

Stanovnicima Narone - municipibus municipii

Bekavac, Silvia; Miletić, Željko

Source / Izvornik: **Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu, 2016, 33, 237 - 246**


Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:291:223585>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution 3.0 Unported](#)/[Imenovanje 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-29**



INSTITUT ZA
ARHEOLOGIJU

Repository / Repozitorij:

[RIARH - Repository of the Institute of archaeology](#)



UDK 902
ISSN 1330-0644
VOL 33/2016.
ZAGREB, 2016.

P **riilozi**

Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu

Pril. Inst. arheol. Zagrebu, 33/2016
Str./Pages 1-352, Zagreb, 2016.

Izdavač/*Publisher*
INSTITUT ZA ARHEOLOGIJU
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Adresa uredništva/*Address of the editor's office*
Institut za arheologiju/*Institute of archaeology*
HR-10000 Zagreb, Ulica Ljudevita Gaja 32
Hrvatska/*Croatia*
Telefon/*Phone* ++385/(0)1 61 50 250
Fax ++385(0)1 60 55 806
e-mail: urednistvo.priloz@iarh.hr
<http://www.iarh.hr>

Glavni i odgovorni urednik/*Editor in chief*
Marko DIZDAR

Uredništvo/*Editorial board*
Marko DIZDAR, Snježana KARAVANIĆ, Viktória KISS (Budapest, HUN) (prapovijest/Prehistory),
Marija BUZOV, Goranka LIPOVAC VRKLJAN (antika/Antiquities), Katarina Katja PREDOVNIK
(Ljubljana, SLO), Natascha MEHLER (Wien, AUT), Juraj BELAJ, Tatjana TKALČEC (kasni srednji
vijek i novi vijek/Late Middle Ages and Modern era), Predrag NOVAKOVIĆ (Ljubljana, SLO)
(metodologija/Methodology)

Izdavački savjet/*Editorial advisory board*
Dunja GLOGOVIĆ (Zagreb), Ivor KARAVANIĆ (Zagreb), Timotej KNIFIC (Ljubljana,
SLO), Laszlo KÓVACS (Budapest, HUN), Kornelija MINICHREITER (Zagreb),
Mladen RADIĆ (Osijek), Aleksandar RUTTKAY (Nitra, SK), Ivančica
SCHRUNK (Minneapolis, USA), Željko TOMIČIĆ (Zagreb), Ante UGLEŠIĆ (Zadar)

Prijevod na engleski/*English translation*
Sanjin MIHELIC, Dragan BOŽIĆ, Ana ĐUKIĆ, Heidy ETEROVIĆ, Ana GRABUNDŽIJA,
Igor KULENOVIĆ, Tamara LEVAK POTREBICA, Marko MARAS, Krešimir MIJIĆ

Prijevod na hrvatski/*Croatian translation*
Sanjin MIHELIC

Prijevod na njemački/*German translation*
Mario GAVRANOVIĆ

Lektura/*Language editor*
Ivana MAJER (hrvatski jezik/Croatian)
Sanjin MIHELIC, Tamara LEVAK POTREBICA, Marko MARAS, Emily ZAVODNY
(engleski jezik/English)
Mario GAVRANOVIĆ (njemački jezik/German)

Korektura/*Proofreads*
Katarina BOTIĆ
Marko DIZDAR

Grafičko oblikovanje/*Graphic design*
Roko BOLANČA

Računalni slog/*Layout*
Hrvoje JAMBREK

Tisak/*Printed by*
Tiskara Zelina d.d., Sv. I. Zelina

Naklada/*Issued*
400 primjeraka/400 copies

Sadržaj

Contents

Izvorni znanstveni radovi

Original scientific papers

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | ANDREJA KUDELIC
Kurilovec – Belinščica – bronzanodobno naselje u
Turopolju | ANDREJA KUDELIC
<i>Kurilovec – Belinščica – A Bronze Age Settlement
in the Turopolje Region</i> |
| 53 | IGOR KULENOVIC
Kasnobrončanodobno naselje Podgajac – Glogovica
kod Slavenskog Broda | IGOR KULENOVIC
<i>A Late Bronze Age Settlement Podgajac –
Glogovica near Slavonski Brod</i> |
| 89 | MARIO GAVRANOVIC
ALEKSANDAR JAŠAREVIC
Neue Funde der Spätbronzezeit aus Nordbosnien | MARIO GAVRANOVIC
ALEKSANDAR JAŠAREVIC
<i>Novi nalazi kasnoga bronzanog doba iz sjeverne
Bosne</i> |
| 133 | DARIA LOŽNJAK DIZDAR
PETRA RAJIĆ ŠIKANJIĆ
O pogrebnim običajima u 11. st. pr. Kr. na jugu
Karpatske kotline
(primjer: groblje u Slatini) | DARIA LOŽNJAK DIZDAR
PETRA RAJIĆ ŠIKANJIĆ
<i>On Burial Practices in the Southern Carpathian
Basin in the 11th Century BC
(Case Study: Cemetery in Slatina)</i> |
| 155 | DRAGAN BOŽIČ
Graves from the Certosa Phase in Early Iron Age
Barrow 48 at Stična | DRAGAN BOŽIČ
<i>Grobovi certoškoga stupnja u
stariježeljznodobnom tumulu 48 u Stični</i> |
| 171 | TAJANA SEKELJ IVANČAN
TENA KARAVIDOVIĆ
Tkalački stan iz Virja | TAJANA SEKELJ IVANČAN
TENA KARAVIDOVIĆ
<i>A Loom from Virje</i> |
| 237 | SILVIA BEKAVAC
ŽELJKO MILETIĆ
Stanovnicima Narone – <i>municipibus municipii</i> | SILVIA BEKAVAC
ŽELJKO MILETIĆ
<i>To the Inhabitants of Narona – municipibus municipii</i> |
| 247 | JURAJ BELAJ
MARIJANA BELAJ
Prstenasti broš s natpisom iz templarske Gore –
prijedlog dekodiranja | JURAJ BELAJ
MARIJANA BELAJ
<i>An Inscribed Annular Brooch from the Templar Site of
Gora – A Possible Decipherment</i> |

Prethodno priopćenje

- 271 IVOR KARAVANIĆ
NIKOLA VUKOSAVLJEVIĆ
NATALIJA ČONDIĆ
SLOBODAN MIKO
IVAN RAZUM
NIKOLINA ILIJANIĆ
KRUNOSLAV ZUBČIĆ
RAJNA ŠOŠIĆ KLINDŽIĆ
JAMES C. M. AHERN
ANTONELA BARBIR
Projekt „Kasni musterijen na istočnom Jadranu – temelj za razumijevanje identiteta kasnih neandertalaca i njihovog nestanka”: sažetak 2. i 3. godine istraživanja

- 287 ANA GRABUNDŽIJA
CHIARA SCHOCH
AGATA ULANOWSKA
Kosti za tkalački stan. Eksperiment tkanja s astragalima

- 307 RENATA ŠOŠTARIĆ
HRVOJE POTREBICA
NIKOLINA ŠAIĆ
ANTONELA BARBIR
Prilog poznavanju halštatskih pogrebnih običaja – arheobotanički nalazi tumula 13 i 14 iz Kaptola kraj Požege

Pregledni rad

- 317 AGATA ULANOWSKA
Towards Methodological Principles for Experience Textile Archaeology.
Experimental Approach to the Aegean Bronze Age Textile Techniques in the Institute of Archaeology, University of Warsaw

Recenzije

- 341 KREŠIMIR MIJIĆ
Aleksandra Nikoloska i Sander Müskens (eds.), Romanising Oriental Gods?, Međunarodni znanstveni skup Skopje, 18.–21. rujna 2013., Skopje, 2015, 440 str.

- 345 UPUTE AUTORIMA

Preliminary communication

- IVOR KARAVANIĆ
NIKOLA VUKOSAVLJEVIĆ
NATALIJA ČONDIĆ
SLOBODAN MIKO
IVAN RAZUM
NIKOLINA ILIJANIĆ
KRUNOSLAV ZUBČIĆ
RAJNA ŠOŠIĆ KLINDŽIĆ
JAMES C. M. AHERN
ANTONELA BARBIR
Project Late Mousterian in the Eastern Adriatic – Towards Understanding of Late Neanderthals' Identity and Their Demise: Summary of the 2nd and 3rd Years of Research

- ANA GRABUNDŽIJA
CHIARA SCHOCH
AGATA ULANOWSKA
Bones for the Loom. Weaving Experiment with Astragali Weights

- RENATA ŠOŠTARIĆ
HRVOJE POTREBICA
NIKOLINA ŠAIĆ
ANTONELA BARBIR
A Contribution to the Understanding of Hallstatt Burial Customs – Archaeobotanical Evidence from Tumuli 13 and 14 at the Site of Kaptol, near Požega

Report

- AGATA ULANOWSKA
Prilozi metodološkim principima u iskustvenoj tekstilnoj arheologiji.
Eksperimentalni pristup tekstilnim tehnikama bronzanog doba Egeje na Institutu za arheologiju Sveučilišta u Varšavi

Book reviews

- KREŠIMIR MIJIĆ
Aleksandra Nikoloska and Sander Müskens, Romanising Oriental Gods?, International Symposium Skopje, 18–21 September 2013, Skopje, 2015, 440 p.

- GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

Stanovnicima Narone – *municipibus municipii*

To the Inhabitants of Narona – *municipibus municipii*

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Antička arheologija

Original scientific paper
Roman archaeology

UDK/UDC 904:930.27](398 Narona)

Primljeno/Received: 15. 01. 2016.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 17. 08. 2016.

SILVIA BEKAVAC
Odjel za arheologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV/2
HR-23000 Zadar
silviabekavac@gmail.com

ŽELJKO MILETIĆ
Odjel za arheologiju, Sveučilište u Zadru
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV/2
HR-23000 Zadar
zmiletic@unizd.hr

Na natpisima oslobođeničkih sevira u Naroni javlja se kratica MM koja je u literaturi i epigrafičkim bazama protumačena kao sintagma Vlvir m(agister) M(ercurialis) ili Vlvir m(onu)m(entum) ob honorem. Epigrafičkom analizom natpisa iz Narone i komparacijom sa srodnim spomenicima iz Betike, Lacija i Kampanije opovrgnuta su takva čitanja i predloženo je da se MM razriješi s municipibus municipii. Kroz konfrontaciju sa znanstvenim mišljenjima odbačeni su stavovi o dvostrukom municipalitetu i transformaciji iz duovirata u kvatuorvirat, a prihvaćen je Vittinghoffov model kojim se opovrgava mogućnost izračuna vremena konstitucije kolonije na osnovi imena tribusa stanovnika. Na temelju rekonstrukcije gospodarskog, političkog i administrativnog profila kasnorepublikanske i ranocarske Narone, dopunjena je Medinijeva teza o promjenama statusa oslobođenika u toj koloniji. Zaključak je da se naronitanska zajednica transformirala zbog provođenja zakona lex Iulia municipalis, lex Roscia i lex Iulia theatralis kojima se regulira položaj društvenih slojeva i interesnih grupa. Potomci oslobođenika iz vremena staroga naronitanskog konventa proželi su se s pridošlim italjskim kolonistima, a novi sloj libertina više nije imao pristupa privilegiranom položaju u upravi grada.

Cljučne riječi: Narona, oslobođenici, seviri, municipes municipii, magister Mercurialis

The abbreviation of MM that can be found on the inscriptions commissioned by freedmen seviri from the Roman municipality of Narona, has been interpreted in scientific literature and epigraphic databases as: Vlvir m(agister) M(ercurialis) or Vlvir m(onu)m(entum) ob honorem. Based on the epigraphic analysis and on the comparison with similar monuments from Latium, Campania and the province of Baetica, this interpretation is hereby disputed, and the alternative one proposed, resolving the abbreviation of MM as municipibus municipii. The notion of a dual municipality in Narona, and of a corresponding transformation from quattuorviri to duoviri is also disputed. The Vittinghoff model, rejecting the possibility of utilization of inhabitants' tribus names as the basis for the calculation of the timeline of the constitution of the colony, is substantiated. Medini's account of the changes of status of the freedmen (libertini) in Narona is complemented through a reconstruction of the economic, political and administrative profile of the Late Republican and Early Imperial Narona. It has been concluded that the Naronitan community had undergone a transformation in order to comply with lex Iulia municipalis, lex Roscia and lex Iulia theatralis, regulating the position of social orders and interest groups. Descendants of the freedmen from the times of the old conventus proceeded to amalgamate with the newly-arrived settlers with the civil status, while the subsequently freed libertines enjoyed no more access to privileged positions in the municipal administration.

Key words: Narona, freedmen, seviri, municipes municipii, magister Mercurialis

Narona je rano uspostavljena kao vojni mostobran za osvajanje Ilirika (Zaninović 1980: 173–181), a plodna dolina rijeke Naron omogućila je formiranje senatskih posjeda i organiziranje moćnog oslobođeničkog sloja (Wilkes 1969: 245–252; Medini 1980: 195–197; Glavičić 2002: 573–590). Iz kolonije Julije Narone potječe važan korpus natpisa iz kas-

Narona was established early as a military beachhead for the conquest of the Illyricum (Zaninović 1980: 173–181), while the fertile valley of the Naron River allowed for the formation of senatorial holdings and the development of a powerful freedmen rank (Wilkes 1969: 245–252; Medini 1980: 195–197; Glavičić 2002: 573–590). An important body of inscriptions from the Late Republic and Early Imperial

norepublikanskog i ranocarskog razdoblja. Novo društveno uređenje, principat, okončalo je institucionalnu krizu propale Republike i reformiralo odnose unutar društvenih slojeva. Dinamičnost socijalnih procesa u Naroni naglašena je, jer naselje u tom prijelaznom razdoblju, u doba Cezara ili Oktavijana, stječe status kolonije (AE 1912, 45; Wilkes 1969: 248; Cambi 1978: 57–59), a dvije krupne grupe, stari sloj naseljenika s dominantnim oslobođeničkim slojem i doseljeni kolonisti koji su rimski građani, uspostavljaju novi balans moći i postupno se amalgamiraju u *municipes*, slobodno stanovništvo grada. Nakon analize skraćenice MM koja se javlja na natpisima iz Narone, dat ćemo novi prijedlog njezina značenja, a zatim objasniti kako ona ilustrira društvene mijene u gradu.

Na nekoliko naronitanskih spomenika navodi se i kratica MM. U znanstvenoj literaturi ona se razrješava kao dio sintagme *Vlvir m(agister) M(ercurialis)* ili *Vlvir m(onu)m(entum) ob honorem*. U epigrafičkim bazama, kao i u recentnoj raspravi (Rodà de Llanza 2011: 189–195; Mayer i Olivé 2010: 250–266), na natpisima oslobođenika koji pripadaju grupi spomenika podignutih u povodu postizanja municipalne časti (*ob honorem*), nude se oba rješenja. Primjer je *CIL* 3, 1798 u bazi *Clauss Slaby* (EDCS-27500106) gdje se donosi rješenje *s m(onu)m(entum): L(ucius) Lusius Corpio / L(ucius) Lusius Quintio / L(uci) lib(ertus) IIIIIlvir / m(onu)m(entum) ob h(onorem)*. Heidelbergška baza (HD053393) ispravlja lekciju toga natpisa, a riječ *monumentum* zamjenjuje se s *m(agistri) M(ercuriales): L(ucius) Lusius Corpio / L(ucius) Lusius Quintio / L(uci) lib(erti) IIIIIlvir(i) / m(agistri) M(ercuriales) ob h(onorem)*. Također unutar identične kategorije natpisa, npr. posvetnih (*CIL* 3, 1770: *Divo Augusto sacrum*; *CIL* 3, 1792: *Mercurio Augusto sacrum*), na dvojak se način tumači što bi dedikanti trebali biti s obzirom na značenje kratice MM: *seviri magistri Mercuriales ob honorem* (HD053377; HD053386; HD053393; HD053394; EDCS-26600654; EDCS-26600654; EDCS-26600655; EDCS-10100818; EDCS-26600666) ili *seviri monumenti ob honorem* (EDCS-27500093; EDCS-27500102; EDCS-27500106; EDCS-27500107). Smatramo da takva rješenja nisu dobra.

Ako prihvatimo mogućnost da skraćenica MM znači *magistri Mercuriales*, moramo odgovoriti jesu li oni samostalno tijelo neovisno o sevirima ili su to jedinstveni *seviri magistri Mercuriales*. Na osnovi rasporeda riječi u formulaciji *IIIIIlviri ob honorem MM* (*CIL* 3, 1775 i *CIL* 3, 1800) smatramo da nije moguće da se ime nekog tijela ili položaja razdvaja umetnutim izrazima koji opisuju akciju toga istog tijela. Znači, možemo jedino prihvatiti da je eventualno riječ o dva odvojena, različita tijela. Jedno bi bilo *sevirat*, drugo bi činili *magistri Mercuriales*. Međutim, tom prijedlogu protivi se činjenica da na šest natpisa *seviri MM* (negdje se javlja jedna osoba, negdje više njih, a na natpisu *CIL* 3, 1770 nabrojeno je poimence svih šest oslobođenika) podižu spomenike ob

periods hails from the colony of Iulia Narona. The new type of social order, the principate, brought about the end to the institutional crisis of the failed Republic, and reformed relations between the social strata. The dynamic nature of these social processes had been particularly marked in Narona, as the settlement was raised to the status of a colony during this transitional period, in Caesar's or Octavian's times (AE 1912, 45; Wilkes 1969: 248; Cambi 1978: 57–59), while the two large social groups, the old settlers dominated by the freedmen, and the newly arrived colonists with the status of Roman citizens, arrived at a new balance of power and became gradually amalgamated into the *municipes*, the free inhabitants of the city. Following the analysis of the abbreviation MM, evident in the Naronitan inscriptions, an alternative interpretation of its meaning would be provided in the present article, along with an explanation of how it illustrated the social change in the city.

The said abbreviation, MM, appears on several Naronitan monuments. The interpretation found in the scientific literature suggest it to be a part of the string: *Vlvir m(onu)m(entum) ob honorem*; or: *Vlvir m(agister) M(ercurialis)* (Rodà de Llanza 2011: 189–195; Mayer i Olivé 2010: 250–266). Both resolutions are found in the epigraphic database of monuments erected by the freedmen on the occasion of their accession to the municipal honour (*ob honorem*). One such example is *CIL* 3, 1798 from the Clauss Slaby collection (EDCS-27500106) where the following resolution is cited: *s m(onu)m(entum): L(ucius) Lusius Corpio / L(ucius) Lusius Quintio / L(uci) lib(ertus) IIIIIlvir / m(onu)m(entum) ob h(onorem)*. The Heidelberg collection (HD053393), proposes a corrected resolution, where the term of *monumentum* is replaced by *m(agistri) M(ercuriales): L(ucius) Lusius Corpio / L(ucius) Lusius Quintio / L(uci) lib(erti) IIIIIlvir(i) / m(agistri) M(ercuriales) ob h(onorem)*. Also within the frame of an identical collection of inscriptions, e.g. the consecration ones (*CIL* 3, 1770: *Divo Augusto sacrum*; *CIL* 3, 1792: *Mercurio Augusto sacrum*), there are alternative interpretations of the status of dedicans in reference to the abbreviation of: *seviri magistri Mercuriales ob honorem* (HD053377; HD053386; HD053393; HD053394; EDCS-26600654; EDCS-26600654; EDCS-26600655; EDCS-10100818; EDCS-26600666) or *seviri monumenti ob honorem* (EDCS-27500093; EDCS-27500102; EDCS-27500106; EDCS-27500107). We find these resolutions lacking.

If we are to accept the possibility that the abbreviation MM signifies *magistri Mercuriales*, we need to provide the answer to the question on whether they represented a body independent of the *seviri* or were there the unitary *seviri magistri Mercuriales*. The placement of words in the formulation *IIIIIlviri ob honorem MM* (*CIL* 3, 1775 and *CIL* 3, 1800), seems to indicate the unlikelihood of a resolution where the name of a body or of a position would be separated by inserts describing actions by that same body. Consequently, we can only conclude that two separate and discrete bodies are in question. The *sevirat* would represent one of these bodies, while the other one would consist of the *magistri Mercuriales*. The fact that *seviri MM* are cited in six inscriptions as the ones erecting the monuments *ob honorem* (in some of them one person is listed, in other multiple ones, while *CIL* 3, 1770 lists all six freedmen by name)

honorem, a začuđujuće je da bi tu akciju poduzela šestorica koji su tobože istodobno pripadnici dvaju različitih tijela. U duhu rimske prakse jest da se postizanje pojedinih, zasebnih položaja obilježava i zasebnim počastima, a ne da se grupno slave. Ukratko, podaci iz natpisa pokazuju da ne postoje ni dva zasebna tijela. Takvu situaciju dodatno potvrđuju primjeri natpisa iz Narone na kojima su spomenuti samo *seviri*, bez oznake MM (CIL 3, 1793; CIL 3, 1828; ILJug 2, 654), dok s druge strane nemamo ni jedan primjer da bi se spomenuli samo *m(agistri) M(ercuriales)*, pa tako ni u situaciji *ob honorem*. Da je u Naroni jako upitno postojanje tijela *magistri Mercuriales* vidimo i stoga jer se oni ne spominju na nadgrobni spomenicima. U slijedu obnašanih časti pojedinih preminulih oslobođenika javlja se *sevir* služba, ali nemamo ni jedan primjer onih koji bi uz tu titulu *Vlvir* istaknuli slova MM, tj. funkciju *magister Mercurialis*, kao što se predlaže na drugim tipovima spomenika. Na primjeru starijeg čitanja dva natpisa iz Narone, komparativnom analizom ilustrirat ćemo takvu situaciju. Prvi je nadgrobni natpis (ILJug 3, 1888): *Sex(tus) Herennius / Sex(ti) l(ibertus) Eros IIIIIvir / Licinia Q(uinti) f(ilia) lucunda / Herennia Sex(ti) fil(ia) Tyc(h)e / Herennia Sex(ti) lib(erta) [----]*. Smatramo da se Seksto Herenije Eros javlja i na drugom, posvetnom, natpisu (ILJug 3, 1870): *Aesculapio / sacrum / M(arcus) Caesius M(arci) l(ibertus) / Primus / [S]ex(tus) Herennius / Sex(tus) Sex(ti) l(ibertus) Eros / IIIIIviri / m(agistri) M(ercuriales) ob h(onorem)*.

Prije dokazivanja treba primijetiti da postoji dvojba oko interpretacije broja i imena osoba na natpisu ILJug 3, 1870. Jedna je pouzdano *M. Caesius M. libertus Primus*. Slijedi imenska formula *Sex. Herennius Sex. Sex. l. Eros*. U heidelberškoj bazi (HD025221) drže to imenom jedne osobe, a udvojeno ime *Sextus* u sredini protumačili su kao kognomen. U tom bi slučaju osoba imala dva kognomena (*Sextus, Eros*) između kojih je oznaka libertinskog statusa i prenamen patrona (*Sextus*). To se rješenje čini lošim, jer začuđuje i dvostruki kognomen oslobođenika (natpis je vjerojatno iz ranog principata) i smještaj libertinske oznake između dva kognomena. Drugačije moguće rješenje jest da je klesar pogreškom uklesao jedno ime *Sextus* više nego što treba, a ispravno bi ime glasilo *Sex. Herennius Sex. l. Eros*. Također, možemo predložiti da se unutar navedene formule kriju imena dviju osoba čiji bi zajednički patron bio *Sex. Herennius*. U tom slučaju, patron Seksto Herenije i dva oslobođenika dijelila su isti praenomen i nomen, pa bi to mogao biti razlog kontrahiranja imena dvaju oslobođenika. Znači, riječ bi bila o oslobođenicima čije bi cjelovito ime bilo: 1. *Sex. Herennius Sex. libertus* i 2. *Sex. Herennius Sex. libertus Eros*. Postoje epigrafski primjeri za takvu „uštedu“ prostora. Bez obzira na to koje je rješenje ispravno, tj. krije li se iza navedene formule jedan oslobođenik *Sex. Herennius Sex. libertus Eros* ili je to ime jedne od dvije navedene osobe, on je *sevir* i kraj te titule donosi se oznaka MM.

seems to contradict such an interpretation, as it would be unusual for the six men to undertake this if they are supposedly the members of two different bodies at the same time. The spirit of the Roman practice is to celebrate the attainment of individual and varying honours separately, not jointly. In consequence, the data from the inscriptions seem to also indicate the absence of two separate bodies. This is reinforced additionally by the examples of inscriptions from Narona where *seviri* are mentioned without the marcation of MM (CIL 3, 1793; CIL 3, 1828; ILJug 2, 654), while on the other side, there are no examples of a mention of simple *m(agistri) M(ercuriales)*, including in *ob honorem* situations. The fact that the sepulchral monuments in Narona do not include the mention of the *magistri Mercuriales* also seems to indicate that their presence in the colony is questionable. The sequence of honours attained by individual freedmen, as listed on their monuments, does list the office of *sevir*, but no examples of the title of a *Vlvir* being accompanied by the letters MM i.e. the function of the *magister Mercurialis*. Using the example of an earlier interpretation of two of the Narona inscriptions, a comparative analysis may provide an illustration of the above-mentioned situation. The first of them is the sepulchral inscription: (ILJug 3, 1888): *Sex(tus) Herennius / Sex(ti) l(ibertus) Eros IIIIIvir / Licinia Q(uinti) f(ilia) lucunda / Herennia Sex(ti) fil(ia) Tyc(h)e / Herennia Sex(ti) lib(erta) [----]*. We believe that the same Sextus Herenius Eros is mentioned in the second, consecration inscription: (ILJug 3, 1870): *Aesculapio / sacrum / M(arcus) Caesius M(arci) l(ibertus) / Primus / [S]ex(tus) Herennius / Sex(tus) Sex(ti) l(ibertus) Eros / IIIIIviri / m(agistri) M(ercuriales) ob h(onorem)*.

Before embarking on an evidentiary exposition, it should also be noted that there are alternative interpretations of the number and names of the individuals listed in the inscription ILJug 3, 1870. One of them is reliably read as *M. Caesius M. libertus Primus*. The next appellation is listed as *Sex. Herennius Sex. Sex. l. Eros*. In the Heidelberg collection (HD025221), it is assumed to be the name of a single individual, where the double mention of the *Sextus* in the middle part of the inscription is viewed as the cognomen. If this were the case, the person would have had two cognomens (*Sextus, Eros*), separated by the mark of a libertine status and the praenomen of the patron (*Sextus*). This resolution seems a poor one, as both the double cognomen of the freedman (the inscription probably dates to the early Principate) and the location of the libertine mark between the two cognomens is unusual. An alternative resolution is based on the assumption that the stonemason committed a mistake by carving one superfluous mention of the name of *Sextus*, and suggests that the correct text would read *Sex. Herennius Sex. l. Eros*. It could also be proposed that the text refers to two individuals, with *Sex. Herennius* as their joint patron. In this case, the patron Sextus Herennius and the two freedmen shared the same praenomen and nomen, and this could have caused the contraction of the names of the two freedmen. Consequently, the freedmen's names would have been the following: 1. *Sex. Herennius Sex. libertus* i 2. *Sex. Herennius Sex. libertus Eros*. There are epigraphic examples of such parsimony. Regardless of which the above-listed solutions may be correct, i.e. of whether the text

Na prvom, nadgrobnom, spomeniku Seksta Herenija Erosa nema kratice MM premda je navedena seviratska funkcija. Razlog izostavljanja jest što oznaka, prema našem prijedlogu, ne označava neku dužnost (nije riječ o tijelu *magistri Mercuriales*), pa ne spada na popis obnašanih časti (*cursus honorum*). Zaključimo da rješenje problema ne treba sagledati kroz pokušaj dokazivanja pogrešne pretpostavke da kratica MM označava tijelo zasebno od sevira, a nije točan ni drugi prijedlog o postojanju jedinstvenog tijela *seviri MM*.

Na prvi pogled ovakva tvrdnja nije u skladu s evidencijom iz drugih dijelova Carstva. Velik broj natpisa na kojima se nedvojbeno javljaju *magistri Mercuriales* potječe iz Lacija, Kampanije i Apulije (CIL 2, 1417; CIL 6, 510; AE 1912, 106; AE 1937, 131; AE 1964, 131; AE 1964, 132; AE, 1988, 257; AE 1992, 285; AE 1999, 538). Te su osobe većinom oslobođeničkog statusa što je jasno naznačeno, međutim, nemamo ni jedan primjer da bi ti *magistri* na natpisu pokazali da su ujedno i *seviri*. Na epigrafičkim spomenicima iz Carstva slova MM razrješavaju se i na druge načine. U onim slučajevima u kojima je nedvojbeno riječ o *magistrima* nekih bogova (tj. službenicima u hramu ili na nekoj drugoj nižoj kulturnoj funkciji, nikako svećeničkoj), oni su statusno građani ili oslobođenici ili robovi. Njihove titule glase: *magister mentis Bonae* (CIL 10, 6512; AE 1912, 106; EDCS-44800354; EDCS-44800355), *magister Martis* (CIL 1, 1801) i *magister Minervalis* (CIL 5, 7462; CIL 5, 7565). U slučaju naronitanskih natpisa, kraticu MM ne možemo razriješiti na jedan od tih načina jer protiv toga vrijede isti argumenti kojima smo odbacili mogućnost da se u Naroni spominju *magistri Mercuriales*. Usput, u prethodnim primjerima, kada se oslobođenik predstavlja kao *magistar* (-*mentis*, -*Martis*, -*Minervalis*), ta funkcija nikad nije vezana uz sevirsku službu. Sličnog su karaktera *magistri montis* iz Karnunta koji su osoblje svetoga karnuntinskog brda Pfaffenberg (AE 1982, 777; AE 1982, 784; AE 1991, 1314). Tamo je specifična situacija u kojoj veterani, rimski građani, čine sloj *magistara*.

Spomenuto je da se zbog navedenih nedoumica u epigrafičkoj bazi *Clauss Slaby* ponekad kratica MM razrješava na drugačiji način, kao dio sintagme *IIIIIIviri ob honorem monumenti*. Takav prijedlog treba odbaciti, pogotovo na primjeru natpisa CIL 3, 1801, u kontekstu kojeg ona nema smisla. U tom i nekim drugim slučajevima (HD053377; HD053386; HD053393; HD053394) stoga je u heidelberškoj bazi ostavljeno rješenje *magistri Mercuriales*, koje smo generalno opovrgli. Osim toga, takva nedosljednost u epigrafičkim rješenjima, primijenjena u istom kontekstu i na istim tipovima spomenika, teško da odražava stvarnu situaciju.

Naš prijedlog ide u drugom smjeru, a to je da slova MM upućuju na okolnosti u kojima je sevirat postignut ili na objekt prema kojem je radnja toga tijela usmjerena. Konkretno, sintagmu treba razriješiti s *Vlviri m(unicipibus) m(unicipii)*. Analogna epigrafička rješenja nalazimo na broj-

fers to one freedman named *Sex. Herennius Sex. libertus Eros*, or the inscription refers to two individuals as explained above, the person(s) is the sevir and the mark of MM is listed next to this title.

The first, sepulchral monument of the Sextus Herennius Eros does not contain a reference to MM, although the sevirate function is in fact listed. The reason for this omission, according to the interpretation proposed by the authors hereby, is the fact that the mark of MM does not in fact refer to a duty (of *magistri Mercuriales*) and is therefore absent from the list of honours (*cursus honorum*). We would like to propose that the resolution of the present problem is not to be based on the attempts to prove a faulty proposition that the abbreviation of MM signified a body separate from the *seviri*, or the incorrect suggestions of the existence of a unitary body of *seviri MM*.

At the first glance, such a claim contradicts the evidence hailing from other parts of the Empire. The large number of inscriptions indubitably referring to *magistri Mercuriales* stem from Latium, Campania and Apulia (CIL 2, 1417; CIL 6, 510; AE 1912, 106; AE 1937, 131; AE 1964, 131; AE 1964, 132; AE, 1988, 257; AE 1992, 285; AE 1999, 538). The individuals cited are predominantly the freedmen, and such their status is listed in the inscriptions clearly. However, there are no examples of these *magisters* being listed as *seviri* at the same time. There are alternative interpretations of the letters MM found on epigraphic monuments from the Imperial period. In the cases where the relevant individuals were clearly identified as the *magisters* of certain gods (i.e. officials at a temple, or performing another minor cult function, never a priestly one), their status had been the one of citizens, freedmen or slaves. Their titles are listed as: *magister mentis Bonae* (CIL 10, 6512; AE 1912, 106; EDCS-44800354; EDCS-44800355), *magister Martis* (CIL 1, 1801), *magister Minervalis* (CIL 5, 7462; CIL 5, 7565). In the case of the Naronitan inscriptions, the abbreviation of MM cannot be interpreted in any such way, as the reasoning that led us to discard the possibility of a mention of *magistri Mercuriales* in Naronia remain valid in this instance, too. Incidentally, in the case of the previously mentioned inscriptions, when a freedman is referred to as a *magister* (-*mentis*, -*Martis*, -*Minervalis*), this office is never tied to the office of a sevir. The *magistri montis* from Carnuntum, the officers of the sacred Carnuntian hill of Pfaffenberg (AE 1982, 777; AE 1982, 784; AE 1991, 1314), seem to share the same character, as in their specific local setting the stratum of *magisters* consisted of the veteran citizens of Rome.

It has already been mentioned that, due to the above-listed ambiguities, the abbreviation of MM is sometimes interpreted in an alternative fashion in the *Clauss Slaby* epigraphic collection, as a part of the *IIIIIIviri ob honorem monumenti* syntax. Such an interpretation should be rejected, especially in reference to the CIL 3, 1801 inscription, where it would be rendered meaningless. For this reason, in the case of this inscription, as well as in several others, (HD053377; HD053386; HD053393; HD053394) the Heidelberg collection allows for the interpretation of *magistri Mercuriales*, already summarily disproved hereby. Moreover, such an inconsistency of epigraphic interpretations, applied to the

nim natpisima u provinciji Betici gdje je uobičajeno da gradski dužnosnici, *Ilviri, aediles, pontifices* i drugi (CIL 2, 1074; CIL 1378; CIL 2, 1941; CIL 2-7, 56), nose „dodatak” *municipum municipii* kojim se naglašava da su oni magistrati stanovnika municipija, tj. da imaju nadležnost nad onima koji su *municipes*. Drugim riječima, magistrati usmjeravaju svoje djelovanje prema *municipes*.

Evidentno je, međutim, da se betička „kontrolna grupa” djelomice razlikuje u odnosu na naronitansku. Tako se kratica MM u Naroni javlja samo uz oslobođeničke sevire, tj. nemamo primjera da bi je iskazivali građani odnosno građanski magistrati. Također, status betičkih flavijevskih gradova jest status municipija, a onaj Narone status kolonije, pa bi se formula sa spomenom municipija u Naroni na prvi pogled činila neprikladnom. Oba problema možemo riješiti imamo li na umu Medinijevo naglašavanje specifične i izrazite uloge oslobođenika u kasnorepublikanskoj i ranocarskoj Naroni (Medini 1980: 195–202).

Ilustrativan je za situaciju u Naroni natpis (CIL 3, 1820=8423) na kojem se spominju po dvije osobe u dva gradska tijela (*magistri Narone, quaestores*), a u svakom od njih jedna je osoba bila rimski građanin, a druga oslobođenik: *Q(uintus) Safinus Q(uinti) f(ilius) / Sex(tus) Marius L(uci) l(ibertus) / mag(istri) Naro(nae) / Q(uintus) Marcus Q(uinti) f(ilius) / P(ublius) Annaeus Q(uinti) l(ibertus) Epic(adus) / q(uaestores) / tur(rim) fac(iendam) coir(averunt)*. Takva izjednačenost dvaju, pravno različitih, društvenih slojeva govori o iznimnoj političkoj moći libertina sredinom 1. st. pr. Kr. u vrijeme kada Narona ima kvazimunicipalno ustrojstvo, tj. kada se javlja kao *conventus civium Romanorum* (Medini 1980: 196). Politička moć proizlazi iz njihove ekonomske snage; naime, dio oslobođenika pripadao je senatorskim obiteljima (Medini 1980: 195–197; Glavičić 2002: 573–590). Oslobođenici koji su u tom vremenu magistrati zajedno s građanima, nisu stavljali kraticu MM jer se podrazumijevalo da su i jedni i drugi dužnosnici nad cijelom, jedinstvenom Naronom, oblikovanom u republikanski konvent, upravo kako stoji na natpisu CIL 3, 1820=8423: *magistri Naronae*. Medini dokazuje da se nakon konstituiranja *coloniae civium Romanorum* odvijaju dva fenomena: potomci oslobođenika stječu građansko pravo i čine važan udio među građanskim kvatuorvirima nove kolonije, a novi sloj oslobođenika izbačen je iz kolegija gradske uprave. Način na koji su oni nadoknadili društvenu poziciju izgublenu u gradskoj vlasti zbog restriktivne legislativne aktivnosti, tj. provođenja *lex Iulia municipalis* (Lepore 2010: 130), bio je stvaranje seviratskog modela koji uočavamo u cijelom Carstvu (Ross Taylor 1914: 231–235; Duhtoy 1976: 171–172; Buonopane 2001: 339–341; Buchi 2002: 67). Sevirsko tijelo čine najugledniji, znači i najbogatiji pojedinci oslobođeničkog sloja, koji, bez obzira na njihovu gospodarsku snagu i moć koje su posjedovali u doba konventa, više ne participiraju u građanskim magi-

same context and the same type of monuments, cannot be construed as correspondent to the truth of the matter.

The resolution proposed hereby is based on an entirely different proposition, suggesting that the letters of MM indicate the context in which the offices of the seviri are attained, or the object of their referent activities. Specifically, the said syntax is to be interpreted as *Vlviri m(municipibus) m(municipii)*. The analogous epigraphic solutions may be found in numerous inscriptions in the province of Baetica, where it was customary for the city officials such as *Ilviri, aediles, pontifices* and others (CIL 2, 1074; CIL 1378; CIL 2, 1941; CIL 2-7, 56), to bear the “appendix” of *municipum municipii*, emphasizing their function of magistrates of the municipal inhabitants, i.e. their competence over the *municipes*. In other words, the magistrates directed their actions towards the *municipes*.

There are evident differences, however, between the Baetican “control group” and the Naronitan set. For instance, the abbreviation of MM appears in Narona only in reference to the freedmen seviri, i.e. there are no examples of its mention by citizens or citizen’s magistrates. Furthermore, the Baetican Flavian cities enjoyed the status of a municipium, while Narona was a colony, rendering the mention of a municipium in Narona inappropriate at face value. Both of these potential objections may be discarded in the context of Medini’s emphasis of a specific and marked role that the freedmen played in Late Republic and Early Imperial Narona (Medini 1980: 195–202).

The inscription (CIL 3, 1820=8423) is illustrative of such a situation in Narona, where two individuals are mentioned as officials in each of the two municipal bodies (*magistri Narone, quaestores*), where one of them was a Roman citizen and the other one a freedman: *Q(uintus) Safinus Q(uinti) f(ilius) / Sex(tus) Marius L(uci) l(ibertus) / mag(istri) Naro(nae) / Q(uintus) Marcus Q(uinti) f(ilius) / P(ublius) Annaeus Q(uinti) l(ibertus) Epic(adus) / q(uaestores) / tur(rim) fac(iendam) coir(averunt)*. Such an equal mention of two, legally quite distinct social ranks indicates an exceptional political power the libertines enjoyed at the end of the 1st cent. BC, when Narona has had a quasi-municipal structure, i.e. when it appeared as a *conventus civium Romanorum* (Medini 1980: 196). This political power stems from their economic strength, as part of the freedmen belonged to senatorial families (Medini 1980: 195–197; Glavičić 2002: 573–590). The freedmen, who served as magistrates alongside the citizens in this period, failed to utilize the abbreviation of MM because it was understood that both had competence over the entire, unitary Narona, designed as a Republican convent, as clearly listed in the inscription CIL 3, 1820=8423: *magistri Naronae*. Medini inferred that, following the establishment of *coloniae civium Romanorum*, two phenomena were taking place: the descendants of the freedmen attained the status of the citizen and proceeded to constitute a significant part of citizen quattuorviri of the new colony, while the new cohorts of the freedmen were excluded from the collegia of the municipal administration. The constitution of the sevirate model, apparent in the entire Empire (Ross Taylor 1914: 231–235; Duhtoy 1976: 171–172; Buonopane 2001: 339–341; Buchi 2002: 67), represents an attempt at compensation of

straturama nego, u skladu s mehanizmima rimskoga stratificiranog društva, stvaraju novo tijelo vezano uz vlastiti sloj. Tanak, gornji sloj oslobođenika još je u doba Republike tvorio ljude od povjerenja magistrata. Uvođenjem principata oslobođenička je vrhuška Carstva postala strahovito utjecajna i bogata. Pojedinci su bili imućniji od Krasa, najbogatijeg senatora Republike, a novac su posuđivali i carevima (Millar 2001: 69).

U novokonstituiranoj koloniji Naroni, na natpisima iz posljednjih desetljeća 1. st. pr. Kr. i na samom početku 1. st. po Kr., navođenjem oznake *m(municipibus) m(municipii)* ističe se veza sevira sa starijim konventom (možemo ga nazvati *conventus vetus municipum Naronae*). Premda oslobođenički seviri nemaju više ovlasti (*potestas*) nad građanima, njihova aktivnost usmjerena je i prema građanskom sloju, odnosno njihove munificencije, honorificencije i druge beneficije bile su na dobrobit svima koji su *municipes*, i građana i oslobođenika.

Riječ *municipes* upotrijebljena u sintagmi evidentno ne označava samo građane nego sve slobodne stanovnike grada. U brojnim natpisima na kojima se navode *decuriones, seviri* i *Augustales*, nazivom *municipes* označavaju se svi ostali slobodni građani koji nisu pripadnici nekog od prethodno nabrojanih tijela ili društvenih redova. Npr.: ...*centumviri et seviri et Augustales et municipes intramurani*... (CIL 11, 3808, Veii); ...*decurionibus HS XII dedit item municipibus et incolis HS IIII nummum*... (AE 1948, 84). Ako drugačije protumačimo tu kategoriju stanovnika, onda bi u novoj pravnoj konstelaciji u Naroni bilo nemoguće objasniti da su oslobođenički seviri isključili vlastiti oslobođenički sloj iz prostora djelovanja. To potkrepljujemo navodom pravnog autora Ulpijana, zabilježenim u *Digestama*, 50, 1,27: *Eius, qui manumisit, municeps est manumissus, non domicilium eius, sed patriam secutus. Et si patronum habeat duarum civitatum municipem, per manumissionem earundem civitatum erit municeps* (Od onog koji oslobađa, slobodni sugrađanin ne nasljeđuje njegovo prebivalište nego domovinu. Ako je patron građanin u dvije zajednice, oslobođenik će manumisijom biti municeps istih zajednica); kao i navodom iz Paulovih *Sentencija*, *Digeste*, 50, 1,22,2: *Municipes sunt liberti et in eo loco ubi ipsi domicilium sua voluntate tulerunt* (*Municipes* su slobodni i u tom mjestu vlastitom voljom nositelji su prebivališta). S tim u skladu, termin *municipes* u koloniji Naroni obuhvaća oslobođenike i građane. Formula *municipes municipii* za koju smo naveli da je na natpisima iz Narone pasivna kategorija (*municipibus municipii*) na koju se djelovanje magistrata odnosi, na natpisima iz Betike označava čiji su to magistrati (*municipum municipii*), a također se koristi i na treći način na natpisima iz drugih dijelova Carstva, kao oznaka za aktivnu kategoriju stanovnika (*municipes municipii*), onih koji poduzimaju nekakvu akciju. Jedan od brojnih primjera gdje slobodno stanovništvo (*municipes*) usmjerava svoju akciju vidimo na nat-

a loss of the social position, caused by the introduction of restrictive legislation, i.e. *lex Iulia municipalis* (Lepore 2010: 130). The sevirate body consisted of the most respected and the most affluent individuals from the freedmen stratum, who, regardless of their economic strength and the power they enjoyed during the convent, were no longer eligible to participate in the municipal magistratures. In accordance with the mechanisms of the stratified Roman society, they proceeded to create a new body for their own estate instead. The individuals holding magistrate offices constituted a very shallow upper stratum of freedmen in the Republican period. With the introduction of the principate, the freedmen elite of the Empire achieved unprecedented influence and riches. Some among them were more affluent than Crassus, the richest Senator of the Republic, and served as moneylenders to the Emperors themselves (Millar 2001: 69).

In the newly established colony of Naronae, the inscriptions stemming from the last decades of the 1st cent. BC and from the very beginning of the 1st cent. AD, the introduction of the listing of *m(municipibus) m(municipii)* is used to emphasize the link between the seviri and the preceding convent (we may propose the appellation of *conventus vetus municipum Naronae*). Although the freedmen seviri have no more competence (*potestas*) over citizens, their activities are directed towards the citizen stratum as well, meaning that their munificence, honorificence, and other beneficence served the common good, i.e. represented the benefit for all the *municipes*, citizens and freedmen alike.

The term of *municipes* utilized in the abbreviation clearly subsumes not only citizens, but all free inhabitants of the municipium. In the numerous inscriptions citing *decuriones, seviri* and *Augustales*, the term of *municipes* signifies all other free inhabitants not members of the specifically mentioned bodies or social strata. For instance: ...*centumviri et seviri et Augustales et municipes intramurani*... (CIL 11, 3808, Veii); ...*decurionibus HS XII dedit item municipibus et incolis HS IIII nummum*... (AE 1948, 84). The alternative interpretation of the mentioned category of inhabitants would indicate that, within the framework of the new legal environment of Naronae, the freedmen seviri were the ones to ban their own estate from public agency. This is substantiated by the quotation from the legal author Ulpian in *Digestae*, 50, 1,27: *Eius, qui manumisit, municeps est manumissus, non domicilium eius, sed patriam secutus. Et si patronum habeat duarum civitatum municipem, per manumissionem earundem civitatum erit municeps*; as well as from the *Sententiae* of Julius Paulus in *Digestae*, 50, 1,22,2: *Municipes sunt liberti et in eo loco ubi ipsi domicilium sua voluntate tulerunt*. In consequence, the term of *municipes* in the colony of Naronae clearly encompassed the freedmen and citizens. The formula of *municipes municipii* seems to have represented a passive category (*municipibus municipii*), delineating the object of magistrates' actions in the Naronitan inscriptions, as we explained above. In Baetican inscriptions, this formula delineated whose magistrates were those (*municipum municipii*). The same formula was utilized in the third distinct fashion in the inscriptions from other parts of the Empire, as a signifier of an active category of inhabitants (*municipes municipii*), those who actively carry out specific actions. One of numerous

pisu iz Veja u Etruriji (CIL 11, 3797): *M(arco) Herennio / M(arci) f(ilio) Picenti co(n)s(ule) / municipes municipi(i) / Augusti Veientis / intramurani / patrono / [-----]*.

Uporaba izraza *m(municipibus) m(municipii)* manifestira pokušaj da oslobođenički seviri u novoj koloniji zadrže privilegije iz starog konventa u odnosu na pridošlice Italike, koloniste građanskog statusa. Rimska epigrafička građa uvijek preslikava odnose između društvenih grupa. Jasno se pravi razlika između staroga, etabliranog stanovništva i onih koji se u grad naseljavaju sa strane, koji su pridošlice. Za ilustraciju navodimo četiri reprezentativna, između stotina primjera distinkcije: *qui Antiochensis coloniae aut coloni aut incolae sunt* (AE 1997, 1482 = EDCS 12700147), *civi, municipes et incolae* (CIL 2, 1054), *ab eo qui eius municipii municipes incolave erit* (CIL 2, 1964) i *cives Singilienses et incolae* (CIL 2-5, 790). Isto tako, pravi se razlika između građana s njihovim gradskim vijećem i preostalog slobodnog stanovništva (građana i oslobođenika) kao što vidimo na primjeru natpisa iz Kapene: *...ob honorem sacerdotalem / honestissimis caerimoniis / praebitum decuriones / item municipes / et postea sacerdoti Veneris / bis epulum et sportulas decur(ionibus) / et municipibus praebuit / l(ocus) d(at)us d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)...* (AE 1982, 267). U svakodnevnom životu takva segregacija i diskriminacija naročito se dobro očituje u zakonima *lex Roscia* i *lex Iulia theatralis* kroz koje su regulirana mjesta sjedenja na javnim igrama i predstavama (Rawson 1987: 102), a proistječu iz duboko ukorijenjene rimske vrline respektiranja (*verecundia*) onih na višem položaju.

Ovaj segment zakonskog djelovanja dio je Augustove temeljite reforme rimskog društva. Odnosi građanskog i oslobođeničkog orda u Naroni slijede također trendove iz Augustove regulacije provincijske birokracije. U imperijalnim provincijama car je, više političkim nego administrativnim mjerama, stari republikanski sustav upravljanja zamijenio novim, u kojem senatorski legati zastupaju Augusta koji ima prokonzularne ovlasti. Umjesto senatorskim kvestorima republikanskog tipa kojima je povjereno skupljanje poreza u senatorskim provincijama, taj posao u carskim provincijama povjeren je prokuratorima iz viteške klase i oslobođenicima koji su djelovali kao neka vrsta Augustovih privatnih poduzetnika. Kada oni bivaju shvaćeni kao službeni magistrati, viteški prokurator, počevši još u Augustovo doba, postupno kroz cijelo prvo stoljeće potiskuju oslobođenike iz takvih službi (Weaver 1965: 465; Eck 2007: 98) Nakon pretvaranja Dalmacije u imperijalnu provinciju, slično se zbiva u municipalnoj upravi Narone. Dio novih građanskih magistrata Narone potomci su republikanskih oslobođenika, a njima se u obnašanju vlasti pridružuju i došljaci, odnosno italski kolonisti koji su konstituirali koloniju. Novi oslobođenici, međutim, više nisu smjeli sudjelovati u gradskoj upravi.

Kronološki reper upotrebe kratice MM mogao bi biti natpis CIL 3, 1769 kojeg *sevir* Gaj Julije Marcijal, oslobođenik

examples of an utilization delineating self-directed activity of the free inhabitants (*municipes*) is evident from the inscription in the Etruscan Veii (CIL 11, 3797): *M(arco) Herennio / M(arci) f(ilio) Picenti co(n)s(ule) / municipes municipi(i) / Augusti Veientis / intramurani / patrono / [-----]*.

The utilization of the term of *m(municipibus) m(municipii)* indicates an attempt by the freedmen seviri to preserve the privileges gained in the context of the previous convent in the context of the new colony, when confronted with Italic newcomers, the colonists with the citizen status. The Roman epigraphic material maps the relations between social groups consistently. The difference between the old, established inhabitants and those newly arrived from elsewhere is delineated clearly. Among hundreds examples of such a distinction, four representative ones are cited hereby: *qui Antiochensis coloniae aut coloni aut incolae sunt* (AE 1997, 1482 = EDCS 12700147), *civi, municipes et incolae* (CIL 2, 1054), *ab eo qui eius municipii municipes incolave erit* (CIL 2, 1964), and *cives Singilienses et incolae* (CIL 2-5, 790). The difference between the citizens with their municipal council, and the remaining free inhabitants (citizens and freedmen) was also highlighted, as evident from the Capena inscription: *...ob honorem sacerdotalem / honestissimis caerimoniis / praebitum decuriones / item municipes / et postea sacerdoti Veneris / bis epulum et sportulas decur(ionibus) / et municipibus praebuit / l(ocus) d(at)us d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)...* (AE 1982, 267). Such a segregation and discrimination in everyday life is well reflected in the laws of *lex Roscia* and *lex Iulia theatralis*, that regulate the access to seating at public plays and spectacles (Rawson 1987: 102), and which stem from the deeply rooted Roman virtue of respect (*verecundia*) towards those in higher social positions.

This regulatory activity represents a part of August's fundamental reform of the Roman society. The pattern of the relationship between the citizen and freedmen ordo follow the blueprint of August's regulation of the provincial bureaucracy. Utilizing more political than administrative measures, the Emperor replaced the old Republican administrative system with the new one in the Imperial provinces, whereby the senatorial legates represented August, in his competence of a proconsul. While the tax collection in the senatorial provinces was carried out by the senatorial questors of the Republican type, in the Imperial ones this work was delegated to the procurators of the equestrian class, and to those from the ranks of the freedmen, who acted as a sort of August's private entrepreneurs. As this role during the reign of Augustus became more and more defined as that of an official magistrate, the equestrian procurators squeezed the freedmen out of those offices increasingly during the first century (Weaver 1965: 465; Eck 2007: 98). When Dalmatia was awarded the status of an imperial province, the similar process began to take place in the municipal administration of Narona as well. The descendants of the republican freedmen made a part of new citizen magistrates of Narona, and were joined there by the newcomers, i.e. the Italian colonists who constituted the colony. The new freedmen, however, were precluded from participating in the municipal administration from that point on.

Chronologically, the inscription of CIL 3, 1769 represen-

Makrina, posvećuje još živomu caru Augustu, tj. prije njegove smrti 14. godine 1. st. Marcijalov patron bio je također oslobođenik, što je vidljivo iz činjenice da uz Marcijalovu libertinsku oznaku stoji patronov kognomen. Na nadgrobnom natpisu *CIL* 3, 1833 gotovo sigurno spominje se ta ista osoba Gaj Julije Marcijal, samo što je naveden prenamen patrona (*Caius*), a ne kognomen. Također, na tom nadgrobnom spomeniku izostala su slova MM i donosi se samo sevirska funkcija, zbog razloga koje smo naveli u raspravi. Bez ikakve dvojbe, linija oslobađanja ima korijen u Cezarovo obitelji, stoga je lakše razumjeti ovu privatnu posvetu živućem caru Augustu, odnosno posvetu *Augusto sacrum* u ovom slučaju ne treba vezivati uz nekoga kasnijeg cara. Na nešto kasnijim natpisima, npr. na onom s posvetom *Divo Augusto* koji nije mogao nastati prije Tiberijeva razdoblja, još uvijek se javlja kratica MM (*CIL* 3, 1770).

Medinijeva interpretacija koja uključuje postojanje neke vrste dvojnog municipaliteta, tj. grupe stanovnika konventa i grupe kolonista, djelomice je sukladna s razmišljanjem o dvojnim tribusima u Saloni koje Suić tumači postojanjem pretkolonijalnog municipaliteta u Saloni, potvrđenog kod Cezara sintagmom *cives Romani qui Salonis consistunt* (Caes, bell. civ. III, 9). Pseudomunicipalitet retardira i u novooosnovanoj koloniji (Suić 1958: 13). „Dvostruku” municipalnost prepoznali smo i u Hispaniji; reprezentativan primjer jest flavijevski *municipium liberi Sin(i)giliensis* u kojem uz *ordo Sinigiliensis* postoji i *ordo Sinigiliensis vetus*, očito s korijenima u starijem, predflavijevskom vremenu (*CIL* 2-5, 792; *CIL* 2-5, 794; Revel 2013: 242–243).

O dvojnim municipalitetima u Carstvu, bez obzira na to koji su razlozi doveli do takvog stanja i egzistiraju li oni istodobno ili je riječ o nekakvim retardacijama, svjedoče mnogi natpisi, npr. u Tamugadiju *AE* 1989, 982 i *CIL* 8, 2392 (*patrono coloniae et municipi res publica coloniae Thamugadensium decreto decurionum*).

Držimo da je Suić dobro uočio postojanje dviju grupa stanovništva u Saloni (starije i doseljeničke), samo što ih ne možemo dokazivati kroz pojavu municipalnih tijela kvatuorvira (tobože starijeg oblika magistratskog tijela) i duovira (mlađeg oblika). To su magistrature u kojima broj ljudi varira od grada do grada i eventualno se mijenja radi nekih općih tendencija, a ne zbog tobožnje veze s nekim od ova dva oblika municipalnog organiziranja. U samoj Saloni dosad nije potvrđeno da se *Ilviri* i *Illiviri* javljaju istodobno (Zaninović 1973: 499–502; Bekavac 2015: 12–13), pa se čini da je jednostavno došlo do promjene broja ljudi u tom tijelu, neovisno o pravnom statusu grada. Da se kvatuorviri mogu javiti i jako kasno dokazao je Vittinghoff (1977: 8) na primjeru municipija *Septimium*, u kojem *Illiviri* postoje na prijelazu iz 2. u 3. st. Njegova kritika usmjerena je i na mogućnost kronološkog određenja konstitucije kolonija u provinciji Dalmaciji na osnovi postojanja dvaju tribusa koje

ted perhaps the date for the use of the MM abbreviation. In it, *sevir* Caius Iulius Martialis, the freedman of Macrinus, dedicates to the still living Emperor August, i.e. at some point before the Emperor's death in the 14 AD Martial's patron seems to have been a freedman as well, as made evident by the fact that Martial's libertine mark is accompanied by his patron's cognomen. The same Gaius Julius Martial is almost certainly the very person mentioned in the sepulchral inscription of *CIL* 3, 1833 with the only difference that the praenomen of the patron (*Caius*) is listed, instead of his cognomen. Furthermore, the monument lists the *sevir* function only, with no reference to the MM, for the reasons discussed above. Without a doubt, the line of the emancipation stemmed from the Caesar's family, making it easier to understand the private dedication to the living Emperor August. In other words, the dedication of *Augusto sacrum* is not to be linked to any subsequent Emperor in this case. The somewhat more recent inscriptions, such as those dedicated to *Divo Augusto* that could not have been executed earlier than the reign of Tiberius, still may contain the abbreviation of MM (*CIL* 3, 1770).

Medini's interpretation, based on the proposed existence of a dual municipality, i.e. of a group of inhabitants of the convent, and of a group of colonists, is partly consistent with the concept of dual *tribus* in Salona, attributed by Suić to the legacy of a pre-colonial municipality in Salona, as confirmed by Caesar's reference to *cives Romani qui Salonis consistunt* (Caes, bell. civ. III, 9). This pseudo-municipality survived in the newly-founded colony (Suić 1958: 13). The "dual" municipality may also be discerned in Hispania, with the Flavian municipality of *liberi Sin(i)giliensis*, where, in addition to the *ordo Sinigiliensis* the *ordo Sinigiliensis vetus* could also be found, clearly rooted in the older, pre-Flavian times (*CIL* 2-5, 792; *CIL* 2-5, 794; Revel 2013: 242–243).

The dual municipalities in the Empire, regardless of the reasons for their existence and regardless of whether they co-existed, are well documented, such as in Tamugadium *AE* 1989, 982 and *CIL* 8, 2392 (*patrono coloniae et municipi res publica coloniae Thamugadensium decreto decurionum*).

We believe that Suić inferred correctly the existence of two inhabitant groups in Salona (an older one and the newcomers), but their existence cannot be proven by the coexistence of the municipal bodies of quattuorviri (allegedly the older form of a magistrate body) and duoviri (a more recent form). Those represent magistratures held, from one municipality to another, by varying numbers of individuals. The variations in number of individuals holding these offices seems to be subject to general trends, not to one or the other form of municipal structure. In Salona itself, there is no confirmation of a simultaneous existence of *Ilviri* and *Illiviri* (Zaninović 1973: 499–502; Bekavac 2015: 12–13), leading us to the conclusion that this was a matter of a simple change of number of individuals serving in the body, regardless of the legal status of the municipium. Vittinghoff (1977: 8) found the evidence of quattuorviri quite late, in the case of the municipality of *Septimium*, where *Illiviri* were still in evidence at the turn of the 2nd to the 3rd cent. AD. The same author also questioned the feasibility of determining of the timeline of the constitution of colonies in the province of

Suić također povezuje uz dva oblika organiziranja građana u Saloni (Suić 1958: 17–22). Zaključimo da u najranije carsko doba u kolonijama na istočnoj obali Jadrana ne egzistiraju usporedno dva municipaliteta premda je postojanje dviju gradskih grupacija slobodnog stanovništva, onih vezanih uz stariji konvent i doseljenih kolonista, uobičajena pojava.

Naveli smo da je u provinciji Betici formula *municipes municipii* označavala zakonski autoritet nad slobodnim stanovništvom, odnosno vlast (*potestas*) nad gradom u cijelosti. U Betici se jednim zakonom *lex Flavia Malacitana* ustrojio velik broj gradova (CIL 2, 1963; CIL 2, 1964; EDCS-20200002; Lepore 2010: 202). Kako se u njegovu tekstu zakona o betičkim municipijima sustavno i masovno navodi formula *municipes municipii* u raznim varijantama, betički magistrati, čak i oslobođenički seviri, slijede taj obrazac i preslikavaju ga na kamenim spomenicima, premda se podrazumijeva da dužnosnici zakonski posjeduju takve ovlasti. Inače je bila uvriježena praksa da se svakom gradu pojedinačno daje *lex data* pri osnutku (Mousourakis 2007: 210), pa u drugim gradovima, izvan Betike, nije bilo univerzalnoga tekstualnog obrasca s „nametnutim“ izrazom *municipes municipii*. Zbog toga se on ne navodi uz titule građanskih magistrata. Seviri u Naroni nemaju zakonsku ingerenciju nad ukupnim stanovništvom kao građanski magistrati nego ističu da je njihov beneficijarski angažman, kakav je uvriježen za libertinska tijela u cijelom Carstvu (CIL 10, 1881: *ob perpetuam et plurifariam munificentiam*; AE 2008, 416: *ob plurima beneficia*) usmjeren na njih. Stoga smo predložili razrješenje kratice MM s *municipibus municipii*, u smislu „za stanovnike Narone“, za one koji uživaju te dobrobiti. Paradoksalno, takav je iskaz posljedica sužavanja nadležnosti oslobođeničkih tijela u odnosu na pretkolonijalno vrijeme, odnosno potrebe libertina da sačuvaju posebni društveni položaj u Naroni.

Generaciju kasnije, do sredine 1. st., nestala je klasa oslobođenika starog konventa, njihovi potomci postali su integralni dio građanskog sloja, a novi oslobođenici bivaju manumisirani od strane „običnih“ građana kolonije, ne više od moćnih senatora. Građanski sloj sada ima ekskluzivno pravo upravljanja, nestao je model uprave grada podijeljene između dviju grupa formiranih na početku poleogeneze, a seviri koji su potpuno izgubili sponu s izvršnom vlasti postupno izostavljaju oznaku MM na spomenicima.

Dalmatia on the basis of the existence of two tribes, as proposed by Suić and associated with the two types of municipal structure in Salona (Suić 1958: 17–22). We may well conclude that, in the earliest Imperial period, there is no evidence of a parallel existence of two municipalities, although the existence of two groupings of municipal free inhabitants, one tied to the older convent and the other consisting of the newly settled colonists, seems to represent a common occurrence.

It has been mentioned that, in the province of Baetica, the formula of *municipes municipii* delineated a legal authority over free inhabitants, i.e. the power (*potestas*) over the municipality as a whole. By virtue of a single law, *lex Flavia Malacitana*, a large number of municipalities were established in Baetica (CIL 2, 1963; CIL 2, 1964; EDCS-20200002; Lepore 2010: 202). As the text of the law utilizes the formula of *municipes municipii* in its various variants systematically and repeatedly, the Baetican magistrates, including the freed *seviri*, follow this pattern and copy it to various stone monuments, although it is understood that only the officials have such a competence. In contrast, the standard practice dictated that each municipality be awarded a *lex* at the establishment (Mousourakis 2007: 210), so the other municipalities outside Baetica did not necessarily follow an “obligatory” single textual pattern, which included the appellation of *municipes municipii*. For this reason, this appellation is absent from the titles of decurional magistrates. The seviri in Naronia did not have the legal competence over the entire population as the decurional magistrates do. Instead, they tended to emphasize that their office was directed at the population as a form of a public benefit, similarly to the offices carried out by libertine bodies Empire-wide (CIL 10, 1881: *ob perpetuam et plurifariam munificentiam*; AE 2008, 416: *ob plurima beneficia*). For this reason, we hereby propose the interpretation of the abbreviation of MM as *municipibus municipii*, meaning “to the inhabitants of Narona”, those who enjoy these benefits. Paradoxically, this expression resulted from the reduction of competencies of freedmen’s bodies in comparison to the pre-colonial times, i.e. from the desire of the libertines to preserve their special social position in Narona.

One generation later, by the end of the 1st cent. AD, the class of freedmen under the old convent disappeared. Their descendants had become an integral part of the citizen class, and the new freedmen were being manumitted by the “ordinary” citizens, not just by powerful senators any more. The citizen class now held the exclusive administrative powers, and the model of administration shared by two groups formed at the beginning of poleogenesis became extinct. The seviri, their ties to the executive power now completely severed, abstain from any further mention of MM in their monuments.

Prijevod / Translation
Heidy Eterović

Lektura / Proofreading
Sanjin Mihelić

IZVORI / LIST OF SOURCES

AE – *Anée épigraphique*, Paris.
 CIL – *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin.
 EDCS: Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss – Slaby, <http://www.manfredclaus.de/central.html> (10. 11. 2015.).
 HD: Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg, <http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/html> (10. 11. 2015.).

ILJug Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMXL et MCMLX repertae et editae sunt, Ljubljana, 1963; *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMLX et MCMLXX repertae et editae sunt*, Ljubljana, 1978; *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMII et MCMLX repertae et editae sunt*, Ljubljana, 1986.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bekavac, S. 2015, *Rimska religija i kultovi u društvenoj strukturi pretkršćanske Salone*, PhD Thesis, Filozofski fakultet u Zadru, Zadar.
- Buonopane, A. 2001, Sevirato e augustalità ad Aquileia: nuovi dati e prospettive di ricerca, in Aquileia dalle origini alla costituzione del Ducato longobardo, *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, Vol. 54, 339–373.
- Buchi, E. 2002, Il sevirato nella società della regio X, *Ceti medi in Cisalpina*, Milano, 14.10.–16.10.2000., Milano, 67–78.
- Calabi Limentani, I. 1968, *Epigrafia Latina*, Istituto editoriale Cisalpino, Milano–Varese.
- Cambi, N. 1978, Antička Narona. Postanak i razvitak grada prema novijim arheološkim istraživanjima, *Materijali*, Vol. 15, 57–66.
- Duhtoy, R. 1976, Recherches sur la répartition géographique et chronologique des termes sévir augustalis, augustalis et sévir dans l'empire romain, *Epigraphischen Studien*, Vol. 11, 143–214.
- Eck, W. 2007, *The Age of Augustus*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden–Oxford–Carlton.
- Glavičić, M. 2002, *Gradski dužnosnici na natpisima obalnog područja rimske provincije Dalmacije*, PhD Thesis, Filozofski fakultet u Zadru, Zadar.
- Hardy, E. G. 2007, The Table of Heraclea and the Lex Iulia municipalis, in: *Roman History. Ten Essays bearing on the administrative and legislative work of Julius Caesar*, The Lawbook Exchange, New Jersey, 239–294.
- Lepore, P. 2010, *Introduzione allo studio dell'epigrafia giuridica latina*, Giuffrè Editore, Milano.
- Mayer i Olivé, M. 2010, Algunas consideraciones sobre el papel social de los libertos en una ciudad de la costa Adriática: seviri Augustales y M. M. en Narona, *Epigraphica*, Vol. 72, 247–271.
- Medini, J. 1980, Uloga oslobođenika u životu Narone, *Dolina rijeke Neretve od prapovijesti do ranog srednjeg vijeka*, Metković, 4.–7. listopada 1997., Split, 195–206.
- Millar, F. 2001, *The emperor in the Roman world*, Duckworth, London.
- Mousourakis, G. 2007, *A legal history of Rome*, Routledge, London–New York.
- Rawson, E. 1987, Discrimina Ordinum: The Lex Julia Theatralis, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. 55, 83–114.
- Rodà de Llanza, I. 2011, Los seviri Augustales de Narona, *Kačić*, Vol. 41–43 (2009/11), 189–209.
- Ross-Taylor, L. 1914, Augustales, Seviri Augustales, and Seviri, *Chronological Study, Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 45, 231–253.
- Suić, M. 1958, O municipalitetu antičke Salone, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 60, 11–42.
- Vittinghoff, F. 1977, Zur römischen Municipalisierung des lateinischen Donau Balkanraumes. Methodische Bemerkungen, *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. II (6), 3–51.
- Weaver, P. R. C. 1965, Freedmen procurators in the Imperial Administration, *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Vol. 14/4, 460–469.
- Wilkes, J. J. 1969, *Dalmatia*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Zaninović, M. 1973, Decuriones at Salona, *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte*, Vol. 17, 499–502.
- Zaninović, M. 1980, Područje Neretve kao vojni mostobran rimske antike, *Dolina rijeke Neretve od prapovijesti do ranog srednjeg vijeka*, Metković, 4.–7. listopada 1997., Split, 173–181.