed to the Thracian infiltration to the territory of Dardania, which is supposed by Mateescu to have rapidly expanded since the beginning of the second century. Although Mateescu’s thesis of this Thracian penetration could be fitly applied to explaining the Thracian elements in Albanian, as for us, it does not appear to be probable. Most likely, we must

---

59) Felletti Maj, op. cit., 177 (pl. XXVI, 81sq.), 179, no. 217 (pl. XXVII, 84) and 180, no. 222 (pl. XXVII 83); 193 (pl. XXXI, 97) and 193sq., no. 245 (pl. XXXI, 100; XXXII, 99).
60) Cf. ThLL. Onom. II, 415. The name Cristina, however, can be pagan, either of Greek (ThLL, Onom. II, 407) or Latin (ThLL, Onom. II, 725) origin.
61) On the unit see E. De Ruggiero, Dardani, Diz. ep. II, 1465 (only some attestations); Cheesman, op. cit., 676 and 178; Wagner, op. cit., 131sq.
62) It is possible that the brother-in-law of Bithus, Hermogenes, was also a Thracian, who bore a Greek name. In another inscription from Ravna, dated by the editors on letter-forms in the third century (A. Premerstein — Vulić, Antike Denkmäler in Serbien und Macedonien, JÖAI VI, 1903, Bbl. 46, no. 52) there is mentioned one more soldier of a cohort, the same as it seems, with a cognomen of Greek origin (Aristi[nus]); it is not excluded that also here is meant a Thracian. Kraft (op. cit., 175) cites an incomplete list of the names of the known soldiers of the unit, without stating the nationality of any of them.
look for the reason of Bithus' participation in the cohort in the acceptance of the close local enlistment, which had become general since Hadrian\(^\text{66}\)).

The post of Bithus is anyhow to be understood as *adiutor corniculariorum*, which, as it seems, can also be found cited elsewhere in this short form\(^\text{67}\)).

8. (figs. 8—11) Two bronze plates of a military diploma found several years ago at the village of Planinica near Pirot, inv. no. 128. The first plate is broken across, at the height of ring holes. Dimensions: H. 14,7cm., W. 11, 2cm., Th. 0,2cm.; letters *tab. I extr.* 0,4cm. (except 1.21 where 0,5cm. and 1.22 where 0,6cm.; the first letters of 11.3, 6, 8, 10 and 19 are somewhat higher), *tab. I int.* 0,3cm., *tab. II extr.* 0,6cm., *tab. II int.* 0,5cm. Weight: *tab. I* 130gm., *tab. II* 140gm. The text reads (because of an interesting divergence, the text of both sides of the first plate is given; the inconsistent and sporadically incorrect punctuation is noted in the transcription):

*Tab. I, extrinsecus* (fig. 8):

\[
\text{IMPCAESDIVIANTONINIMAGNI · PII · FIL · DIZISEVERI · PII · NEP. M · AVRELLIVSANTONINVSPIVSFELIXAVGSAERDOS AMPLISSIMVSDEI · INVICTI · SOLISELAGALI 5 PONTIFMAXIM · TRIBPOT · V · COS · IIII · PP ET IMPER · CAESM · AVR [· · ·]NTONINI · PIIFELICIAVGFIL · DAVIANTONINIMA[· · ·]PIINEP · DIVI · SEVERI · PII · PRONM · AVRELLIVSALEAND[· · ·]NOBILISSIMVSCAES · IMPERI · ETOSACERDOTISCOS. 10 NOMINAMILITVMQVIMILITAVERTNT · INCOHOR TIVBSPRAETORISANTONINIANISDECEM · I · II · III IIII V · VI · VII · VIII · VIII · X · PIISVINDICIBVSQVIPIEET FORTITER · MILITIA · FVNT · SVNT · IVSTRIBVIMVS CONVBII · DVMTAXAT · CVMSINGVLISETPRIMIS 15 VXORIBVSETIAM · SIPEREGRINI · IVRIS · FEMI NASINMATRIMONIO · SVOIVNERINT · PROINDE LIBEROSTOLLANTACIESXDOBVSCIVBVSROMA NISNATOS. AD · VII · IDVS · JAN . IMPM · AVRELLIOANTONINOPIOFELICEAVGIII 20 M · AVRELLIOALEXANDROCAES COS · COHVII · PR · ANTONINIANA · P · V · C · AVRELIO · C · F · VLP · VALENTI · SERDIC. \]

\(^{66}\) Kraft, *op. cit.*, 50sq. The general value of this conclusion of Kraft is not doubtful, though the translation of the recruiting area from the South Pannonia to the Northern should be explained in another way (see Mócsy, *Bevölkerung*, 121).

DESCRIPT ET RECOGNIT · EXTABVLÆ · AEREA · QVEFIXA
ESTROME · INMVRO · POSTEMPL · DIVIAVGADMNER
VAM

Imp. Caes(ar), divi Antonini Magni Pii fil., / divi Severi Pii nep(os), / M. Aurellius Antoninus Pius Felix Aug(ustus), sacerdos / amplissimis dei invictis Solis Elagabali, / pontif(ex) maxim(us), trib(unicia) pot(estatu) V, co(n)s(ul) III, p(ater) p(atriae) / et Imper. Caes(aris), M. Aur[elli Antonini Pii Felici <s> Aug(usti) fil., / divi Antonini Ma[gni] Pii nep(os), divi Severi Pii nep(os), / M. Aurellius Alexander[er], nobilissimus Caes(ar)/ imperi et sacerdotes, co(n)s(ul)


L. 5 Without taking into consideration some differences in the size of abbreviations, the occurrence of the conjunction et in this line of our diploma is the only noticeable divergence from the text of the diploma CIL XVI 140 of the same year.

L. 6 The form felici instead of felicis is not the result of the phonetic weakening of this sibilant in the final position, nor is it a simple slip of the engraver but is a consequence of the mechanical accomo­ 
dation to the endings of the words from the context. Cf. also examples singulis instead of singuli singulars, peregrinis iuris feminas instead of peregrini iuris feminas.

L. 16 The vulgar determining in matrimonio suo iunxerint instead of matrimonio suo iunxerint occurs for the first time as early as 208.

L. 19 For the abl. felice cf. e. g. CIL XVI 1.

Tab. I, intus (fig. 9)

IMP · CAES · DIVI · ANTONINIMAGNIPII · FIL.
DIVI · SEVERI · PII · NEPOS · M · AVRELLIVS.
ANTONINVSPIVS · FELIAXAVG · SA[...OS] · AM

68) See on the whole question Väästenänen, op. cit., 78sqq.
69) Like spellings uxoribus (CIL XVI 183), [Aur]eliiu (CIL XVI 185).
72) Cf. CIL XVI p. 209.
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S. Dušanić — P. Petrović

PLISSIM · DEI · INVICTI · SOLIS · ELAG[...]. PONTIF.

5 MAX.TRIB.POT.V·COS.III·P·P·ETM·AYRELLIV·SALEXAN
DENOBILISSIM · CAES · IM[.]ERI · ETSÁCERDOT · COS·
NOMINA · MILITVMQVIMILITAVER · INCOHORTIB·
VRBANISANTONINIAN · QUATTVORXXIXIIXIII
SVBIECIQVIVIBVS · FORTITERETPIEMILITIAFVNC·

TISVNT · IVS · TRIBVI · CONVBI · DVMTRAXATŚINGVLIS
ETPRIMIS · VXORIB · VTÉTIĀM · SIPEREGRINI·
IVRIS · FEMINAS · INMATRIMONIO · SVO · IVN
XERINTPROINDELIBEROSTOLLANT · ACSI·
EXDVOB · CIVIB · ROM NIS · NATOS.

trib(unicia) pot(estate) V, co(n)s(ul) IIII, p(ater) p(atriae)
, et M.Aurellius Alexanjnder nobilissim­
us) Caes(ar) im[p]eri et sacerdotiis
, co(n)s(ul).

L. 5 Here for the first time the text of the interior side of the plate differs considerably from the text of the exterior side (the differences in the degree of the abbreviation of the words we meet already from 1.2 and they are numerous): two whole lines (6 and 7) of the full version are omitted.

L. 8 The astonishing mention of the cohortes urbanae could be explained in two ways. The engraver may have used, by mistake, an old pattern which contained the formula nomina militum, qui militave­
runt in cohortibus praetoriis decem...et urbanis quattuor...subiecinus, quibus fortiter et pie militia functis ius tribuimus and while copying he may have left out the whole passage relating to the praetorian cohorts and, besides, automatically altered the correct functis into modern functi sunt. This possibility does not seem very likely, especially because the joined mention of the cohortes praetoriae and the cohortes urbanae took place for the last time more than half a century before, in the diploma of 16273) (CIL XVI 124). The other alternative is that the en­
graver had confounded two contemporary patterns: one meant for a praetorian, the other for a soldier of a cohortes urbana, resp. that he had copied the general part of our diploma from a diploma already made, and this by mistake from a diploma for a soldier of an urban cohort. That similar confusions occurred is proved by CIL XVI 154 (cf. H. Nesselhauf ad n.). The fact that since 194 (CIL XVI 134) in diplomas

73) Degrassi, op. cit., 46.
of the urban cohorts the formula *quibus fortiter et pie militia functis* had been abandoned in favour of the formula *qui fortiter et pie in militia functi sunt* (*CIL* XVI 137) does not exclude our explanation — the text of the interior side of a diploma of 216 (*CIL* XVI 137) also combines the older and the newer formula (cf. Nesselhauf an n.). Besides, the circumstance that the verbs *subieci(mus?)*, *tribui(mus?)* in the text of the interior side of the diploma end in the vowel leads to the question whether we have to deal here with abbreviations at all (hence the question-mark in our supplements) and shows, perhaps, also in this point the influence of an older pattern.

As the end of the word *Antoninianis* was destroyed by the hole for the ring (similarly also in 1. 14), the text of the interior side had been inscribed before that of the exterior side.

L. 10 *Cum* is omitted as in the diploma *CIL* XVI 135 of 208. It is more likely that we have to deal here with a simple slip of the engraver, than with a hyperclassic construction.

**Tab. II, intus (fig. 10):**

```
AD · VII · IDVS · IAN
IMPANTONINI · AVGIII · M · AVR · ALEXANDER
CAES · COS ·
COH · VII · PR · ANTONIANAP · V.
5 C · AVRELIOC · F · VLPVALENTI · SARĐIC
DESCRIPTETRECOGNITEXAERAERQVEFIX
ROMEINMVR · POST[,]JMPIPLDIVI AVG
AD MINERVAM
```


|coh(ors) VII pr(aetoria) Antoni <ni> ana p(ia) v(index)5/C. Aurelio C. f. Ulp(ia) Valenti, S <e>rdic(a).
|/Descrip(tum) et recognit(um) ex tab ula> aer(ea), qu <a> e fix(a)
|<est> |Rom <a> e in mur(o) pos <t> i [e]mpl(um) divi Aug(usti) |ad Minervam.

L. 2 Instead of being in the ablative, the name of the first consul is in the genitive, and that of the other is in the nominative. With regard to the widely spread tendency of the vulgar latinity to the extracting of the personal names out of the construction and their isolation in the first case74), the form *Alexander* instead of *Alexandro* cannot be taken as a simple *lapsus*. However, the genitive *Antonini* is more difficult to understand. It could be a psychological error under the influence of *Antonini* . . . *fil.* from the full version of emperor’s name.

L. 4 For the other cases of haplography in diplomas cf. CIL XVI p. 213.

L. 5 Sardica (instead of Serdica) reflects the oscillation between a and e before r\(^2\)); the form with a frequently occurs in Greek authors\(^{26}\), but can be found also in Latin texts (JRS XVIII, 1928, 212 sq., no. 5; Iord., Rom. 383; acta of the council of Serdica of 343) Examples of the same phenomenon in diplomas: Garasenus (CIL XVI 15), Caeser (CIL XVI 10).

L. 6 The omissions of the words, as well as various dittographies, are not rare in the texts of the interior side of diplomas (see CIL XVI p. 213 and 248).

Tab. II, extrinsecus (fig. 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. Aureli Valeri</th>
<th>M. Aureli Valeri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P Aeli Stratullini</td>
<td>P. Aeli Stratullini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Flavi Maximiani</td>
<td>T. Flavi Maximiani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aureli Nepotiani</td>
<td>M. Aureli Nepotiani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Aeli Seniliani</td>
<td>5 T. Aeli Seniliani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aureli Augustalis</td>
<td>M. Aureli Augustalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Aureli Secundi</td>
<td>T. Aureli Secundi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diploma is dated 7th January 222 and belongs to the short period of the joined rule of Elagabalus and Alexander Severus. One diploma (the first plate) of the same date is already known (CIL XVI 140), but it is heavily damaged in the part containing the names of the emperor and of the caesar. The mutilation was intentional and certainly it was the consequence of the damnatio memoriae which had befallen the emperor-priest\(^{27}\). As shown by Forni\(^{28}\) and confirmed by our diploma, this mutilation, however, had not been done by an official factor and depended on the loyalty of the recipient of the document; nevertheless, we should reckon with a possibility of an official amputation of diplomas distributed to veterans after 13th March of the same year. The fortunate circumstance that our diploma remained intact enables us to give a correct restoration of the lost text after the name of Alexander Severus in the diplomas CIL XVI 140 and 141, and in the inscriptions CIL VI 2001 and VII 585. The unusual denomination of the Caesar which figured there did not include the term consors, as assumed for the inscriptions by Mommsen, and for the diplomas by Hülsen\(^{29}\), and read nobilissimus Caesar imperii et sacerdotis. A

\(^{25}\) See Mihailov, op. cit., 10.
\(^{26}\) Listed in Mihailov, op. cit., 11; E. Oberhummer, Serdica, RE II R. II (1921), 1169.
\(^{27}\) Cf. Nesselhauf ad CIL XVI 139sq.
\(^{28}\) G. Forni, La correngenza di Severo Alessandro a proposito di un frammento di diploma militare ritrovato in Lodi, Archiv. stor. Lodigiano, 1959, 8sqq.
\(^{29}\) Th. Mommsen ad CIL VI 2001; id., Römisches Staatsrecht, II\(^{\text{a}}\) 1148n. 3; Ch. Hülsen, Ein neues Militärdiplom, Röm. Mitt. XXII (1907), 437sq. Their restoration won the general acceptance.
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AVL-VLONIAN.

IMP. ANTONINUS PACATUS, AEF C. C. N. V. C. C.

CAESAR.

CAESAR.

C. ANTONIUS NERVI.

V. AVREL. T. E. F. P. MAECEN.

PL. III

Fig. 10
detailed discussion of this interesting title will be the subject of an
other paper.

The recipient of our diploma, in spite of his undoubtedly Thracian
origin, bears a genuine Roman name — an usual thing since the end
of the second century\(^80\). Instead of the designation of the tribe we find
in his name the emperor attribute of Serdica — *Ulpia*, as it was custom
in the praetorian *laterculi*\(^81\), and was not uncommon in diplomas\(^82\).
M. Aurelius Valens is but one among the especially numerous praeto­
rians of the Thracian birth of whom we know since the time of Septi­
mius Severus\(^83\), moreover, he is not by far the only one from the ter­
ritory of Serdica\(^84\). The fact that this diploma was found in the village
of Planinica which is situated, like the whole environs of Pirot in the
ancient territory of Serdica\(^85\), shows that the recipient returned to
his native-place after having served his military term, as done by the
majority of his comrades\(^86\).

Beograd. 
Niš.

S. Dušanić.
P. Petrović.

---

81) See *ib.,* 264sqq.
84) For numerous epigraphic attestations of the participation of the inhabit­
ants of Serdica *resp.* of its territory, see e.g. Mateescu, *Eph. Dacorom.* I (1923),
265sqq.
85) A. Domaszewski, *Die Grenzen von Moesia superior und der illyrische Grenz­
zoll,* AEM XIII (1890), 153.