

**Michał Duch**

(Gniezno)

**THE INTEGRATION PROCESS  
OF THE LOWER MOESIAN AREAS**

**Abstract**

The objective of this article is to provide a short presentation of the integration process of the areas that formed Lower Moesia. The author aims to present select methods implemented by the Romans in order to place the discussed territories under their complete control. The main differences between the individual parts of Lower Moesia have also been indicated in the article, as well as the ways in which they mutually supplemented each other, ultimately composing a cohesive whole.

**Key words**

Lower Moesia, administration, civitas, territory, integration, municipium

Rome<sup>1</sup> used force to conquer an area that was part of Lower Moesia, similarly as it did with many other provinces<sup>2</sup>. This was no easy task as seizing control of the entire Lower Danube region took the Romans almost two centuries and required enormous military resources since the local population mounted fierce resistance. The beginnings of this struggle should be linked to the moment in which Gaius Scribonius Curio's army arrived at the Danube, whereby a fierce battle ensued that lasted a few years (75-73 BC) against the Dardani and the Moesians (*bellum Dardanicum*)<sup>3</sup>. The end should be linked to the moment in which over the course of two war campaigns (AD 101-102; AD 105-106) Trajan ultimately destroyed the Dacian state ruled by Decebalus<sup>4</sup>. The integration of the conquered areas was similarly not a simple process.

### BORDER ISSUES

In the process of conquering the area and gradual spread of Roman control down along the Danube, the Romans slowly introduced their own model of territorial administration. The conquered area was organized in the form of *civitas Moesiae et Treballiae*<sup>5</sup>, and later, in AD 15, Moesia was created<sup>6</sup>. The newly-introduced province did not constitute an independent entity but along with Macedonia and Achaëa it formed part of a larger administrative and military unit under the command of the imperial governor residing in Macedonia<sup>7</sup>. This remained the case until Moesia was granted the status of an independent province in AD 46. At that time, Moesia bordered the newly-created Thrace province at the Haemus Mons. East of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The project has been financed with resources provided by the National Science Center, Poland, allotted on the basis of decisions: 2011/03/N/HS3/00873 and 2015/19/B/HS3/00547.

<sup>2</sup> I would like to thank Dr Miłoslawa Stępień for translating this article and also to Dr Agnieszka Tomas for valuable remarks.

<sup>3</sup> T. Sarnowski, *Wojsko rzymskie w Mezji Dolnej i na północnym wybrzeżu Morza Czarnego*, Warszawa 1988, p. 15.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 52-53.

<sup>5</sup> ILS 1349.

<sup>6</sup> The exact date of establishing Moesia is the subject of academic debate focused around two different sources: Tac., *Ann.*, I. 80 and Cass. Dio 58, 25, 4; cf. R. Ivanov, *Das römische Verteidigungssystem an der unteren Donau zwischen Dordicum und Durostorum (Bulgarien) von Augustus bis Maurikios*, *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 78, 1997, p. 477.

<sup>7</sup> Tac., *Ann.*, I, 80; Cass. Dio 58, 25; A. Stein, *Die Legaten von Moesien*, Budapest 1940, p. 18; R. Syme, *The Early History of Moesia*, [in:] *idem*, *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans 80 BC-AD 14*, A. Birley (ed.), Exeter 1999, p. 208; T. Sarnowski, *Wojsko rzymskie*, p. 18.

river Yantra, the narrow strip along the Danube (*ripa Thraciae*) formally belonged to Thrace but was under the control of the Moesian army<sup>8</sup>. During Vespasian's reign, administratively Moesia was expanded by this narrow strip of land that reached the Danube delta. Lower Moesia was created by Domitian, who in AD 86 divided the area into Upper (Moesia Superior) and Lower Moesia (Moesia Inferior)<sup>9</sup>. The Dacian Wars led by Emperor Trajan in AD 101-102 and AD 105-106 were events of considerable significance for the administrative shape of Lower Moesia. Undoubtedly, they led to the administrative reorganisation of the Lower Danube region. As noted by Agnieszka Tomas<sup>10</sup>, this is confirmed by the so-called Hunt's *pridianum* dated by R.O. Fink to AD 100-105<sup>11</sup> (but he considers AD 100 to be the most probable dating). The text on the papyrus mentions the Haemus Mountains in the *intra provinciam* section (*ad haemum ad armenta adducenda*) and it should also be noted that a few lines above there is also the phrase *transdanuvium in expeditionem*, suggesting that the lands north of the Danube were also controlled by the governor of Lower Moesia<sup>12</sup>. This phrase probably refers to the Wallachian plain, southern Moldova, eastern Oltenia and south-eastern Transylvania, which as a result of Trajan's Dacian Wars were included into the Lower Moesia territory by AD 117, and thus by the moment that Hadrian renounced part of these lands (the Wallachian plain, southern Moldova), forming Lower Dacia (Dacia Inferior) from the remaining area<sup>13</sup>. Thus, the dating of this papyrus to AD 105-106 proposed by Ronald Syme is correct<sup>14</sup>. Were the Haemus Mountains therefore located, at least for a short time during the Dacian Wars, within the territory of Lower Moesia? The dating of the so-called Hunt's papyrus indicates that this could have been the case as it presents the situation before the foundation of

---

<sup>8</sup> L. Mrozewicz, Kaiser Claudius und die Donauländer, *Eos* 87, 2000, pp. 295-310; on the liquidation of Thrace: J. Kolendo, Aneksja Tracji za cesarza Klaudiusza, [in:] L. Mrozewicz, K. Iłski (eds.), *Studia Moesiaca* 1, Poznań 1994, pp. 87-100; on Moesia becoming independent and the military situation: T. Sarnowski, *Wojsko rzymskie*, p. 28.

<sup>9</sup> T. Sarnowski, Borders of the province and its changes, [online]. RGZM [access: 2017-01-05]. Available at: <<https://www2.rgzm.de/transformation/home/framesUK.cfmL>>; L. Mrozewicz, *Flawiusze nad Dunajem*, [in:] idem (ed.), *Studia Flaviana* I, Poznań 2010, p. 68.

<sup>10</sup> A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thracas. The rural Hinterland of Novae in Lower Moesia (1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Centuries AD)*, Oxford 2016, s. 101.

<sup>11</sup> RMR 63 = British Museum Papyrus 2851.

<sup>12</sup> RMR 63.

<sup>13</sup> I.B. Cătănciu, Dacia's Borders under Trajan's Rule – Remarks, *Limes* XIX, p. 727; L. Ruscu, On Nicopolis ad Istrum and Her Territory, *Historia* 56, 2, 2007, p. 214, 221.

<sup>14</sup> R. Syme, *The Lower Danube under Trajan*, [in:] idem, *Danubian Papers*, Bucharest 1971, p. 126.

Augusta Traiana, Nicopolis ad Istrum<sup>15</sup>. When these towns were founded, significant modifications must have ensued in the organisation of the province. Not much is known about these changes aside from what can be deduced indirectly from the abovementioned papyrus. When the borders of the new Dacian provinces (Dacia Porolissensis, Dacia Superior, Dacia Inferior) were shaped during Hadrian's reign, the north-western part of Lower Moesia ceased to perform the role of a borderland. In AD 136, the southern border of Lower Moesia was demarcated and its course was determined, as discussed further below. The last area to be included into Lower Moesia was Montana along with its closest surroundings, which led to the borders of Lower Moesia being moved farther west, from the lower course of the Ciabrus River to the Almus River estuary (Lom)<sup>16</sup>.

It is precisely the course of the southern border that causes the most difficulties, as the towns newly founded after the Dacian Wars – Nicopolis ad Istrum and Marcianopolis<sup>17</sup> – were situated within the borders of Thrace and not Lower Moesia. Therefore, Lower Moesia consisted of a narrow strip of land lying between Thrace and the Danube. According to Boris Gerov, the borders of Lower Moesia after AD 136 ran south of Montana, and then north of the locality of Roman, east of Butovo, north of Nicopolis ad Istrum and Maslarevo, and farther, almost in a straight line below Abrittus and above Marcianopolis, reaching the territory of the Greek towns, after which it ran south, encompassing Messembria<sup>18</sup>. This was how Boris Gerov reconstructed the border relying, among other things, on border stones bearing the text *inter Moesos et Thracas*. However, he did not know of the stones discovered at Novae and in Polski Senovec<sup>19</sup>. At present, we have at our disposal ten stones bearing this formula, discovered in the following localities: Roman, Butovo, Maslarevo, Polski Senovec, Hotnica, Svištov and Novae<sup>20</sup>. Very

<sup>15</sup> A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thracas*, p. 101.

<sup>16</sup> M. Tačeva, *The Northern Border of the Thracia Province to the Severi* (2. from Nicopolis ad Istrum to Odessos), *Thracia* 11, 1995, p. 434; T. Sarnowski, *Borders of the province and its changes*.

<sup>17</sup> As regards Marcianopolis, a theory exists that this city was founded during Hadrian's reign, see A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thracas*, p. 101.

<sup>18</sup> B. Gerov, *Die Grenzen der römischen Provinz Thracia bis zur Gründung des Aurelianischen Dakien*, [in:] idem, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien*, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, III, Amsterdam 1998, p. 442.

<sup>19</sup> For a summary of the research into the history of the publications and commentaries on the *inter moesos et thracas* stones, cf. L.C. Ruscu, *On Nicopolis ad Istrum*, pp. 219-220; A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thracas*, pp. 108-113; Roman (AE 2004, 1306a-b), Butovo (CIL III 12407), Maslarevo (CIL III 14422), Polski Senovec (AE 1985, 729), Hotnica (AE 1985, 730), Novae (AE 1985, 733) i Svištov (CIL III 439).

<sup>20</sup> L.C. Ruscu, *On Nicopolis ad Istrum*, p. 216.

convincingly, Ligia C. Ruscu demonstrated that all these stones, except for the one discovered in Hotnica, depict the borderlands between between Lower Moesia and Thrace<sup>21</sup>. In all probability, Lower Moesia in its eastern course, at least until the times of Pertinax/Septimius Severus<sup>22</sup>, was much narrower than it is generally thought to have been. However, I do not think that Nicopolis ad Istrum's territory directly bordered the Danube and cut through Lower Moesia as this would have been impractical and would have introduced chaos into the exaction of customs duties (*portorium*)<sup>23</sup>. Nonetheless, the area that this Greek town covered, similarly as that of Marcianopolis, must have been extensive<sup>24</sup>. Another debatable issue involved the question of whether Tyras and Olbia belonged to Lower Moesia from the times of Septimius Severus' reign<sup>25</sup>.

The effect of these border modifications was that when its borders were taking on their final shape, Lower Moesia consisted of very diverse terrains in terms of their urban development. The land located along the Danube was dominated by the army and the settlers who followed the military. Somewhat farther inland lay the towns of Nicopolis ad Istrum and Marcianopolis. The Greek towns by the Black Sea, such as Olbia, Tyras, Histria, Tomis, Callatis, Dionysopolis, Odessos and Messembria (Messembria was incorporated into Thrace during Pertinax's reign<sup>26</sup>), were of a completely different character than the Dobruja area. In economic terms, the Montana region was special, located in the south-western part of Lower Moesia, which was a strongly militarized mining district<sup>27</sup>. The surroundings of the Šumen district today differ quite significantly from what they were in Antiquity, when this was a poorly urbanized area with extensive agricultural potential<sup>28</sup>. The linguistic division of the province was also quite distinctive. Latin was predominant in

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, p. 229.

<sup>22</sup> D. Boteva, The South Border of Lower Moesia from Hadrian to Septimius Severus, [in:] P. Petrovič (ed.), Roman Limes on the Lower Danube, Belgrade 1996, pp. 173–176.

<sup>23</sup> About *portorium* in Lower Moesia see B. Gerov, Zur epigraphischen Dokumentation des publicum portorii Illyrici et ripae Thraciae, [in:] idem, Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien, Gesammelte Aufsätze, III, Amsterdam 1998, pp. 479–490.

<sup>24</sup> Similarly as Tacheva (On the Northern Border), D. Boteva is of the opinion that Nicopolis ad Istrum covered a small area. However I agree that this city was not fully a port town.

<sup>25</sup> This issue was convincingly discussed by K. Królczyk in this volume, further literature there.

<sup>26</sup> D. Boteva, The South Border, p. 174; according to Boteva, the modifications in the borders of Lower Moesia were introduced by Petrinax in the period between January and March, AD 193.

<sup>27</sup> M. Binev, Montana, [in:] R. Ivanov (ed.), Rimski i rannovizantijski selišta v Bălgarija, 2, 2, Sofija 2003, pp. 160–182.

<sup>28</sup> B. Gerov, Landownership in Roman Thracia and Moesia (1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Century), Amsterdam 1988, p. 121.

the northern part of Lower Moesia, along the Danube and in the interior close to military complexes, while Old Greek colonies continued to use the Greek language, similarly as did the towns newly founded by Trajan, which in majority consisted of colonizers originating from Greek-speaking Asia Minor<sup>29</sup>.

## THE INTEGRATION PROCESS

### Limes

The military camps constructed by the Roman army performed the role of Roman administrative centres. This Roman expansionism was gradual. After creating Moesia, Dimum was the easternmost military post. In AD 44, direct Roman occupation of the lands edged farther east. It was at that time that the legionary camp at Novae was established, at which *legio VIII Augusta* was stationed<sup>30</sup>.

According to Andrew Poulter, after the annexation of Thrace during Claudius' reign, the Romans imposed military control over the small tribes, dividing them without respecting their natural boundaries, primarily as regards the Timachi, the Tricornenses, the Picenses. As he noted, the names of the tribes might not have been changed, but the Romans introduced complete territorial reorganization subordinated to the forts of auxiliary units<sup>31</sup>. Ratiaria was the *civitas* of the Moesians (Ρατιαρία Μυσῶν (κολωνία); Ratiaria of the Moesians (a colony)), while Oescus was that of the Triballians (Οἴσκος Τριβαλλῶν (Οικοστριβαλλῶν); Oescus of the Triballians (belonging to the Triballi))<sup>32</sup>. The Timachi area was probably very small, limited to a single valley in the north bordering the Danube (Timacus, today Timok)<sup>33</sup>. In addition, the Romans might also have organized the *civitas* of Dimensionium<sup>34</sup>. Thus, the autochthonous population the conquerors en-

<sup>29</sup> See note 126.

<sup>30</sup> T. Sarnowski, *Wojsko rzymskie*, p. 28.

<sup>31</sup> A. Poulter, *Cataclysm on the Lower Danube: The Destruction of a Complex Roman Landscape*, [in:] Ch. Neil (ed.), *Landscapes of Change: Rural Evolutions in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Aldershot-Burlington 2004, p. 226.

<sup>32</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, 9, 10, 10.

<sup>33</sup> A. Poulter, *Cataclysm on the Lower Danube*, p. 226.

<sup>34</sup> L. Mrozewicz, *Rozwój ustroju municypalnego a postępy romanizacji w Mezji Dolnej*, Poznań 1982, p. 75.

countered were organized into special tribal administrative units (*civitates, territoria*), administered by *praefectus civitates*<sup>35</sup>.

Another turning point occurred under Vespasian, who dislocated the Roman units east of the Yantra River to the Danube Delta<sup>36</sup>. His work was completed by Trajan, who primarily initiated an enormous construction programme in the Lower Danube lands<sup>37</sup>.

In the relevant academic literature, the citygenic role of the military structures built by the Romans is frequently emphasized. They formed the beginnings of many later towns and settlements. A model Roman colonisation process took place in the small sparsely populated strip of land along the Lower Danube, which later led to the Romanisation of the landscape. This area succumbed to Roman influence very rapidly, which to a large extent was due to it being sparsely inhabited<sup>38</sup>. As a result, the Romans did not encounter any significant difficulties. Civilians of various professions, as well as veterans and their families settled in the vicinity of legionary forts, forming the neighbouring *canabae* and slightly more distant *vici*<sup>39</sup>. Such settlements existed near Oescus, Novae, Durostorum and Troesmis<sup>40</sup>. Near the Danube, civil settlement was not focused only in the vicinity of legionary camps, but also at the forts of auxiliary units, next to which *vici* developed<sup>41</sup>. Such settlements near forts were located in: Ruse (Sexaginta Prista), Taliata and Murighiol (*vicus Classicorum*)<sup>42</sup>, but also in the vicinity of Noviodunum,

<sup>35</sup> Ibidem, p. 75.

<sup>36</sup> T. Sarnowski, *Wojsko rzymskie*, p. 27.

<sup>37</sup> R. Ivanov, *The Roman Limes in Bulgaria (1st-6th C. AD)*, [in:] L. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov, S. Torbatov (eds.), *The Lower Danube Limes (1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> C. AD)*, p. 23.

<sup>38</sup> M. Duch, *Gospodarcza rola armii rzymskiej w prowincji Mezja Dolna (Moesia Inferior)*, Gniezno-Poznań 2016, pp. 66-76.

<sup>39</sup> B. Gerov, *Zum Problem der Entstehung der römischen Städte am Unteren Donaulimes*, [in:] idem, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien, Gesammelte Aufsätze*, I, Amsterdam 1980, p. 349.

<sup>40</sup> The *canabae* at Oescus has not yet been located with any certainty. It can only be stated that it was situated *intra leugam*, cf. I. Bojanov, *Oescus – from castra to colonia*, *AB* 12, 3, 2008, p. 71; S. Parnicki-Pudelfko, *Canabae Novae: problem lokalizacji*, [in:] *Novae-Sektor Zachodni* 1976, 1978, Poznań 1981, pp. 201-204; *CIL* III 7474; the Durostorum *canabae* was subjected to archaeological studies: P. Donevski, *Zur Topographie von Durostorum*, *Germania* 68, 1, 1990, p. 236; *ISM* V 141, 154, 158; settlement duality near the camps was commonplace in the Roman limes area, B. Gerov, *Zum Problem*, p. 349.

<sup>41</sup> L. Mrozewicz, *Ze studiów nad rolą canabae w procesie urbanizowania terenów pogranicza reńsko-dunajskiego w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa*, [in:] W. Pająkowski, L. Mrozewicz (eds.), *Balcanica Posnaniensia 3. Novae I kultura starożytna*, Poznań 1984, p. 288.

<sup>42</sup> T. Sarnowski, *Origin of vici* [online]. RGZM [access: 2017-02-13]. Available at: <www2.rgzm.de/Transformation/Poland/StrPln02Pl.htm>; A. Suceveanu, M. Zahariade, *Un nouveau 'vicus' sur le Territoire de la Dobroudja romaine*, *Dacia* 30, 1986, pp. 109-120; A. Suceveanu,

Capidava and Transmarisca<sup>43</sup>. Others also probably existed elsewhere as the Lower Moesian fortification system extended for 670 km (up to the Danube delta)<sup>44</sup>; and, according to Martin Lemke, we know of a little over 50 confirmed fortified spots<sup>45</sup>.

Such settlements had enormous economic and demographic potential, which is attested by the surface they occupied. For example, according to estimates, the Durostorum *canabae* covered a surface of 60 ha. Various public utility buildings were erected here, as well as some rather small *villae*<sup>46</sup>. In Novae, the *canabae* maximally covered an area of 80 ha<sup>47</sup>, but this does not mean that the entire area was inhabited<sup>48</sup>, and so far a villa *extra muros*<sup>49</sup>, a temple to Mithra and some cemeteries<sup>50</sup> have been discovered here. In addition, *vici* developed 2.2 km from the legionary camps, usually later receiving the status of *municipium*<sup>51</sup>. The process of granting municipal rights occurred quite late in Lower Moesia, but this was due to the late placement of the entire length of the Danube under Roman protection. In light of the newly discovered *lex Troesmensis*, it is sure that the municipalisation process of Lower Moesia began in AD 177-180<sup>52</sup>. As a result

---

M. Zahariade, Du nom Antique de la cité romaine et romaine tardive d'Independența (dep. de Tulcea), *Dacia* 31, 1987, p. 94.

<sup>43</sup> ISM V 268; ISM V 77; J. Kolendo, Miasta i terytoria, plemienne w prowincji Mezji Dolnej w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa, [in:] M. Jaczynowska, J. Wolski (ed.), *Prowincje rzymskie i ich znaczenie w ramach Imperium*, Wrocław 1976, p. 50.

<sup>44</sup> A.G. Poulter, Town and Country in Moesia Inferior, [in:] idem (ed.), *Ancient Bulgaria. Papers presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria*, Nottingham 1983, p. 85.

<sup>45</sup> M. Lemke, Towards a military geography of Moesia inferior, [in:] L. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov (eds.), *Limes XXII. Proceedings of the XXII<sup>nd</sup> International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Ruse, Bulgaria (September 2012)*, Sofia 2015, p. 846.

<sup>46</sup> P. Donevski, Kanabi na XI Klavdiev Legion, [in:] R. Ivanov, G. Atanasov, P. Donevski (eds.), *Istorija na Silistra. Antičnijat Durostorum*, Sofia 2006, p. 227.

<sup>47</sup> S. Conrad, D. Stanchev, *Archaeological Survey on the Lower Danube: Results and Perspectives*, *Black Sea Studies* 4, 2006, pp. 309-331, p. 321.

<sup>48</sup> Archaeological material is densely scattered over 80 ha around Novae, see: A. Tomas, *Living with the Army I. Civil Settlements near Roman Legionary Fortresses in Lower Moesia*, Warszawa 2017, pp. 41-42.

<sup>49</sup> M. Čičkova, La basilique et la nécropole paléochrétiennes extra muros (Mésie Inférieure), [in:] A. Biernacki, P. Pawlak (eds.), *Late Roman and Early Byzantine Cities on the Lower Danube from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD. International Conference. Poznań, Poland, 15-17 November 1995*, Poznań 1995, pp. 57-69.

<sup>50</sup> L. Press, T. Sarnowski, Novae, rzymska twierdza legionowa i miasto wczesnobizantyjskie nad dolnym Dunajem, *Novensia* 1, 1987, p. 304.

<sup>51</sup> A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thracas* (Oxford), p. 140.

<sup>52</sup> W. Eck, *Die lex Troesmensium: ein Stadtgesetz für ein municipium civium Romanorum*, *ZPE* 200, 2016, p. 582.



of such policies, we know of the municipium Novensium<sup>53</sup>, Durostorum (municipium Aurelium Durostorum)<sup>54</sup>, Troesmis (municipium Troesmensium)<sup>55</sup> Tropaeum Traiani (municipium Traianensium Tropaeensium)<sup>56</sup> and Noviodunum (municipium Noviodunum)<sup>57</sup>. All these municipia were formed along the Danube, with only Tropaeum Traiani, located in the southern Dobruja area (currently Adamclisi), not possessing any military connotations (even though *vexillationes* were permanently stationed nearby). Among researchers, the predominant opinion is that Tropaeum Traiani developed in place of a *vicus*, but some support the theory that rather this occurred in place of a tribal *civitas*<sup>58</sup>.

The results of the municipal policies in Lower Moesia could have been better if the towns did not have to compete with the Greek urban centres on the Black Sea coast<sup>59</sup>. Only Oescus, which before the conquest had been the tribal centre of the Triballi, achieved the status of a colony during Trajan's reign (*Colonia Ulpia Oescensium*)<sup>60</sup>. The new colony was founded in place of the legionary camp. This area, as attested by how the town later looked, had a lot of economic potential<sup>61</sup>. The inhabitants also quickly began to take advantage of the economic potential created by the *legio V Macedonica* near Oescus, such as by continuing their exploitation of military quarries

<sup>53</sup> AE 1964, 224; B. Gerov, Die Rechtsstellung der untermösischen Stadt Novae, [in:] idem (ed.), Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien, Gesammelte Aufsätze, I, Amsterdam 1980, p. 115; I provided a summary of the on-going debate about the municipal status of Novae see: M. Duch, Economic role of the Roman Army in the province of Lower Moesia (Moesia Inferior), p. 133 in fn. 207.

<sup>54</sup> AE 1925, 110 = ISM I 302: „Ael(ius) Se[veri]anus d(ecurio) m(unicipi) Durosteri”, an equally animated discussion is being conducted about this *municipium* as in the case of Novae, cf. I. Bojanov, Municipium Aurelium Durostorum or vicus Gavidina, AB 14, 2, 2010, pp. 53-59; Bojanov indicates the canabae.

<sup>55</sup> ISM V 148, 149, 150, 152, 153, 163, 164, 165, 166, 180, 183.

<sup>56</sup> CIL III 7484, 12465, 14437.

<sup>57</sup> A. Barnea, Municipium Noviodunum, Peuce X, 1, pp. 81-84; For more on the creation of municipia in Lower Moesia, cf. L. Mrozewicz, Rozwój ustroju, pp. 78-88; E. Doruțiu-Boilă, Über den Zeitpunkt der Verleihung des Municipalrechts in Scythia Minor, Dacia 22, 1978, pp. 245-247; M. Tačeva, Die munizipalisierung in den Provinzen Moesia Superior und Moesia Inferior (Mitte des 2.-Mitte des 3. Jhs.), [in:] M. Mirkovič (ed.), Römische Städte und Festungen an der Donau, Beograd 2005, pp. 215-216.

<sup>58</sup> A. Panaite, Tropaeum Traiani, from Civitas to Municipium, a Hypothesis, [in:] A. Panaite, R. Cîrjan, C. Căpiță (eds.), Moesica et Christiana. Studies in Honour of Professor Alexandru Barnea, Brăila 2016, pp. 163-172.

<sup>59</sup> L. Mrozewicz, Arystokracja municypalna w rzymskich prowincjach nad Renem i Dunajem w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa, Poznań 1989, p. 25.

<sup>60</sup> I. Bojanov, Oescus, p. 69.

<sup>61</sup> B. Gerov, Landownership, p. 95.

(including those discovered in Kreta, Kunino – Vraca, and in the vicinity of the town of Berkovica)<sup>62</sup>.

### Scythia Minor (Dobruja) and the Greek towns

The population of Dobruja<sup>63</sup> was concentrated in such Greek towns as: Histria (at the mouth of the Danube in Dobruja), Tomis (Constanța), Callatis (Mangalia), Dionysopolis (Balchik). I would also include Odessos (Varna) and Messembria (Nessebar)<sup>64</sup> to this list, as well as various villages in which herding and relatively inefficient agriculture were the basis of the local economy. The population living nearby led a semi-nomadic or nomadic lifestyle (the Gets and the Scythians)<sup>65</sup>. Dobruja is not a vast area. It was frequently targeted for plunder and invaded by the tribes living north of the Danube<sup>66</sup>, which most certainly negatively influenced its urban and economic development. This primarily had an impact on the Greek towns that were subjected to the disastrous events of the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC and the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD. The most serious of these was certainly the Gets invasion under Burebista's command in 55 BC<sup>67</sup>. However, the Roman invasions had equally dramatic consequences. In 72/71 BC, Marcus Terentius Varro Lucullus crossed the Haemus Mountains and in the course of his march occupied (and perhaps also destroyed) Callatis, Parthenopolis, Tomis, Histria and Bizone<sup>68</sup>. After being liberated from the Romans, not long after Lucullus, these terrains were attacked by Gaius Antonius Hybrida in 61 BC; however,

---

<sup>62</sup> Z. Dimitrov, Stone Cutting in Moesia Superior and Inferior during the Roman Age [online]. RGZM [access: 2017-02-02]. Available at: <[www2.rgzm.de/Transformation/Bulgaria/Steinbearbeitung/PhfEnV2\\_03.htm](http://www2.rgzm.de/Transformation/Bulgaria/Steinbearbeitung/PhfEnV2_03.htm)>.

<sup>63</sup> I do not take into account the military complexes located along the limes, as these were discussed above.

<sup>64</sup> These two towns were not situated within Dobruja but were closely linked to it.

<sup>65</sup> R.M. Batty, On Getic and Sarmatian Shores: Ovid's Account of the Danube Lands, *Historia* 43, 1, 1994, pp. 92-96.

<sup>66</sup> Ovid., *Tristia*, V. 7. 9-20.

<sup>67</sup> Dio Chrys. 36, 4; Ior. Get. 67; M. Musielak (*Spółczesność greckich miast zachodnich wybrzeży Morza Czarnego*, Poznań 2003, p. 92) indicates the inscription IGBR I 323, which is proof that Burebista did not occupy Messembria; S. Dimitrova in the text *The Military-Political and Diplomatic Activities of Burebista in the Lower Danube Region, Thracia* 17, 2007, pp. 159-172, here: p. 159, put forward the hypothesis that out of all the western Pontic towns only Histria and Odessos were damaged as a result of Burebista's attacks, while Tomis and Callatis "did not suffer incursions".

<sup>68</sup> Eutropius VI 10; while Fest., IX. mentions Lucullus's occupation of the Greek towns.

he was defeated at Histria by the Bastarnae<sup>69</sup>. Ultimately, the Greek towns acknowledged the Roman protectorate after Marcus Licinius Crassus's campaign in 28-27 BC<sup>70</sup>.

When the Romans took power of present-day Dobruja, the process of its integration was very distinctive. As of 72 BC, when M. Terentius Varro Lucullus mounted an armed expedition against the Greek towns, the areas they occupied were referred to as *Laevus Pontus*<sup>71</sup>. Before the emancipation of Moesia, the lands were controlled by the governor of Macedonia, while the remaining area of Dobruja was administered by the Thracian kings (*ripa Thraciae*)<sup>72</sup>. In academic circles, the issue of the administrative organisation of Greek towns during the Julio-Claudian period remains intensely debated, with the majority of the researchers supporting the hypothesis that they were organized in the form of *praefectura orae maritimae*, while others claim that the Greek towns were incorporated into the *praefectura civitatum* or *praefectura ripae Thraciae*<sup>73</sup>. Florian Matei-Popescu, based on a new reading of Mirena Slavova's fragments of the Horothesia of Dionysopolis<sup>74</sup>, is of the opinion that in the period between the formation of Moesia and AD 46 the Greek towns were organized as a separate administrative unit called *Pontus* or *Laevus Pontus*, administered by a *praefectus* selected from among the *primipilares*, who were subordinated to the Moesian governor<sup>75</sup>. In terms of the legal status of Greek cities: Kallatis had the status of *civitas foederata*, Histria was a *civitas libera et immunis*, Tomis performed the function of the most important metropolis of Left Pontus and might perhaps have enjoyed the same status as Histria, while the majority of researchers are of the opinion that the remaining towns were *civitates foederatae* or *civitates liberae et immunes*, and after the emancipation of Moesia they received the

<sup>69</sup> Legionary signs were lost at that time (cf. Cass. Dio 50, 38, 10), and regained a few decades later (Cass. Dio 51, 26, 5).

<sup>70</sup> Cass. Dio 51, 25, 1.

<sup>71</sup> F. Matei-Popescu The Horothesia of Dionysopolis and the Integration of the Western Pontic Greek Cities in the Roman Empire, [in:] V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca 2014, p. 460.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 461.

<sup>73</sup> L. Ruscu, On the *praefectura orae maritimae* on the western coast of the Black Sea, [in:] M.A. Janković, V. D. Mihailović, S. Babić (eds.), *The Edges of the Roman World*, Cambridge 2014, p. 160; F. Matei-Popescu The Horothesia, p. 463; L. Ruscu, *Becoming Roman? Shifting Identities in the Western Pontic Greek Cities*, [in:] *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca 2014, p. 474.

<sup>74</sup> Lines 26-32 of the Horothesia of Dionysopolis (IGBulg V 5011), ZPE 120, 1998, pp. 99-106.

<sup>75</sup> F. Matei-Popescu, The Horothesia, p. 465.

status of *civitates stipendiariae*, but we have no sources that would confirm this<sup>76</sup>. The full incorporation of the Greek towns of the Black Sea coast into the Moesian structures happened in AD 46, when they were included into the *portorium ripae Thraciae*<sup>77</sup>.

The Romans founded numerous villages based on the Roman model in the neighbourhood of Greek towns. According to Andrew G. Poulter, this was a conscious policy introduced by Rome, aimed at building a solid logistics infrastructure for the Lower Moesian garrisons<sup>78</sup>. A representative example of this are the vicus Quintionis and vicus Secundini, which were inhabited by veterans and other Roman citizens, as well as by the Lai and the Bessi resettled from Thrace<sup>79</sup>. Traces of settlement in Dobruja confirm that its population density was higher than in the areas between Dimum and Durostorum<sup>80</sup>. As much as 45 rural centres could have been located in the Dobruja area during the Principate period<sup>81</sup>. Such a high concentration of Roman villages enables putting forward the supposition that settlement in this place was supported by the Roman authorities, which testifies to the deliberate nature of the urbanisation and integration policies in these areas. A particular expression of these policies is observable especially after the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, when many newly-founded villages with Roman names appeared, primarily near the roads<sup>82</sup>, such as vicus Novus, vicus Petrus, v... (Neatirnaea), vicus Urb..., vicus Secundini, vicus Hi..., vicus... (Gälbior), vicus Clemensianensis, vicus Ulmetum, vicus Parsal..., Laicos Purgos, vicus Celeris<sup>83</sup>. In addition, a few times more *villae rusticae* were founded in the Dobruja area than in the remaining Lower Moesia region<sup>84</sup>. The intense development of

<sup>76</sup> Ibidem, p. 466, cf. the discussion therein.

<sup>77</sup> Ibidem, p. 467.

<sup>78</sup> A.G. Poulter, Rural Communities (vici and komai) and their role in the organization of the limes of Moesia Inferior, [in:] W.S. Hanson, L.J.F. Keppie (eds.), Roman Frontier Studies 1979: Papers presented to the 12th International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies, Oxford 1980, p. 736.

<sup>79</sup> L. Mrozewicz, Rozwój ustroju, p. 65.

<sup>80</sup> M. Duch, Gospodarcza rola, pp. 67-70, idem, The Impact of Roman Army on Trade and Production in Lower Moesia (Moesia Inferior), StEurGn 11, 2015, pp. 236-240.

<sup>81</sup> A.G. Poulter, Rural Communities, p. 729.

<sup>82</sup> Ibidem, p. 734.

<sup>83</sup> Ibidem, p. 731.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. V.H. Baumann, Ferma Romană din Dobrogea, Tulcea 1983, p. 148; V. Dinčev, Rimskite vili v dnešnata bălgarska teritorija, Sofia 1997, pp. 115-119; P. Dyczek, Amfory rzymskie z obszaru dolnego Dunaju. Dystrybucja amfor i transportowanych w nich produktów w I-III w. po Chr., Warszawa 1999, p. 266.

rustic villas began here at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD<sup>85</sup>. Alongside the villages (*vici*), the villas were an important element of the supply system provisioning the Lower Moesian garrisons<sup>86</sup>.

Even though the traditional Greek administrative system remained in place in the direct vicinity of the former Greek colonies, in the nearby rural areas Roman-type villages were founded. This is illustrated by the example of the town of Histria. Roman villages, such as the abovementioned vicus Quintionis<sup>87</sup>, vicus Secundini<sup>88</sup>, as well as vicus Celeris<sup>89</sup>, were created within Histria's territory. Roman influence in Histria is especially visible in the fact that the *archontes* headed the *regio Histria*, while we can observe *aediles* in the lower ranks (typical Roman magistrates)<sup>90</sup>. At present we are able to provide a general estimation of the radius of territorium Odessitanorum. Recently we have also established the existence of territorium Aegyssense<sup>91</sup>. Until the time of establishing Tropaeum Traiani, civitas Ausdecensium (consisting of the Ausdecensium, the Bessi and the Lai resettled to the area at the turn of the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD) also functioned in the Dobruja area<sup>92</sup>. In terms of other administrative forms, we also know of the territorium Capidavense, with its capital (*civitas*) in Capidava<sup>93</sup>.

It should be emphasized at this point that military *vici* administering a certain area (*territorium, regio*) developed not only within the Dobruja region but also in the limes and in the interior of the province. In the Dobruja area, this is observable in Capidava and Aegyssus, for the limes – in Dimum and for the interior – in Abrittus and Montana<sup>94</sup>.

### Hinterland

The hinterland or interior of Lower Moesia is understood as the area extending from the line of the Roman fortifications situated along the Danube inland. This primarily applies to the area around Montana,

<sup>85</sup> V.H. Baumann, *Ferma Romană*, pp. 27-29.

<sup>86</sup> A.G. Poulter, *Rural Communities*, pp. 729-744.

<sup>87</sup> ISM I 324-332, 340-341.

<sup>88</sup> ISM I 343-347, 349.

<sup>89</sup> ISM I 350-351.

<sup>90</sup> L. Mrozewicz, *Rozwój ustroju*, p. 75.

<sup>91</sup> Conrad, p. 183, no. 219=AE 2004, 1281.

<sup>92</sup> L. Mrozewicz, *Rozwój ustroju*, p. 75.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 71.

<sup>94</sup> S. Nemeti, M. Bărbulescu, *Arcobadara*, *Latomus* 69, 2010, p. 454.

Nicopolis ad Istrum, Marcianopolis and Abrittus, which were discussed in the first part of this article in terms of their incorporation into Lower Moesia.

One of the many actions undertaken by the Romans in these areas was the gradual dismantling of the Thracian strategies<sup>95</sup>. This particular administrative system functioned not only south of the Haemus Mountains but also to the north<sup>96</sup>, both in the times when Thrace was a client state and also after it was transformed into a Roman province<sup>97</sup>. The strategies were headed by representatives of the local Thracian elites<sup>98</sup>. Such administrative units, surely for social and political reasons, were not dismantled abruptly. We know that some of them were still in existence during the times of the Antonine dynasty<sup>99</sup>. However, not much can be said about them, especially about those that were located in the Lower Moesian area. It can only be indicated that for the area of interest to us one strategy has been confirmed with certainty in the vicinity of Odessos<sup>100</sup>. Some researchers think that the land on which Nicopolis ad Istrum was built was not included in the Thracian system of strategies<sup>101</sup>, and thus that they functioned only in the area east of the Yantra River. However, based on Claudius Ptolemy's geographic text, completed during Antonius Pius's reign, it can be established that 14 strategies existed in Thrace<sup>102</sup>, and at least two might have included the Lower Moesian area. According to Marie-Gabrielle G. Parissaki, Ptolemy provided information about the Thracian strategies for the final period of their existence, i.e. between the late reign of Vespasian and that of Trajan/Hadrian. Marie-Gabrielle Parissaki also specified two earlier periods, with the first of these lasting from the mid-1<sup>st</sup> century AD to the provincialisation of Thrace, while the second – from AD 46 to Vespasian's

---

<sup>95</sup> At present, the best analysis of the Thracian strategies would be Marie-Gabrielle G. Parissaki's article, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative de la Thrace à l'époque romaine. L'histoire des stratégies*, *Revue des Études Grecques*, 122, fasc. 2, Juillet-décembre 2009, pp. 319-357. Among other publications, one should also indicate the following text: B. Gerov, *Zum Problem der Strategien im römischen Thrakien*, *Klio*, 52, 1970, pp. 123-132.

<sup>96</sup> Traces of the strategies to the north of the Haemus Mountains come in the form of an inscription from Abrittus dated to 21 AD: IGBulg II 743, the inscription is dedicated to King Rhoemetalces II and it lists the following strategies: Anchialus, Selletike and Rhysike; A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thraces*, p. 77.

<sup>97</sup> The main sources for research into strategies would be the inscription from Topeiros and the accounts by Pliny the Elder (Plin., *NH.*, IV, 40) and by Ptolemy.

<sup>98</sup> M.-G. Parissaki, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative*, p. 336.

<sup>99</sup> B. Gerov, *Zum Problem der Strategien*, pp. 123-132.

<sup>100</sup> M.-G.G. Parissaki, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative*, p. 328.

<sup>101</sup> L.R. Ruscu, *On the Nicopolis ad Istrum*, p. 226.

<sup>102</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, 9, 11, 7-8.

reign<sup>103</sup>. A fragment of special interest in Ptolemy's text is one from which it can be inferred that at least two strategies out of the four mentioned by the geographer, extending from west to east, might have administratively encompassed areas that would later become part of Lower Moesia. These might perhaps have been the Ousdikese and Selletike strategies<sup>104</sup>. A daring theory was recently proposed by Peter Delev that Ousdikese and Selletike should rather be considered to have been located north of the Haemus Mountains, as these areas constituted part of Thrace at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD. According to Delev, Ousdikese existed in the spot where Nicopolis ad Istrum was later constructed and – analogously – Selletike was created in place of Marcianopolis<sup>105</sup>. Unfortunately, Peter Delev does not refer to Hunt's Pridianum, in which it is explicitly stated that Haemus Mons were to be found within Lower Moesia (*intra provinciam*). There is also a hypothesis claiming that Nicopolis ad Istrum was supposed to have been built in the area of the Ryssike strategy<sup>106</sup>, but evidence is lacking as the name of this strategy cannot have been derived from the name of the river, which has a Slavic and not a Thracian etymology<sup>107</sup>. Without a doubt, Thracian strategies were gradually eradicated and replaced by the typically Roman administrative model. If the strategies existed in areas that later made up part of Lower Moesia, the process of their eradication began along with Emperor Trajan's urbanisation programme<sup>108</sup>. Ultimately, in light of the stones bearing the phrase *inter Moesos et Thraces* their end must have occurred in AD 136<sup>109</sup>.

According to Agnieszka Tomas, the demarcation act aimed to separate the areas in Moesia inhabited by Roman citizens from those occupied by the Thracians having their own administrative centres, which in effect increase

---

<sup>103</sup> M.-G. Parissaki, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative*, p. 353.

<sup>104</sup> Ptol., *Geogr.*, 9, 11, 8: Στράτηγαι δε εἰσιν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ πρὸς μὲν ταῖς Μυσηαῖς καὶ περὶ τοῦ Αἰμοῦ το ὄρος ἀρχομενοὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν Δαθηλτικῆ, Σαρδικῆ; Marie-Gabrielle G. Parissaki, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative*, p. 338.

<sup>105</sup> P. Delev, *Once More on the Thracian Strategies of Claudius Ptolemy*, *Sbornik v pamet na professor Velizar Velkov*, Sofia 2009, pp. 246-247.

<sup>106</sup> M. Tačeva, *Trakijските Strategii i Trajanovata urbanizacija*, [in:] eadem, *Vlast i socium w rimska Trakija i Mizija*, Sofia 2000, p. 35.

<sup>107</sup> P. Vladkova, *The Earliest Nicopolis ad Istrum*, [in:] *The Roman and Late Roman City*, Sofia 2002, p. 31.

<sup>108</sup> M. Tačeva, *Trakijските Strategii*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>109</sup> This opinion is also shared by A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thraces*, [chapter *Boundary Stones*]; Ruscu claims that the strategies were eradicated as early as in the period of Trajan's reign, p. 214.

imposing taxes on them and accelerated urbanisation<sup>110</sup>. Aside from increasing the effectiveness of tax collection, one other reason should be indicated. Through such means, Rome wanted to separate the tribal groups from each other, cutting them off by creating a border between them, and suppressing their ethnic identification and affiliations<sup>111</sup>. It can also be presumed that the *inter Moesos et Thraces* border was imposed in a completely arbitrary way, without taking into account the existing linguistic, ethnic and cultural divisions. It is obvious that the stones bearing the phrase separated an area that was largely homogeneous<sup>112</sup>. Rome maintained the Thracian strategies for a long time because the loyal Thracian elites, frequently functioning as cultural intermediaries, headed them<sup>113</sup>. One such person was Apollonios Eptaikenthos, a strategos known primarily from an inscription from Abrittus dated to AD 21<sup>114</sup> and a few other inscriptions that are a reflection of his career<sup>115</sup>, which most certainly could not have developed without the support of the Romans. This is confirmed by the fact that he was granted Roman citizenship by Emperor Claudius<sup>116</sup>. A perfect illustration of the cooperation between the Thracian elites and the Romans is the inscription from Topeiros from the time of Nero's rule, listing 33 strategoi, founders of a statue for procurator Marcus Vettius Marcellus, out of which 23 of them possessed Roman citizenship<sup>117</sup>. Perhaps Apollonios and the members of the elites listed on the inscription from Topeiros adopted Roman culture not because they actually desired to become Romans. It seems more probable that these were pragmatic choices resulting from their desire to participate in Roman power. If we follow the cognitive theory of culture<sup>118</sup>, the Thracian elites voluntarily adopted elements of Roman culture purely for their own reasons, for personal benefits, because this was what the situation in which they had found themselves required. However, this does not mean that they lost their Thracian identity, which was most probably expressed

<sup>110</sup> A. Tomas, *Inter Moesos et Thraces*, pp. 108-113.

<sup>111</sup> Similar procedures were undertaken by the Romans in Asia Minor, cf. C. Ando, *The Administration of the Provinces*, [in:] D. Potter (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, p. 183.

<sup>112</sup> J. Kolendo, *Miasta i terytoria*, p. 65.

<sup>113</sup> On the elites as intermediaries for Roman culture, cf. S.T. Roselaar, Introduction, [in:] eadem (ed.), *Processes of Cultural Change and Integration in the Roman World*, Leiden-Boston 2015, pp. 6-7.

<sup>114</sup> IGBulg II 743.

<sup>115</sup> M.-G.G. Parissaki, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative*, pp. 324-325.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 326.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 330.

<sup>118</sup> S.T. Roselaar, Introduction: *Processes of Cultural Change and Integration in the Roman World*, [in:] eadem (ed.), *Processes of Cultural Change*, pp. 9-10.



within the societies in which they lived. This is evidenced by the fact that the strategists attached a lot of significance to the proper functioning of temples, as attested by the large amount of foundation inscriptions. This is due to the fact that temples in Thracian societies performed the function of social centres and were traditional points at which public activities were concentrated, a reflection of „Thracian euergetism”<sup>119</sup>. Thus, if the Thracian aristocrats adopted elements of Roman culture, it was only those that they considered attractive and useful, while retaining their own ethnic identity. This surely must have been one of the reasons that the Thracian administrative districts (the strategies) slowly but steadily underwent gradual urbanisation. The culmination of this process was the foundation of the towns Marcianopolis and Nicopolis ad Istrum directly within the Thracian tribal territory<sup>120</sup>. The conclusion that Marcianopolis was built in such an area was put forward by the renowned scholar Jerzy Kolendo, based on the inscriptions on the boundary posts bearing the phrase F TERR THRAC, which he read as *fines terrae Thracum* or *fines territorii Thracum* (the boundary of the land of the Thracians or territory of the Thracians). Posts with such content separated the lands of the Thracians from those lands that belonged to the town of Odessos (*fines terrae Odessitanorum*)<sup>121</sup>. Certainly, the existence of tribal territories testified to the slow integration of local tribes living in the non-urbanized areas within the Roman Empire, as they continued to function within the scope of their traditional social, economic and organisational divisions<sup>122</sup>. Thus, their existence evidences that the integration process in Lower Moesia proceeded irregularly. Recently, another hypothesis concerning the *fines terrae Thracum* and *fines terrae Odessitanorum* boundary posts was advanced by Igor Lazarenko, according to whom these posts separated the municipal area of Odessos from the Thracian provincial areas, and thus we would be dealing not with the separation of the town’s lands but rather with the demarcation of Thrace’s

---

<sup>119</sup> N. Sharankov, Novi Danni za trakijskite stratezi, Arhaeologija LVI, 1-2, 2015, p. 74. Sharankov claims that frequently the only place enabling the Thracian aristocrats public expression were the interiors of temples. It is difficult to state whether this was a typically Thracian method or rather the result of Hellenistic influences. Undoubtedly, the temples, especially in the period when Thrace was not urbanized, were the most important space for the Thracian community.

<sup>120</sup> J. Kolendo, Miasta i terytoria, pp. 47, 59.

<sup>121</sup> Ibidem, p. 54; AE 2002, 1250a-b.

<sup>122</sup> Ibidem, p. 66.

borders<sup>123</sup>. Without going into detail, his argumentation is convincing, but Jerzy Kolendo's views and those of Igor Lazarenko are not contradictory. This would mean that we are dealing here both with the separation of the territory of the town of Odessos from the tribal areas and a clear demarcation of the boundaries of the Thracian provinces.

The towns that were newly founded by Trajan after the Dacian Wars, i.e. Nicopolis ad Istrum<sup>124</sup> and Marcianopolis, were not organized like Roman towns but as traditional Greek poleis<sup>125</sup>. Most of the settlers of these towns originated from Syria and various areas in Asia Minor<sup>126</sup>. Trajan chose the Greek model as a basis for their further development as Hellenistic influences and traditions were strong in this area<sup>127</sup>. These towns and their rural territories developed to such a high degree because they provided the logistics resources for the Roman army stationed along the *limes*<sup>128</sup>. Due to the state of research, this is especially observable on the example of Nicopolis ad Istrum, because the ceramic products that were made near this town (in Butovo, Pavlikeni) made their way to Novae, but also to other places where the armies were stationed in Lower Moesia<sup>129</sup>. The size of Nicopolis ad Istrum's territory is the subject of a lively academic debate, as discussed above in the context of the southern border of Lower Moesia. If Nicopolis ad Istrum covered a large area, Marcianopolis must have similarly been an extensive town. Thanks to the inscription from Nevsia (Varna region), we know that Marcianopolis was divided into regions of which one is recognised: *regio Gelegetiorum*<sup>130</sup>. This might have testified to the fact that the *regiones* were subordinated to the *territorium*. It is interesting to note that the grave of a Romanized Thracian, dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD and containing objects used in bathhouses, was found in Marcianopolis. This

<sup>123</sup> I. Lazarenko, The Southern Boundary of Terra Odessitanorum (1<sup>st</sup>-beginning of 2<sup>nd</sup> c.), AB VI, 1, 2002, pp. 52-53.

<sup>124</sup> This town was initially called Nicopolis ad Haemum, cf. Klaud., Ptol., Geogr., 11, 7; P. Vladkova, The Earliest Nicopolis ad Istrum, p. 32.

<sup>125</sup> L. Ruscu, On the Nicopolis ad Istrum, p. 214.

<sup>126</sup> L. Slokoska, P. Vladkova, I. Tsurov, R. Ivanov, Nicopolis ad Istrum, [in:] R. Ivanov (ed.), Rimski i Rannovizantijski gradove v Bălgarija. Studies in Memory of Prof. Teofil Ivanov, 1, 1, Sofia 2002, p. 85.

<sup>127</sup> M.I. Rostovtzeff, The Social & Economic History of the Roman Empire, Oxford 1926, p. 233.

<sup>128</sup> A. Tomas, Inter Moesos et Thraces (Oxford), pp. 113-115.

<sup>129</sup> B. Sultov, Ceramic Production on the Territory of Nicopolis ad Istrum (II-nd-IV-th Century), Terra Antiqua Balcanica 1, GSUFF 76/2, 1983 (1985), pp. 11, 25; P. Vladkova, Antičen proizvodstven centăr pri Pavlikeni (Dolna Mizija): plan na kompleksa, periodizacija i vidove keramični izdelija, Veliko Tărnovo 2011, pp. 145, 147.

<sup>130</sup> AE 2000, 1268.

shows that already in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, despite the existence of strong tribal structures in Lower Moesia, the Roman „inclination towards bathing”<sup>131</sup> had reached the indigenous population.

An important role in the defensive structures and maintaining of Roman domination in the province was performed by Abrittus, which was the capital of the *territorium Abrittanorum*<sup>132</sup>. This was a fortified town in which units of the *legio XI Claudia* and *cohors II Lucensium* were stationed<sup>133</sup>. Civil settlement was initially concentrated in the vicinity of the Roman auxiliary armies, next to which *vici* developed<sup>134</sup>. Lands belonging to the *fiscus* were located not far from Abrittus, as the stamped brick FISC(us) informs<sup>135</sup>.

The Romans had a characteristic strategy for the development of the Lower Moesian lands in the vicinity of the present-day district of Šumen. A Thracian fort was located there in Hellenistic times, which aside from performing a defensive function also served as a trade and crafts centre<sup>136</sup>. However, when the Romans seized control over this area, it was not an urbanized or strongly populated area, but rather one with huge agricultural potential<sup>137</sup>. Thus, the Romans had a lot of freedom while they were organizing the area as they saw fit. This resulted in the region providing logistic support and resources for the army stationed in the strip of land next to the Danube<sup>138</sup>. As can be stated based on the stamped building ceramics from the surroundings of Madara, the property used by tenants and independent ceramic producers developed very intensely and on a large scale, as did the large imperial domains that existed not far from Madara<sup>139</sup>. This agricultural potential was confirmed by the fact that archaeologists made the

---

<sup>131</sup> R. Nenova, A. Angelov, A Rich Thracian's Grave from Marcianopolis, AB 3, 1999, pp. 49-59, here: p. 57.

<sup>132</sup> AE 1985, 765.

<sup>133</sup> M. Zahariade, N. Gudea, The Fortifications of Lower Moesia (A.D. 86-275), Amsterdam 1997, p. 94.

<sup>134</sup> B. Gerov, Zum Problem, p. 350, 357.

<sup>135</sup> T. Sarnowski, Wojsko rzymskie, p. 65.

<sup>136</sup> H. Popov, Urbanizacija vāv vātrešnite rajoni na Trakija i Ilirija: prez VI-I vek predi Hrista, Sofija 2002, p. 153.

<sup>137</sup> B. Gerov, Landownership, p. 121.

<sup>138</sup> Ibidem, p. 74-75; T. Sarnowski, Pozamilitarne funkcje armii rzymskiej ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem jej roli w urbanizacji obszarów cesarstwa, Meander 42, 9-10, 1987, pp. 442-442; A. Tomas, Inter Moesos et Thracas (Oxford), p. 3.

<sup>139</sup> B. Gerov, Landownership, p. 74-78.

most abundant discoveries of agricultural tools here out of the entire northern Bulgarian area<sup>140</sup>.

In Lower Moesia, there were areas that were fully integrated (urbanized areas) and non-integrated ones (tribal areas). The pace of integration was dependent on Roman interests. The mining areas, and thus those of higher economic value, were the first to be subjected to strong Roman influence<sup>141</sup>. Thus, Montana encountered Roman colonialism very quickly. The territorium Montantanensium<sup>142</sup> they created encompassed a large area stretching north of the Danube line, with the borders of the province demarcating the end of the territory in the south and the west, while in the east – it probably ended at the edge of today's village of Gradešnica<sup>143</sup>. The Romans immediately began extracting the deposits, and thus also initiating the process of integration. The authorities of the province wanted to ensure security<sup>144</sup> and stabilisation, which is reflected by the fact that veterans were settled here<sup>145</sup>, but primarily by the huge military presence. The permanent stationing of the Roman army in Montana may have occurred as early as during Tiberius' reign in AD 26-27<sup>146</sup>. An inscription found in Išekli confirms the existence here of a *praesidium* built by the *cohors I Sugambrorum veterana* in AD 134<sup>147</sup>. In the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, a *vexillatio* was active in the vicinity of Montana composed of *legio I Italica*, *legio XI Claudia*, *classis Flavia Moesica* under the command of the tribune of *cohors I Cilicum*<sup>148</sup>, while in the period of Gordian III's reign – under that

---

<sup>140</sup> I. Cholakov, Ancient Economy South of the Lower Danube Limes (The Territory of Present-Day North Bulgaria) Based on Finds of Tools from the Period of the 1<sup>st</sup>-the Beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> C. AD, [in:] L.F. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov, S. Torbatov (eds.), The Lower Danube Roman Limes (1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> C. AD), Sofia 2012, p. 64, fig. 1.

<sup>141</sup> A. Hirt, Mines and Economic Integration of Provincial Frontiers in the Roman Principate, [in:] S.T. Roselaar (ed.), Processes of Cultural Change, p. 203.

<sup>142</sup> AE 1987, 881.

<sup>143</sup> L. Mrozewicz, Rozwój ustroju, pp. 73-74.

<sup>144</sup> About Montana see: V. Velkov, Montana (The Present-Day Mihailovgrad), [in:] idem, Roman Cities in Bulgaria. Collected Studies, Amsterdam 1980, pp. 85-101; N.B. Rankov, A Contribution to the Military and Administrative History of Montana, [in:] A.G. Poulter (ed.), Ancient Bulgaria. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria, 2, Nottingham 1983, pp. 40-73; B. Gerov, Landownership, pp. 102-107.

<sup>145</sup> CIL III 12378; CIL XVI 22; L. Mrozewicz, Rozwój ustroju, p. 18; B. Gerov, Landownership, p. 44; K. Królczyk, Veteranen in den Donauprovinzen der römischen Reiches (1.-3. Jh.n. Chr.), p. 93.

<sup>146</sup> N.B. Rankov, A Contribution, p. 40.

<sup>147</sup> AE 1927, 95; N.B. Rankov, A Contribution, p. 42.

<sup>148</sup> V. Velkov, G. Alexandrov, Venatio Caesariana. Eine Inschrift aus Montana (Moesia Inferior), Chiron 18, 1988, pp. 271-277.

of *cohors Gemina Dacorum*<sup>149</sup>. Thanks to the preserved inscription, it is attested that a *castrum* was erected in Montana in the mid-2<sup>nd</sup> century<sup>150</sup>. The period of Montana's greatest prosperity was achieved in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries AD. The area was administered through the agency of Roman soldiers. As in Upper Moesia, regions existed here that were subordinated directly to the control of the legionaries<sup>151</sup>. This primarily applied to the mining regions containing mineral deposits (copper, iron, lead, as well as gold and silver)<sup>152</sup>. The involvement of the army in the proper functioning of these areas is attested by the discovered inscriptions, listing such special posts as *beneficiarius consularis legionis I Italicae agens territorii Montanensium*<sup>153</sup>. Without a doubt, such special tasks were also executed at the command of the provincial governor, who expected the soldiers to not only ensure the security of the region and maintain public order, but also to perform various administrative duties<sup>154</sup>. Police functions were performed by the *centurio regionarius*<sup>155</sup>. In addition, cavalry units were also used to transport valuable ores, but primarily to patrol the area<sup>156</sup>. The *conductor publici portorii Illyrici* resided in the Montana region as the Illyrian customs stations were closely linked to the areas of ore extraction<sup>157</sup>.

## CONCLUSIONS

The borders of Lower Moesia were fully formed during Septimius Severus' reign. The province was fused together out of a variety of territories that the Romans had subjected to different integration strategies. In the north, along the Danube, the conquerors created tribal administrative districts (*civitates, territoria*). Simultaneously, in the vicinity of military centres, civil settlements began to form, which performed administrative roles, and with time some of them were granted the status of municipium and colonies (Oescus). In

<sup>149</sup> M. Binev, *Montana*, p. 165.

<sup>150</sup> CIL III 12376; M. Zahariade, N. Gudea, *The Fortifications*, p. 90.

<sup>151</sup> S. Dušanić, *The Economy of Imperial Domains and the Provincial Organization of Roman Illyricum*, *Godišnjak (Sarajevo)* 29, 1991, p. 48.

<sup>152</sup> S. Dušanić, *Aspects of Roman mining in Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia Superior*, *ANRW II* 6, 1977, p. 58; N.B. Rankov, *A Contribution*, p. 46.

<sup>153</sup> *Montana II*, 57.

<sup>154</sup> *Montana II* 1, 19, 35, 49, 56, 57, 95.

<sup>155</sup> *Montana II*, 39, 134; N.B. Rankov, *A Contribution*, p. 59.

<sup>156</sup> N.B. Rankov, *A Contribution*, p. 46.

<sup>157</sup> *AE* 1996, 1341; S. Dušanić, *The Economy*, p. 50.

Dobruja, the Romans regulated the administrative status of the Greek towns and initiated intensive colonisation in their vicinity, manifested through the founding of villages according to the Roman model. The so-called interior was extremely diversified. Before Nicopolis ad Istrum and Marcianopolis were founded, Thracian strategies were located here, administered by local aristocrats. Montana was subjected to military control due to its abundant natural wealth. From the very beginning, this area was under special military control and administrative management. Abrittus and its surroundings were poorly urbanized; however, the Romans recognized the enormous agricultural potential of this area and introduced imperial domains and land for tenants; thus, this became an area providing logistic support, provisions and resources for the army stationed in the Danube strip.

As a result, Lower Moesia, despite the quite small area it covered, was administratively cohesive, functioned efficiently, and consisted of regions that mutually supplemented each other's needs as each area performed a specific role. Initially, Lower Moesia was intensely militarized; however, the gradual addition of subsequent areas introduced a certain balance in these regards.

### Summary

Lower Moesia was amalgamated from territories whose degree of urbanization varied. The line of the Danube was dominated by the Roman army and civilian settlers who were associated with the army in one way or another. As for the interior of the province, there were the two major urban centres of Nicopolis ad Istrum and Marcianopolis, as well as Montana, Abrittus and environs of the present-day Šumen. The urban potential of eastern Lower Moesia stemmed from the existence of Greek cities, such as Olbia, Tyras, Histria, Tomis, Callatis, Dionysopolis, Odessos, which maintained their separate character, just as the area of Dobruja.

In each of those territories the Romans implemented a different strategy of integration. Along the Danube, Rome established tribal administrative districts (civitates, territoria). Simultaneously, civilian settlements sprang up in the vicinity of military encampments; in time, some of those were granted the status of municipium and colony (Oescus). In Dobruja, the Romans effected an administrative reorganization of the Greek cities and supported intensive colonization, whose most palpable and widespread manifestation was establishing villages which emulated the Roman pattern. The so-called interior represented a highly diverse area. Before Trajan initiated the construction of Nicopolis ad Istrum

and Marcianopolis, Thracian *strategiai* governed by local aristocrats were to be found there. Rome dissolved them gradually and pursued urbanization undertakings there. Having founded both of the aforesaid cities, the Romans opted for a Greek model of their development, realizing that it would be more culturally familiar to Thracians than the Roman one. The pace of integration depended on the interests of Rome itself. The economically valuable mining areas were where Roman influence was brought to bear in the first place. For this reason, Montana was promptly and entirely subordinated to military administration, in order to secure its natural resources. The regions of Abrittus and Šumen were poorly urbanized, but the Romans recognized their substantial agricultural potential (Šumen in particular) establishing a number of imperial domains and land estates for lease, which then became a highly efficient logistical base for the army stationed on the Danube.

In conclusion, although Lower Moesia was a relatively small province, stretching as it did along the Danube, it was a cohesive entity in terms of administration. Each part of the province played a particular role and proved to function in a manner that was complementary to the others.

#### Abbreviations

- AE = L'Année Épigraphique. Revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'Antiquité romaine, Paris, from 1888  
 AB = Archaeologia Bulgarica, Sofia  
 CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Berolini – Paris 1863-2006  
 Cass. Dio = L. Cassius Dio (Cocceianus), Historia Romana  
 Dio Cassius, Roman History, 1-9, transl. by E. Cary, Cambridge (Massachusetts)-London 1955  
 Conrad = Conrad S., Die Grabstelen aus Moesia inferior, Leipzig 2004  
 Dio Chrys. = Dio Chrysostom in five volumes, III, transl. by J.W. Cohoon, H. Lamar Crosby, London – Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1961  
 Eutropius = Eutropii Breviarium ab Urbe condita  
 Brewiaria dziejów rzymskich. Sektus Aureliusz Wiktor: Księga o Cezarach; Eutropiusz: Brewiarium od założenia Miasta; Festus: Brewiarium dziejów ludu rzymskiego, transl. by P. Nehring, B. Bibik, J. Skoracka, P. Woźniczka, Warszawa 2010  
 Fest.= Festus, Breviarium rerum gestarum populi Romani ad Valentinianum Augustum, Ad MM. SS. Codices Vaticanos, Chisianos, aliosque emendatum, Romae 1819  
 GSUFF = Godišnik na Sofijskija Universitet „Kliment Ohridski” Istoričeski Fakultet, Sofia  
 IGBulg = Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae, ed. by G. Mihailov, 1, Inscriptiones orae Ponti Euxini, Editio Altera Emendata, Serdicae 1970  
 Ior. Get.= Jordanes, Getica.  
 Iordanes, The Gothis History, ed. by C. Mierow, New York 1960  
 ISM = Inscriptiile din Scythia Minor grecești și latine = Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris graecae et latinae, I-III, V, București 1980-1999  
 Montana I = V. Velkov, Montana 1, Sofia 1987  
 Montana II = V. Velkov, G. Aleksandrov, Montana 2, Montana 1994  
 Ovid., Tristia = Publius Ovidius Naso, Tristia  
 Ovid, Tristia. Ex Ponto, transl. by A.L. Wheeler, Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1924

Plin. NH = C. Plini Secundi, *Naturalis Historiae*  
 Plini Secundi, *Naturalis Historiae*, libri XXXVII, I, Libri I-VI, ed. by C. Mayhoff, Lipsiae 1906  
 Ptol., Geogr. = Claudius Ptolemaeus, Stückelberger G. Grasshoff (ed.) *Ptolemaios – Handbuch der Geographie. Teilband: Einleitung und Buch 1-4*, Basel 2009  
 RMR = R.O., Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, London 1971  
 StEurGn= *Studia Europaea Gnesnensia*, Gniezno  
 ZPE= *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Köln

### Bibliography

- Ando C., *The Administration of the Provinces*, [in:] D. Potter (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, pp. 177-192.
- Barnea A., *Municipium Noviodunum*, *Peuce* X, 1, 1991, pp. 81-84.
- Batty R.M., *On Getic and Sarmatian Shores: Ovid's Account of the Danube Lands*, *Historia* 43, 1, 1994, pp. 88-111.
- Baumann V.H., *Ferma Romană din Dobrogea*, Tulcea 1983.
- Binev M., *Montana*, [in:] R. Ivanov (ed.), *Rimski i rannovizantijski selišta v Bălgarija*, 2, 2, Sofia 2003, pp. 160-182.
- Bojanov I., *Municipium Aurelium Durostorum or vicus Gavidina*, *AB* 14, 2, 2010, pp. 53-59.
- Bojanov I., *Oescus – from castra to colonia*, *AB* 12, 3, 2008, pp. 69-76.
- Boteva D., *The South Border of Lower Moesia from Hadrian to Septimius Severus*, [in:] P. Petrovič (ed.), *Roman Limes on the Lower Danube*, Belgrade 1996, pp. 173-176.
- Cătănciu J.B., *Dacia's Borders under Trajan's Rule – Remarks*, *Limes* XIX, pp. 723-733.
- Cholakov I., *Ancient Economy South of the Lower Danube Limes (The Territory of Present-Day North Bulgaria) Based on Finds of Tools from the Period of the 1<sup>st</sup> – the Beginning of the 7<sup>th</sup> C. AD*, [in:] L.F. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov, S. Torbatov (eds.), *The Lower Danube Roman Limes (1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> C. AD)*, Sofia 2012, pp. 63-81.
- Čičkova M., *La basilique et la nécropole paléochrétiennes extra muros (Mésie Inférieure)*, [in:] A. Biernacki, P. Pawlak (eds.), *Late Roman and Early Byzantine Cities on the Lower Danube from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 6<sup>th</sup> cent. AD*. International Conference. Poznań, Poland, 15-17 November 1995, Poznań, pp. 57-69.
- Conrad S., Stanev D., *Archaeological Survey on the Lower Danube: Results and Perspectives*, *Black Sea Studies* 4, 2006, pp. 309-331.
- Delev P., *Once More on the Thracian Strategies of Claudius Ptolemy*, *Sbornik v pamet na professor Velizar Velkov*, Sofia 2009, pp. 245-253.
- Dimitrov Z., *Stone Cutting in Moesia Superior and Inferior during the Roman Age* [online]. RGZM [access: 2017-02-05]. Available at: <[www2.rgz.m.de/Transformation/Bulgaria/Steinbearbeitung/PhfEnV2\\_03.htm](http://www2.rgz.m.de/Transformation/Bulgaria/Steinbearbeitung/PhfEnV2_03.htm)>.
- Dimitrova S., *The Military-Political and Diplomatic Activities of Burebista in the Lower Danube Region, Thracia* 17, 2007, pp. 159-172.
- Dinčev V., *Rimskite vili v dnešnata bălgarska teritorija*, Sofia 1997, pp. 115-119.
- Donevski P., *Kanabi na XI Klavdiev Legion*, [in:] R. Ivanov, G. Atanasov, P. Donevski (eds.), *Istoriya na Silistra. Antičnijat Durostorum*, Sofia 2006, pp. 186-227.
- Donevski P., *Zur Topographie von Durostorum*, *Germania* 68, 1, 1990, pp. 236-245.
- Doruțiu-Boilă E., *Über den Zeitpunkt der Verleihung des Municipalrechts in Scythia Minor*, *Dacia* 22, 1978, pp. 245-247.
- Duch M., *Economic role of the Roman army in the province of Lower Moesia (Moesia Inferior)*, Gniezno 2017.
- Duch M., *The Impact of Roman Army on Trade and Production in Lower Moesia (Moesia Inferior)*, *StEurGn* 11, 2015, pp. 235-260.
- Dušančić S., *Aspects of Roman mining in Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia and Moesia Superior*, *ANRW* II 6, 1977, pp. 52-94.



- Dušanić S., The Economy of Imperial Domains and the Provincial Organization of Roman Illyricum, *Godišnjak* (Sarajevo) 29, 1991, pp. 45-52.
- Dyczek P., Amfory rzymskie z obszaru dolnego Dunaju. Dystrybucja amfor i transportowanych w nich produktów w I-III w. po Chr., Warszawa 1999.
- Eck W., Die lex Troesmensium: ein Stadtgesetz für ein municipium civium Romanorum, *ZPE* 200, 2016, pp. 565-606.
- Gerov B., Die Grenzen der römischen Provinz Thracia bis zur Gründung des Aurelianischen Dakien, [in:] idem (ed.), *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien, Gesammelte Aufsätze, III*, Amsterdam 1998, pp. 437-467.
- Gerov, Die Rechtsstellung der untermösischen Stadt Novae, [in:] idem, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien, Gesammelte Aufsätze, I*, Amsterdam 1980, pp. 113-118.
- Gerov B., Zum Problem der Entstehung der römischen Städte am Unteren Donaulimes, [in:] idem, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der römischen Provinzen Moesien und Thrakien, Gesammelte Aufsätze, I*, Amsterdam 1980, pp. 349-359.
- Gerov B., Zum Problem der Strategien im römischen Thrakien, *Klio* 52, 1970, pp. 123-132.
- Gerov G., *Landownership in Roman Thracia and Moesia (1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Century)*, Amsterdam 1988.
- Hirt A., Mines and Economic Integration of Provincial Frontiers in the Roman Principate, [in:] S.T. Roselaar (ed.), *Processes of Cultural Change and Integration in the Roman World*, Leiden-Boston 2015, pp. 201-221.
- Ivanov R., Das römische Verteidigungssystem an der unteren Donau zwischen Dardania und Durostorum (Bulgarien) von Augustus bis Maurikios, *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 78, 1997, pp. 467-640.
- Ivanov R., The Roman Limes in Bulgaria (1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> C. AD), [in:] L. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov, S. Torbatov (eds.), *The Lower Danube Limes (1<sup>st</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> C. AD)*, Mainz 1997, pp. 23-42.
- Kolendo J., Aneksja Tracji za cesarza Klaudiusza, [in:] L. Mrozwicz, K. Iłski (eds.), *Studia Moesiaca 1*, Poznań 1994, pp. 87-100.
- Kolendo J., Miasta i terytoria, plemienne w prowincji Mezji Dolnej w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa, [in:] M. Jaczynowska, J. Wolski (eds.), *Prowincje rzymskie i ich znaczenie w ramach Imperium*, Wrocław 1976, pp. 45-67.
- Królczyk K., *Veteranen in den Donauprovinzen der römischen Reiches (1.-3. Jh.n. Chr.)*, Poznań 2009.
- Lazarenko I., The Southern Boundary of Terra Odessitanorum (1<sup>st</sup>-beginning of 2<sup>nd</sup> c.), *AB VI*, 1, 2002, pp. 45-57.
- Lemke M., Towards a military geography of Moesia inferior, [in:] L. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov (eds.), *Limes XXII. Proceedings of the XXII<sup>nd</sup> International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies held in Ruse, Bulgaria (September 2012)*, Sofia 2015, pp. 845-852.
- Matei-Popescu F., The Horrothesia of Dionysopolis and the Integration of the Western Pontic Greek Cities in the Roman Empire, [in:] V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca 2014, pp. 457-471.
- Mrozwicz L., *Arystokracja municypalna w rzymskich prowincjach nad Renem i Dunajem w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa*, Poznań 1989.
- Mrozwicz L., *Flawiusze nad Dunajem*, [in:] idem (ed.), *Studia Flaviana I*, Poznań 2010, pp. 67-79.
- Mrozwicz L., *Kaiser Claudius und die Donauländer*, *Eos* 87, 2000, pp. 295-310.
- Mrozwicz L., *Rozwój ustroju municypalnego a postępy romanizacji w Mezji Dolnej*, Poznań 1982.
- Mrozwicz L., *Ze studiów nad rolą canabae w procesie urbanizowania terenów pogranicza reńsko-dunajskiego w okresie wczesnego cesarstwa*, [in:] W. Pająkowski, L. Mrozwicz (eds.), *Balkanica Posnaniensia 3. Novae I kultura starożytna*, Poznań 1984, pp. 285-297.

- Musielak M., Społeczeństwo greckich miast zachodnich wybrzeży Morza Czarnego, Poznań 2003.
- Nemeti S., Bărbulescu M., Arcobadara, *Latomus* 69, 2010, pp. 446-456.
- Nenova R., Angelov A., A Rich Thracian's Grave from Marcianopolis, *AB* 3, 1999, pp. 49-59.
- Panaite A., Tropaeum Traiani, from Civitas to Municipium, a Hypothesis, [in:] A. Panaite, R. Cîrjan, C. Căpiță, *Moesica et Christiana. Studies in Honour of Professor Alexandru Barnea, Brăila* 2016, pp. 163-172.
- Parissaki M.G., Étude sur l'organisation administrative de la Thrace à l'époque romaine. L'histoire des stratégies, *Revue des Études Grecques*, 122, fasc. 2, Juillet-décembre 2009, pp. 319-357.
- Parnicki-Pudęłko S., Canabae Novae: problem lokalizacji, [in:] *Novae-Sektor Zachodni* 1976, 1978, Poznań 1981, pp. 201-204.
- Popov H., Urbanizacija vāv vātrešnite rajoni na Trakija i Ilirija: prez VI-I vek predi Hrista, Sofia 2002.
- Poulter A., Cataclysm on the Lower Danube: The Destruction of a Complex Roman Landscape [in:] Ch. Neil (ed.), *Landscapes of Change: Rural Evolutions in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Aldershot, Burlington 2004, pp. 225-254.
- Poulter A.G., Rural Communities (vici and komai) and their role in the organization of the limes of Moesia Inferior, [in:] W.S. Hanson, L.J.F. Keppie (eds.), *Roman frontier studies 1979: papers presented to the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*, Oxford 1980, pp. 729-744.
- Poulter A.G., Town and Country in Moesia Inferior, [in:] idem (ed.), *Ancient Bulgaria. Papers presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria*, Nottingham 1983, pp. 74-118.
- Press L., Sarnowski T., Novae, rzymska twierdza legionowa i miasto wczesnobizantyjskie nad dolnym Dunajem, *Novensia* 1, 1987, pp. 289-322.
- Rankov N.B., A Contribution to the Military and Administrative History of Montana, [in:] A.G. Poulter (ed.), *Ancient Bulgaria. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria*, 2, Nottingham 1983, pp. 40-73.
- Roselaar S.T., Introduction, [in:] eadem (ed.), *Processes of Cultural Change and Integration in the Roman World*, Leiden-Boston 2015, pp. 1-19.
- Rostovtzeff M.I., *The Social & Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1926.
- Ruscu L., Becoming Roman? Shifting Identities in the Western Pontic Greek Cities, [in:] *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca 2014, pp. 473-488.
- Ruscu L., On the praefectura orae maritimae on the western coast of the Black Sea, [in:] M.A. Janković, V.D. Mihailović, S. Babić (eds.), *The Edges of the Roman World*, Cambridge 2014, pp. 159-171.
- Ruscu L., On Nicopolis ad Istrum and Her Territory, *Historia* 56, 2, 2007, pp. 214-229.
- Sarnowski T., Pozamilitarne funkcje armii rzymskiej ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem jej roli w urbanizacji obszarów cesarstwa, *Meander* 9-10, 1987, pp. 439-448.
- Sarnowski T., Borders of the province and its changes [online]. RGZM [access: 2017-02-02]. Available at: <<https://www2.rgzm.de/transformation/home/FramesUK.cfmL>>.
- Sarnowski T., Origin of vici [online]. RGZM [access: 2017-02-02]. Available at: <[www2.rgzm.de/Transformation/Poland/StrPln02Pl.htm](http://www2.rgzm.de/Transformation/Poland/StrPln02Pl.htm)>.
- Sarnowski T., *Wojsko rzymskie w Mezji Dolnej i na północnym wybrzeżu Morza Czarnego*, Warszawa 1988.
- Sharankov S., Novi Danni za trakijskite stratezi, *Arhaeologija* LVI, 1-2, 2015, pp. 62-78.
- Slokoska L., Vladkova P., Turov I., Ivanov R., Nicopolis ad Istrum, [in:] R. Ivanov (ed.), *Rimski i Rannovizantijski gradove v Bālgarija. Studies in Memory of Prof. Teofil Ivanov*, 1, Sofia 2002, pp. 83-104.
- Stein A., *Die Legaten von Moesien*, Budapest 1940.

- Strobel K., *Untersuchungen zu den Dakerkriegen Trajans*, Bonn 1984.
- Suceveanu A., Zahariade M., *Du nom Antique de la cité romaine et romaine tardive d'Independența* (dep. de Tulcea), *Dacia* 31, 1987, pp. 87-96.
- Suceveanu A., Zahariade M., *Un nouveau 'vicus' sur le territoire de la Dobroudja romaine*, *Dacia* 30, 1986, pp. 109-120.
- Sultov B., *Ceramic Production on the Territory of Nicopolis ad Istrum (II-nd-IV-th Century)*, *Terra Antiqua Balcanica* 1, GSUFF 76/2, 1983 (1985).
- Syme R., *The Lower Danube under Trajan*, [in:] *idem*, *Danubian Papers*, Bucharest 1971, pp. 122-143.
- Syme R., *The Early History of Moesia*, [in:] *idem*, *The Provincial at Rome and Rome and the Balkans 80 BC-AD 14*, A. Birley (ed.), Exeter 1999, pp. 193-220.
- Tačeva M., *Die munizipalisierung in den Provinzen Moesia Superior und Moesia Inferior (Mitte des 2.-Mitte des 3. Jhs.)*, [in:] M. Mirkovič (ed.), *Römische Städte und Festungen an der Donau*, Beograd 2005, pp. 211-217.
- Tačeva M., *The Northern Border of the Thracia Province to the Severi (2. from Nicopolis ad Istrum to Odessos)*, *Thracia* 11, 1995, pp. 427-434.
- Tačeva M., *Trakijските Strategii i Trajanovata urbanizacija*, [in:] *eadem*, *Vlast i socium w rimska Trakija i Mizija*, Sofia 2000, pp. 32-47.
- Tomas A., *Inter Moesos et Thracas. The rural Hinterland of Novae in Lower Moesia (1st – 6th Centuries AD)*, Oxford 2016.
- Tomas A., *Living with the Army I. civil Settlements near Roman Legionary Fortresses in Lower Moesia*, Warszawa 2017.
- Velkov V., Alexandrov G., *Venatio Caesariana. Eine Inschrift aus Montana (Moesia Inferior)*, *Chiron* 18, 1988, pp. 271-277.
- Velkov V., *Montana (The Present-Day Mihailovgrad)*, [in:] *idem*, *Roman Cities in Bulgaria. Collected Studies*, Amsterdam 1980, pp. 85-101.
- Vladkova P., *Antičen proizvodstven centăr pri Pavlikeni (Dolna Mizija): plan na kompleksa, periodizacija i vidove keramični izdelija*, Veliko Tărново 2011.
- Vladkova P., *The Earliest Nicopolis ad Istrum*, [in:] *The Roman and Late Roman City*, Sofia 2002, pp. 30-34.
- Zahariade M., Gudea N., *The Fortifications of Lower Moesia (A.D. 86-275)*, Amsterdam 1997.

