

ДРАГАНА ГРБИЋ

ПЛЕМЕНСКЕ ЗАЈЕДНИЦЕ
У ИЛИРИКУ

ПРЕДУРБАНЕ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНЕ СТРУКТУРЕ
У РИМСКИМ ПРОВИНЦИЈАМА ИЗМЕЂУ ЈАДРАНА И ДУНАВА
(I–III ВЕК)



INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES
OF THE SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS
SPECIAL EDITIONS 125

DRAGANA GRBIĆ

TRIBAL COMMUNITIES
IN ILLYRICUM

PRE-URBAN ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES
IN THE ROMAN PROVINCES
BETWEEN THE ADRIATIC AND THE DANUBE
(FIRST-THIRD CENTURIES)

Editor in chief

DUŠAN T. BATAKOVIĆ

Director of the Institute for Balkan Studies SASA

BELGRADE 2014

БАЛКАНОЛОШКИ ИНСТИТУТ
СРПСКЕ АКАДЕМИЈЕ НАУКА И УМЕТНОСТИ
ПОСЕБНА ИЗДАЊА 125

ДРАГАНА ГРБИЋ

ПЛЕМЕНСКЕ ЗАЈЕДНИЦЕ У ИЛИРИКУ

ПРЕДУРБАНЕ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНЕ СТРУКТУРЕ
У РИМСКИМ ПРОВИНЦИЈАМА
ИЗМЕЂУ ЈАДРАНА И ДУНАВА
(I–III ВЕК)

Одговорни уредник
ДУШАН Т. БАТАКОВИЋ
директор Балканолошког института САНУ

БЕОГРАД 2014

Издавач

Балканолошки институт САНУ
Београд, Кнез Михаилова 35
<http://www.balkaninstitut.com>
E mail: balkinst@bi.sanu.ac.rs

Рецензенти

академик *Никола Тасић*
др *Светлана Лома*
др *Војин Недељковић*

Лектура

Весна Смиљанић Рангелов

Превод резимеа и индекс
Урош Рајчевић

Корица

Неда Петковић

Технички уредник
Кранислав Вранић

Штампа

Colorgrafx

Тираж

300

ISBN 978-86-7179-084-0

Књига је штампана у оквиру рада на пројекту Балканолошког института САНУ
„Друштво, духовно-материјална култура и комуникације у праисторији и раној
историји Балкана (№ 177012) захваљујући финансијској подршци Министарства
просвете, науке и технолошког развоја Републике Србије

С а д р ж а ј

Увод	11
1. ИЗВОРИ ЗА ПЕРЕГРИНЕ ЗАЈЕДНИЦЕ ИЛИРИКА	17
1.1. ПЛИНИЈЕ СТАРИЈИ. Географске књиге <i>Енциклопедије природе</i> као извор за административну историју царства	19
1.1.1. Плинијева поглавља о Илирику	20
1.1.1.1. Неколико спорних места код Плинија	29
1.1.2. Плинијеви извори за <i>civitates</i> Далмације и Паноније.	32
1.1.2.1. Варон.	35
1.1.2.2. Агрипина карта и Август	36
1.1.2.3. <i>Formulae provinciarum</i>	42
1.1.3. Историјски слојеви Плинијевог текста и спискови племенских заједница	45
1.1.4. Спискови перегриних заједница код Плинија Старијег	50
1.1.4.1. <i>Civitates quae fuerunt</i>	51
1.1.4.2. Перегрине заједнице у доба Принципата — формула из Августовог времена	51
1.2. ДРУГИ КЊИШКИ ИЗВОРИ ЗА ПЕРЕГРИНЕ ЗАЈЕДНИЦЕ ДАЛМАЦИЈЕ И ПАНОНИЈЕ	54
1.2.1. Апијан	56
1.2.2. Страбон	61
1.2.3. Клаудије Птолемеј	63
1.3. ОДНОС КЊИШКИХ И ЕПИГРАФСКИХ ИЗВОРА ЗА ПЕРЕГРИНЕ ЗАЈЕДНИЦЕ ДАЛМАЦИЈЕ И ПАНОНИЈЕ	68
2. <i>CIVITATES PEREGRINAE</i> ИЗ ПЛИНИЈЕВОГ СПИСКА	71
2.1. <i>CIVITATES</i> ДАЛМАЦИЈЕ	71
2.1.1. <i>Civitates</i> Скардонитанског конвента	72
2.1.1.1. <i>Civitas Iapodum</i>	72
Натписи 1–9	78
2.1.1.2. <i>Civitates Liburniae</i>	81
Натписи 10–13	87
2.1.2. <i>Civitates</i> Салонитанског конвента	89

2.1.2.1.	<i>Civitas Delmatarum</i>	89
	Натписи 14–46	104
2.1.2.2.	<i>Civitas Deurorum</i>	113
2.1.2.3.	<i>Civitas Ditionum</i>	115
	Натписи 47–49	119
2.1.2.4.	<i>Civitas Maezeorum</i>	120
	Натписи 50–57	123
2.1.2.5.	<i>Civitas Sardeatium</i>	126
	Натписи 58–64	130
2.1.3.	<i>Civites</i> Наронитанског конвента	133
2.1.3.1.	<i>Civitas Cerauniorum</i>	133
2.1.3.2.	<i>Civitas Daversorum</i>	134
	Натписи 65–66	137
2.1.3.3.	<i>Civitas Desitiatum</i>	139
	Натписи 67–70	143
2.1.3.4.	<i>Civitas Docleatium</i>	145
	Натписи 71–74	148
2.1.3.5.	<i>Civitas Deretinatorum</i>	149
	Натпис 75	150
2.1.3.6.	<i>Civitas Deraemistarum</i>	151
	Натпис 76	153
2.1.3.7.	<i>Civitas Dindariorum</i>	153
	Натпис 77	156
2.1.3.8.	<i>Civitas Glinditionum</i>	156
2.1.3.9.	<i>Civitas Melcumianorum</i>	158
	Натписи 78–79	161
2.1.3.10.	<i>Civitas Nare(n)siorum</i>	162
	Натписи 80–81	166
2.1.3.11.	<i>Civitas Scirtariorum</i>	167
	Натпис 82	168
2.1.3.12.	<i>Civitas Siculotarum</i>	169
2.1.3.13.	<i>Civitas Vardaeiorum</i>	170
2.2.	<i>CIVITATES</i> ПАНОНИЈЕ	173
2.2.1.	<i>Civitates</i> Паноније у Плинијевом списку	174
	Географски списак заједница Паноније	174
2.2.1.1.	<i>Civitas Serretum</i>	174
2.2.1.2.	<i>Civitas Serapillorum</i>	176
2.2.1.3.	<i>Civitas Iasorum</i>	177
	Натписи 83–85	182
2.2.1.4.	<i>Civitas Andizetum</i>	183
	Натписи 86–88	187
2.2.1.5.	<i>Civitas Colapianorum</i>	189
	Натписи 89–93	192
2.2.1.6.	<i>Civitas Breucorum</i>	194
	Натписи 94–104	199
	„Абецедна листа“ заједница Паноније	203

2.2.1.7. <i>Civitas Arviationum</i>	203
2.2.1.8. <i>Civitas Azaliorum</i>	204
Натписи 105–126.	209
2.2.1.9. <i>Civitas Amantinorum</i>	223
Натпис 127	226
2.2.1.10. <i>Civitas Belgitum</i>	227
2.2.1.11. <i>Civitas Catariorum</i>	227
2.2.1.12. <i>Civitas Cornacatium</i>	229
Натписи 128–132.	232
2.2.1.13. <i>Civitas Eraviscorum</i>	235
Натписи 133–184.	241
2.2.1.14. <i>Civitas Hercuniatium</i>	266
Натпис 185	267
2.2.1.15. <i>Civitas Latobicorum</i>	268
Натпис 186	271
2.2.1.16. <i>Civitas Oseriatium</i>	271
2.2.1.17. <i>Civitas Varcianorum</i>	272
Натписи 187–191.	274
2.2.2. <i>Civitates</i> у Панонији ван Плинијевог списка	276
2.2.2.1. <i>Civitas Boiorum</i>	276
Натписи 192–204	279
2.2.2.2. <i>Civitas Scordicorum</i>	285
Натписи 205–210	288
2.2.2.3. <i>Cives Cotini?</i>	291
3. УРЕЂЕЊЕ, ЖИВОТ И СУДБИНА ПЛЕМЕНСКИХ ЗАЈЕДНИЦА У ИЛИРИКУ У ДОБА ПРИНЦИПАТА	293
3.1. ФОРМИРАЊЕ ПЕРЕГРИНИХ ЗАЈЕДНИЦА И РИМСКА ПОЛИТИКА ПРЕМА ДОМАЋЕМ СТАНОВНИШТВУ	293
3.1.1. Дефинисање територија перегриних заједница.	298
3.1.2. Унутрашња организација перегриних заједница.	301
3.2. УПРАВА НАД ПЛЕМЕНСКИМ ЗАЈЕДНИЦАМА	306
3.2.1. Војна управа над племенским заједницама	306
3.2.2. Аутономија племенских заједница	308
3.3. МЕСТО ПЛЕМЕНСКИХ ЗАЈЕДНИЦА ДАЛМАЦИЈЕ И ПАНОНИЈЕ У ПРОЦЕСУ УРБАНИЗАЦИЈЕ	312
4. TRIBAL COMMUNITIES IN ILLYRICUM Pre-urban Administrative Structures in the Roman Provinces Between the Adriatic and the Danube	319
Appendix: Реципијенти војничких диплома из племенских заједница Далмације и Паноније	333
Конкорданце издања натписа	339
Места из античких писаца	342

ЛИТЕРАТУРА	345
Скраћенице	345
Издања текстова античких писаца	347
Библиографија	349
Индекс.	365
Илустрације	379

TRIBAL COMMUNITIES IN ILLYRICUM

Pre-urban Administrative Structures in the Roman Provinces Between the Adriatic and the Danube

S u m m a r y

This book represents an effort to supply, through a historical-epigraphic approach, an overview of data about the native communities (*civitates peregrinae*) in the Roman province of Illyricum during the Principate (first—third centuries AD), that is the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia which were created by the division of Illyricum after the Dalmatian-Pannonian uprising (AD 9). Today, this expansive area between the Adriatic and the Danube covers parts of Austria, Hungary, part of Slovenia, Croatia, Montenegro, parts of western Serbia and the north-western part of Albania.

The communities discussed here are communities of natives, organized based on their tribal structure, whose inhabitants belonged to the indigenous population and were chiefly of peregrine status — legally speaking, foreigners in the Roman state.¹ Some tribes (primarily in the maritime region) had a defined legal relationship with Rome since the time of the Republic, before Illyricum was formally organized as a province. The two most decisive stages in the transformation of tribes into peregrine *civitates* are Tiberius' Pannonian war (BC 12–9) and the restructuring of the province after the Dalmatian-Pannonian uprising (AD 6–9). A large number of tribes of the interior were conquered during the Pannonian war. Those tribes were consequently transformed into peregrine communities and the province of Illyricum was expanded to the banks of the Danube. After the Dalmatian-Pannonian uprising, caused by heavy taxation and mass recruitment, was quelled in AD 9, the province of Il-

¹ This kind of administrative form is marked by the term *civitas* with the ethnonym in genitive plural (e.g., *civitas Delmatarum*, *civitas Azaliorum*, *civitas Breucorum*, etc.) or simply the ethnonym in nominative plural (*Delmatae*, *Eravisci*). Scuhulten 1895, 515; Kornemann 1903, 301–302.

lyricum was divided into two provinces, later to be named Dalmatia and Pannonia.² Territories and borders of peregrine communities, now divided between two provinces, were also redefined. The system introduced at this time remained, in most cases, current during the whole Principate.

In consolidating the provinces, one of the priorities of the Roman administration was the organization of local populations. Organization here entails the forming of communities, delimiting their territories and imposing taxes. Although these *civitates* were organized based on their tribal structure and retained a certain degree of autonomy when dealing with internal matters, from the moment Roman rule was established they stopped being independent tribes and became *de facto* Roman administrative units. The primary goal of the Roman administration was to divide the indigenous population into administrative and legal units, which is the first step towards their integration. The transformation of free tribes into *civitates* entailed the establishment of rule within territorial units and the establishment of required institutions. They mainly fell under the category of *civitates stipendiariae* or *tributariae*, depending on whether they were communities in senatorial or imperial provinces, which is to say liable to pay taxes and subject to the interference of the governor.

The focus in this work is to situate in space and time all the native, non-Roman communities in Dalmatia and the Pannonias, whose existences is confirmed by evidence, and to create a corpus of communities of this area during the Principate. One of the crucial tasks in achieving this is determining, with the greatest possible precision, the exact position of peregrine communities and their territories. This is needed, firstly, to determine the geographic distribution of inscriptions for each community and, secondly, to be able to perceive the geopolitical and strategic logic of the Roman administration. Following from our first question is the issue of how the tribal communities were governed over. It is, further, important to determine their ethnic composition, a matter inextricably linked with their formation. Special attention is given to questions of the continuity, the transformation and the Romanization of tribal communities or, conversely, recognizing the absence of these processes. One of the central issues is the question of how long the communities existed as independent administrative units. Strictly speaking, the process of urbanization falls outside the scope of this book, however in certain places I have found it necessary to touch slightly upon the forming of towns on tribal territories and the complex issue of parallel existence of communities and towns, their mutual relations and, lastly, the matter of Latin rights of communities and towns formed on tribal territories.

² Pannonia was further divided into Upper and Lower Pannonia during the reign of Trajan.

Much has been written on the native population of the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia in scholarship concerned with political history, onomastics, the army, ore-mining, Romanization, urbanization and so on; little could have been said about the tribal communities of this region without the results of such studies. In the category of synthetic scholarship, the most important works are G. Alföldy's *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien* (1965),³ and A. Mócsy's *Die Bevölkerung von Pannonien bis zu den Markomannenkriegen* (1959).⁴ The main focus of these books is the Romanization of the indigenous populations of these provinces. They presented and interpreted the chief results of research at the time of their writing, and laid the foundations for further research. However, more than half a century has passed since these studies had first been published. Since then, a significant quantity of new epigraphic evidence has come to light, evidence which allows us to confirm or abandon some of the earlier premises, and to draw new conclusions as well. Furthermore, a more detailed analysis of Pliny's chapters demonstrates that some things might be interpreted differently than heretofore.

Of the ancient sources I have used, the greatest emphasis has been laid on epigraphic documents and chapters from book three of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* (*Naturalis historia*), which allow us to know with certainty the number of the communities and their names. The reason why these several chapters from Pliny's geographical books, which reflect mostly the situation in the first half of the first century AD, are a first-rate source for peregrine communities lies in the fact that Pliny used official documents. His "geographical books", in fact, present a rather important source for the way provinces were organized as well as for the status of provincial communities and towns, which is to say as a source for the ethnography and the provincial history of the Empire. Pliny provides lists of communities taken over from official documents, the provincial formulas (*formulae provinciarum*), making them for that reason a significant source for research of provincial communities and for administrative history in general. Therefore, in the case of Illyricum as well, Pliny's chapters are an important starting point in research of the issues concerning the indigenous populations of Dalmatia and Pannonia, and how these were integrated into the Roman state. The lists of communities this author provides testify to the existence of about fifty peregrine *civitates* in the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia. The majority of those communities have been epigraphically attested as well. In addition, with the support of epigraphy, their continued existence can be followed throughout the first three centuries after

³ J. J. Wilkes' capital monograph on the province of Dalmatia (1969) is firmly based on Alföldy's results and conclusions in regard to the native structures.

⁴ The monograph on Pannonia and Upper Moesia from 1974 chiefly sums up the results of his earlier book.

Christ, as can their life and the process of Romanization; or we can, on the other hand, observe some legal and administrative changes which might have affected them. Epigraphic evidence on native *civitates* is, chiefly, much younger than the lists of communities provided by Pliny. The lists themselves mostly reflect the situation from the time of Augustus. Data contemporary to the author — which might in turn have testified to a change in status of some of the communities up to the Flavian era — are almost completely absent from the chapters at hand or appear only in the form of a few scattered traces. A thorough analysis of all of the source material shows that most of the tribal communities from Pliny's lists are epigraphically attested. Only a few communities remain without epigraphic attestation, which might indicate that either they had not maintained their status as autonomous administrative units for long, or more likely that they merely left no trace behind them on account of their small populations which were, furthermore, likely only quite slightly Romanized, if they were Romanized at all.

The book is divided into three parts.

(§1) The first part discusses the sources that testify to the tribes in Dalmatia and Pannonia — the literary sources first and foremost. As already mentioned, the greatest focus is on Pliny's chapters from the third book of his *Natural History* (*NH* III 129–152, § 1.1; § 1.1.1) discussing these provinces. An analysis of these chapters should make it possible to date the information on the communities with greater precision and, to the extent that that is possible, link the groups of data with the sources they are derived from. In chapter § 1.1.1.1, I reconsider some places from Pliny's chapters which present with problems in the manuscript tradition, places which are nevertheless important for the identification of some tribes. In chapter § 1.1.2, I discuss the issues of Pliny's sources for the *civitates* of Dalmatia and Pannonia. Special attention is given to the most important sources: Varro (§ 1.1.2.1), Agrippa's map (§ 1.1.2.2.) and the *formulae provinciarum* (§1.1.2.3). Next, it was necessary to define more clearly the historical layers of the text (§ 1.1.4.) and, in these layers, separate the lists of peregrine communities as they were during the Principate (§ 1.1.4.2.) — which form part of my research in this study — from the historical layer reflecting the situation in the Republican era (§ 1.1.4.1.) — to which belong the names of communities Pliny mentions as *civitates quae fuerunt*. Lastly, I consider the important matter of identifying communities from Pliny's lists with tribes mentioned by other authors writing about the tribes and their communities in this region — Appian (§ 1.2.1), Strabo (§ 1.2.2) and Claudius Ptolemy (§ 1.2.3) — so that data derived from narrative sources can be compared with Pliny's records and epigraphic evidence (§ 1.3).

The second part, titled (§ 2), “*Civitates peregrinae* from Pliny's List”, discusses the peregrine communities of Dalmatia and Pannonia, and forms the core of the book. This whole part is conceived as a catalogue of peregrine com-

munities, including a catalogue of inscriptions (nos. 1–210). Their order follows Pliny’s lists. The communities of Dalmatia (§ 2.1) are, as in Pliny’s account, divided into three *conventus iuridici*: *conventus Scardonae* (§ 2.1.1), *conventus Salonae* (§ 2.1.2), and *conventus Naronae* (§2.1.3). The *civitates* of Pannonia (§ 2.2) are, then, divided into two categories: those that are mentioned by Pliny (§ 2.2.1) and those that are not but are otherwise attested (§ 2.2.2). The communities belonging to the first group are subdivided according to Pliny’s lists, which I have classified as a) the alphabetical list (*NH* III 147), and b) the geographical list (*NH* III 148).

The epigraphic texts are, for greater ease of use, grouped according to the *civitas* they relate to and are placed after certain chapters; I have also provided continuous numeration for them. The catalogue contains only the most important inscriptions: monuments that explicitly mention individual *civitates*; their organizational units; or individual members of communities whose *origo* is mentioned in the text; and, in smaller numbers as they are more rare, those monuments which can be securely linked to the community in question. In my research, I have also considered such monuments as were found in territories ascribed to specific communities, in order to analyze the ethnic origin and the legal status of their populations, their administrative organization and any changes that possibly affected them, including the creation of *municipia* with Roman or Latin rights in tribal territories, and so on. However, determining territorial borders is not always such an easy task. It is at times unclear whether inscriptions can and should be ascribed to a given community based on their geographical or chronological distribution. This is possible only when the text includes the name of the communities or the ethnicons, or if it can be otherwise safely confirmed that the place of discovery belongs to the *civitas* in question. I have, consequently, considered such inscriptions in my study but left them out of the catalogue.

(§ 3) The third part — “Organization, Life and Fate of Tribal Communities in Illyricum during the Principate” — contains my final reflexions. It is comprised of several synthetic chapters which concisely discuss the central issues relating to tribal communities in these provinces.

These conclusions can be briefly summarized as follows.

(§ 3.1) During the consolidation of the province, one of the priorities of the Roman administration was the organization of the local population. Organization here entails the forming of communities, delimiting their territories and imposing taxes. The chief goal was to place the indigenous population into an administrative and legal framework, which is the first step towards their integration into the Roman state. To transform free tribes into peregrine communities meant to establish rule within geographical units and to establish the required institutions within these administrative units, throughout the Roman province. While the *civitates* were indeed organized based on their tribal

structure and retained a certain degree of autonomy when dealing with internal matters, they stopped being tribes as soon as Roman rule had been established, and they became, instead, Roman administrative units. Some stages in the founding of peregrine communities are described by Tacitus (*Tac. Agric.* 21). In discussing Corbulo's efforts to organize the Frisians as a peregrine community, Tacitus, among other things, says: *senatum, magistratus, leges imposuit* (*Tac. Ann.* XI 19). Further, in *Agricola*, he describes the process of transforming native tribes into *civitates* in Britain, as well as their Romanization, which can be taken as a model for this mechanism. Examples can, of course, be found elsewhere as well.

All jurisdiction in the province was in the hands of the governor, and only matters of lesser importance could be resolved within the communities themselves. With this in mind, an important step in the organization of a provincial population was to introduce juridical districts — *conventus iuridici, iurisdictiones*. The seats of juridical districts were in towns, and they would be periodically visited by the governor so he could preside over trials and perform other duties concerning the petitions and requests of provincial communities, as well as some other tasks. Pliny the Elder testifies to the existence of *conventus iuridici* in three Spanish provinces, Dalmatia and Asia. They are further attested by epigraphic documents in several other provinces; nonetheless it is generally considered that they existed in all the provinces.

Members of the native communities were obliged to perform certain duties for the Roman state, including the payment of taxes, enlistment in military units, and others as well, depending on the circumstances: for example, working in the ore-mines and quarries, or maintaining the roads, the system of the *ripa* and so on. In some places the process of pacification went ahead without any disturbances, while in some cases severe measures had to be taken, such as confiscating tribal lands, displacements of the population, enforced recruitment, forced labour and so on. Concerning a systematic displacement of native peoples, one can point to the example of the dislocation of the *Ardiaei*, belonging to a period earlier than the one discussed here. According to the testimony of Strabo and Pliny, the population was reduced and moved into the interior, where they were forced to cultivate infertile soil. During the Principate they formed a rather minuscule peregrine community (§ 2.1.3.13.), whose territory in this period it is, furthermore, exceedingly difficult to locate. After the Dalmatian-Pannonian uprising was suppressed, the powerful tribe of the *Pirustae*, dwelling in the eastern part of Illyricum (*Liv.* XLV 26; *Vell. Pat.* II 115.1) did not have an autonomous community. Contrary to the opinions of Alföldy, Wilkes and others, namely that after Bato's revolt the *Pirustae* were broken up into three communities — the *Ceraunii* (§ 2.1.3.1), the *Scirtarii* (§ 2.1.3.11) and the *Siculotae* (§ 2.1.3.12) — their territory may in fact have been incorporated into the imperial domain in metalliferous eastern Dalmatia. Dis-

placement and forced labour befell other tribes, e.g. the tribe of the *Delmatae* who, however, preserved their autonomous *civitas*. In all probability, one ought to suppose a rather expansive area throughout which the *Delmatae* were displaced: for, besides the belt around the river Drina, and the extreme East of Dalmatia (§ 2.1.3.12, *civitas Siculotarum*), they were also moved into the region belonging to the *Desidiates*, which is to say to another area with thriving mining activity. It is evident that we should assume several stages of displacement during the first and second centuries AD. The *Pirustae*, the *Delmatae* and the *Sardeates* were transported into mining areas of Dacia throughout the second century, where they have left epigraphic evidence. Besides Dacia, we must assume that the *Delmatae* were present in the ore-mines of Upper Moesia as well. Undoubtedly, there had been other cases of such displacement of indigenous populations, albeit ones that have been less plainly documented.

It is, however, possible that some tribes could have been treated better than others since the very beginning. A more favourable treatment was dependent on the tribe's relationship, which is to say the tribal aristocracy's relationship, with Rome. That would seem to be the case with the *Eravisci* and *Azali*, judging, for instance, by the fact that they were allowed to mint coins with their ethnicon. They had been in a more favourable position compared to other tribes since the beginning of the first century; this state of affairs is confirmed by epigraphic evidence for this *civitas* as well, which retained its special status up to the end of the third century (§ 2.2.1.13). Further, Vespasian rewarded loyal populations of Pannonia, the ones that had supported him during the civil war of 68–69, with privileges in the form of citizenship and Latin rights, and by founding towns as well.

(§ 3.1.1) The demarcation of the borders of peregrine *civitates*, which covered a significant portion of the total provincial territory, was an important step: their territories had to be drawn into the cadastral plan (*forma provinciae*), which required that a taxable territory be surveyed and well-defined (cf. Hyg. 205L; P. Brunt, *JRS* 71, 1981, 171 = 345: *CIL* X 3852). Every *civitas* was taken to form a single unit, and the demarcation of individual peregrine communities was typically achieved by using the gromatic formula *ager per extremitatem mensura comprehensus*. This formula refers to surveying the terrain by its outer borders (Front. *De agr. qual.* I 4. *FIRA* 85).

Ethnic and tribal borders did not have to, as a rule, serve as the chief parameter in the division of the provincial land and the delimiting of the borders of territories. When demarcating borders, just as in other considerations, Romans were led by political and geostrategic reasons of a practical nature. Some tribes could be divided between several administrative units or, conversely, several tribes could be combined into a single community. Strabo (XIII 4. 12) testifies to such practices. In a passage that discusses organizing *conventus iuridici* in Asia, he says that Rome gave no heed to the original borders between

the tribes. With the establishment of peregrine *civitates* in the reorganization of the province after the Dalmatian-Pannonian uprising, there was a tendency to create larger territorial units by joining several disbanded autonomous *civitates* into a larger administrative unit on the one hand, while on the other we can clearly observe in some places a fragmentation of larger ethnic units into smaller communities. Opposing as these measures might appear at first blush, they are in fact governed by the same principle. The Romans generally tended to establish a system that would be as efficient as possible and would retain its vitality for as long as possible, which often entailed artificial divisions and was dependent on circumstances on the ground. Accordingly, two types of native communities can be discerned: (a) *civitates* created from tribes, containing whole ethnic groups; and (b) *civitates* created by a political intervention by the Roman state, with populations typically separated out of a larger ethnic group.

The reorganization of the provincial structures began immediately upon the quashing of the uprising in AD 9. Tiberius started to put things in order in the province but his efforts were interrupted by Augustus' death (Vell. Pat. II 123.1–2); for this reason he sent his son Drusus in his place (Vell. Pat. II 125.4; Tac. *Ann.* II 44.1; II 48.5). The greatest engagement in the matter of reorganization is traced to P. Cornelius Dolabella, who was the governor of Dalmatia during Tiberius' reign. It was during Dolabella's governorship (AD 14–21) that the cadastral plan was drawn up — the *forma Dolabelliana* (ILJug 874); some later governors would refer back to this plan when intervening in disputes between provincial communities.⁵ Many boundary inscriptions provide invaluable testimony to the delimiting of territories, and frequently to the internal structuring of the communities.

(§ 3.1.2) There were no significant alterations in the way of life of the tribal communities after Roman rule had been established. The changes brought on by *Romanitas* were usually slow to come, especially in places where a proper urban setting was lacking and where there was no greater outside influence. Native institutions in the communities indeed had Latin names, nevertheless they remained, in essence, indigenous.

It would do well, now, to consider the opinion that the social division within the communities of Dalmatia was *decuria-gens-civitas*, while in Pannonia it was *centuria-gens-civitas*. This opinion is founded on a combination of the information on *decuriae* from Pliny's list (Plin. *NH* III § 141–142) and several epigraphic documents. The fact remains that we cannot with full certainty say what Pliny's *decuriae* are supposed to denote. It is, in fact, less

⁵ Cf. § 2.4. In adjudicating such a lawsuit, the governor of the province would assign a *iudex* (*iudex datus...*), while the surveying was typically entrusted to a legionary centurion or to an auxiliary officer.

likely that these *decuriae* can be ascribed to an indigenous social division, as is assumed by some scholars. Considering the manner in which Pliny mentions tribal *civitates* of the two juridical districts of Dalmatia (*viribus discriptis in decurias*, Plin. *NH* III 142), the terms may in fact be designating the size of the free population in numbers, for fiscal and military purposes, and not as the social division of these tribes. A striking parallel to such comprehensive statistical data on communities given by Pliny is provided in his chapter which discusses the *conventus iuridici* of *Hispania Citerior* (Plin. *NH* III 28); there he gives the number of free people in individual communities: *hominum liberorum capitum tot*. The term *centuria*, mentioned in the inscription from Petrovac (no. 124) is more likely to stand for a *centuria* of hostages, rather than indicating the social division of Pannonian communities.

Regarding the issue of territorial organization of the peregrine communities themselves, epigraphic material testifies to the fact that the *civitates* in Illyrican provinces, as far as their internal territorial structure goes, were subdivided into smaller organizational units: *pagi*, *vici*, *castella*, just as in the other provinces. The names of individual settlements of all three types are known, as are their governing structures (e.g. *magistri vici*, *magistri pagi*, *princeps castelli*). While the whole territory of a given community was considered a single unit in its relationship with the state, first and foremost in the matter of taxes and other duties, the tribal territory nevertheless consisted of a series of smaller units, mainly rural ones. The form of territorial division in Dalmatia best attested is the *castellum*. Inscriptions mention inhabitants of numerous *castella* among the Delmatae: *Barizaniates*, *Lizaviates*, *Bariduum/Baridustae*, *castellum Plana*, *Osiniates*, *castellum Starva*, *Tariona/Tariotae*, and so on; among the *Docleatae*, *Salthua castellum* has been attested; among the *Desidiates*, *Hedum castellum*, and so on. The terms *regio* and *territorium* are used in the context of various territorial categories: tribal, urban, ore-mining, military, and so on. In connexion to peregrine communities, *territorium* has been attested in several inscriptions, although, apparently, it is not used as a *terminus technicus*.

(§ 3.2) In the first century AD, peregrine communities were placed under the control of Roman officers, the *praefecti civitatium*. This function was sometimes performed by legionary centurions or prefects of auxiliary units stationed on the territory of the *civitas* or in its vicinity. The principle governing the appointment of a prefect of a peregrine community, and the question of whether several communities in the same region would be under the control of the same prefect, are known to us only in the roughest of sketches. Based on the sources available, we can observe a number of alternate forms; however, very little can be said of the system which determined the selection of prefects. It is possible that the *praefecti civitatium* were appointed according to local needs. Numerous examples indicate that several peregrine communities, most often neighbouring ones, could be entrusted to the rule of a single prefect.

Such is the case, for instance, of Baebius Atticus who, as the *primus pilus* of the legion V *Macedonica* in the reign of Claudius, was the prefect of the peregrine *civitates Moesiae et Treballiae* in the neighbouring province of Moesia, and after that he was the prefect of the *civitatium in Alpibus Maritimis* (*CIL* V 1838 and 1839). His experience in governing over the peregrine communities in Moesia was clearly decisive in his appointment to the prefecture over the Alpine peregrine communities. Such prefecture is attested among the *Iapodes* and the *Liburni* in Dalmatia during the Dalmatian-Pannonian uprising. A single prefect is attested, *bello Batoniano*, as presiding over these two communities (no. 2). Further, we know that, during Nero's reign, a certain [---] *Marcellus* was the *praefectus civitatium* of the *Maezaei* and the *Daesidiates*, with the addition of another Dalmatian peregrine community — most likely of the *Melcumani* (no. 51). In Pannonia, a military prefecture is attested for the community of the *Colapiani*, governed over by a centurion of the *Legio XIII Gemina* (no. 89), a *L. Antonius Naso*; *L. Volcatius Primus* (no. 105, 106) was the *praefectus ripae Danuvii et civitatium Boiorum et Azaliorum* early in the Flavian epoch, which shows that Danubian peregrine communities were co-ordinated with the *ripa Danuvii*. It is generally assumed that military control over the native structures ceased by the end of the first century. A. Mócsy surmised that the cessation of military rule over peregrine communities of southern and western Pannonia was linked to the founding of towns under the Flavians. However, many of the communities never gained municipal status and remained peregrine. It would be advisable, then, to discuss the end of military rule over peregrine *civitates* somewhat more cautiously. While it is true that military prefects of communities are no longer featured in inscriptions in the Flavian era at the latest, the *civitates* for which prefects have been attested did not in fact change their status. The cessation of military control is most likely linked to socio-political circumstances in the province. As there was no longer any danger of insurrections, the tribal aristocracies remained loyal to the Roman administration. Aside from that, the large number of Italian colonists in regional urban centres, army veterans settled in the area, and the standing armies, all acted as a factor of Romanization of the indigenous structures. A continued mode of control can, however, be observed in the third century. In addition to military prefects, the peregrine communities of some areas might be entrusted to *centuriones regionarii* (nos. 107, 108, cf. § 3.2.1, Tab. 2); they were tasked with military and administrative supervision over an area (*regio*) which lacked civic institutions. These are attested in other provinces as well, in connexion to the governing of peregrine communities and civic structures in general.

After military prefects were no longer appointed to rule over the peregrine communities, governing was given over to a council of native chiefs (*principes*). The council members were chosen from the tribal aristocracy, loyal to the Roman administration. The council was entrusted with lower ranking

law-trials (*iure gentium*) and the internal organization of the community. They were, in addition, responsible for gathering taxes for their *civitas*, which was possibly the main task of this body.

The term used for the leaders of peregrine communities: *princeps, principes civitatis* is attested in all of the western provinces. Occasionally, native terminology is used instead of the Roman one, for instance in Gallic communities — *vergobret*. Some scholars have conjectured that among the Pannonian *Eravisci* (§ 2.2.1.13, no. 140) an *ar(e)m(agos)* is likely attested, however the restoration of that abbreviation is questionable. In the sources for Illyricum, this institution is generally marked by the word *princeps*, and only in the community of the *Iapodes* do we find a function named *praepositus* as well (cf. § 3.2.2, Table 3). A number of tribal chiefs of the *Iapodes* bear the title *princeps et praepositus Iapodum*; Alföldy (1965, 40–41) was of the opinion that *principes / praefecti* could preside over certain Iapodian settlements (πόλεις) or other organizational units, with a *praepositus* as their superior. The only parallel to this case is to be found among the *Scordisci*, where we have an attestation for one *T. Flavius Proculus* (no. 205), with his title of *princeps praefectus*. Judging by the epigraphic material, the nature of the function of the tribal *principes* was collegial. In the community of the *Azali* two chiefs of the community are attested: *Aurel(ii) Vegabius et Valentis* (no. 111); one document mentions two tribal *principes* for the community of the *Boii* (170): *Caledo Sammonis* and *Cobromarus Tosiae* (cf. § 3.2.2, Table 4a).

Inscriptions show that *principes* governed over individual settlements within the peregrine community (§ 2.1.2.1), as observed already in the example of the *Docleatae*, where we have attestation for *Agirrus Epicadi f. princeps k(astelli) Salthua(e)* (no. 72). G. Alföldy (1965, 177) offered a similar inference for the community of the *Iapodes*, concluding that *praepositi* may have presided over a body formed by the *principes*.

In the matter of the citizenship status of the tribal aristocracy, monuments show that some *principes* would indeed be awarded Roman citizenship, while the names of some chiefs are written in their peregrine forms. Most of the native chiefs who were also Roman citizens bear the imperial gentile name (*Flavius, Cocceius, Ulpus, Aelius, Aurelius*). In the majority of cases those are individuals who had been awarded Roman citizenship.

Regarding this, we should mention the important military diploma dated April 5th, 71 (no. 170), issued to the centurion *Velagenus Covionis f.* from the tribe of the *Eravisci*. Among the signed witnesses of the diploma, there are five *principes* of Pannonian peregrine communities of the *Iasi, Andizeti, Brueci* and *Boii*: (1) *T. Flavi Sereni princ(ipis) Iasorum*, (2) *Licconis Davi f. princ(ipis) Breucorum*; (3) *Caledonis Sammonis f. princ(ipis) Boiorum*; (4) *Cobromari Tosiae f. princ(ipis) Boioru<m>*; (5) *Breuci Istickani f. princ(ipis) Antizit(ium)*. Of the five chiefs mentioned in the document, only the *princeps* of the community

of the *Iasi* bears *tria nomina*, while the names of the other tribal leaders are all peregrine. The fact that the *testes* of this diploma are not Roman citizens places this document among the special cases. One of the two native chiefs of the *Boii* community who signed the diploma is attested on a number of epigraphic monuments from the home territory of his own community. In these monuments our *Cobromarus Tosiae f.* is remembered as *T. Flavius Cobromarus*, which is to say a person with Roman citizenship; members of his family were, however, still *peregrini* (§ 2.2.2.1). It is a conceivable inference that the other chiefs were individually awarded Roman citizenship when they testified, as a reward for their support to the Flavian party.

(§ 3.3) Romanization is the process of acculturation of an indigenous population through different mechanisms, and it influences all spheres of life, including spiritual and material culture. The impact of Romanization can be observed in the knowledge and use of the Latin language, the acceptance of Roman cults, adjusting names to correspond to Roman naming conventions, adopting an epigraphic habit and, finally, in the process of urbanization. This process did not evolve everywhere at the same rate; accordingly, its results differed in different areas, which we must ascribe to local circumstances. The social level and the level of political structuring were not equal among all the tribes which were transformed into *civitates* in the first century. One must first presuppose social, economic, military and other reasons, all of which acted as a Romanizing influence on the indigenous population. It is worth repeating Sherwin-White's (1973, 222) statement that: "Loyalty to Rome is marked in the West and in the Danubian provinces by a process which, though commonly called Romanization, is really self-Romanization".

Reasons to preserve tribal communities and the peregrine status of the populations could be many. First of all, we can assume one of those reasons was the mobilization of peregrines for the *auxilia*. Further, various economic interests may have been in play, especially when it concerns finding the appropriate workforce for labour in the ore-mines. There are a number of important, general preconditions for one peregrine community to attain municipal status. The first condition was the existence of a settlement of an urban type; next, the presence of a higher, Romanized indigenous social class, which was capable, with its numbers and its finances, to form the urban aristocracy, which is to say to participate in the civic government; and, lastly, a sufficient number of Roman citizens, a significant number of whom ought to be settlers. The support of patrons could also be an important factor among the successful petitions. A preparatory adaptation stage was necessary first. At the beginning of the first century, these conditions were fulfilled only by communities in Liburnia; consequently, many peregrine *civitates* in this area were granted municipal status already in the first century. When it comes to Pannonia, however, in the first century urban structures existed only on the western and southern

edges of Pannonia — areas with the greatest traffic and communications, and larger concentrations of Roman settlers. The proximity of a settlement to waterways was another important factor in its socio-economic development and urbanization. One wave of municipalization occurred during the reign of the Flavians. The sheer number of the *municipia Aelia* speaks to the importance of Hadrian for the urbanization of the province; according to available information, he founded eight *municipia* in Pannonia, which is not necessarily the final number (three of those *municipia* were attested only in the second half of the previous century). The founding of several towns in Dalmatia can also be traced back to this emperor's reign. Several towns were founded during the reign of Marcus Aurelius and emperors of the Severan dynasty.

A town founded on the territory of any given tribal *civitas* need not incorporate the whole community. It is wholly conceivable that smaller communities could be integrated whole. However, this cannot be taken to be a strict rule, as is further implied in the cases of some smaller communities which, in all likelihood, did not change their administrative status. Epigraphic material suggests that, in a great number of cases, the *civitas* continued to exist while only part of the tribal territory was taken from the community and joined to the civic unit. For instance, the territory belonging to the community of the *Delmatae*, which covered a rather expansive area, saw the founding of multiple towns: *Rider*, *Delimnium*, *Salvium*, *Mangum*. They were formed by the urbanization of individual settlements in the tribal territory, and probably fulfilled the conditions for municipal status by being awarded Latin rights. Epigraphic monuments originating from the territories of these towns show that the native element formed the majority of the population, a great number of whom did not possess Roman citizenship. The tribal territory of the *Iapodes* was fragmented in much the same way, creating several *municipia*: *Metulum*, *Arupium* and perhaps *Raetinum*; however, information on them is quite scarce. The territory of the *Iasi*, possibly in the reign of Hadrian, saw the founding of the *municipium Iasorum*. From the thermal springs located near the settlement was created the *municipium Aquae*, on the territory of the *Daesidiates* in Dalmatia (§ 2.1.3.3). There are no clear indications, for either town, on whether the urban territory encompassed the whole peregrine community. However, urbanization did not necessarily entail the dissolution of the peregrine community. Epigraphic evidence indicates that most peregrine communities were maintained after the towns were founded, which is to say that they were not incorporated into the newly founded *municipia*. More recent epigraphic testimonies (largely military diplomas, which are official documents that, furthermore, allow reliable dating) shows that some communities indeed still existed after the founding of towns on their territories or in their immediate vicinity; these towns were previously thought to have encompassed the neighbouring tribal *civitates*. For example, the community of the *Andizetes* is epigraphically

attested in AD 154, while the colony of *Mursa* was founded already in the reign of Hadrian (*CIL* III 3279 = 10260. Steph. Byz. 458). *Civitas Boiorum* is attested in the year AD 145, during the reign of Antoninus Pius, which is also a later date than the time when the towns surrounding it were founded (§ 2.2.2.1). A document was recently discovered which extends the *terminus ad quem* for the existence of the community of the *Scordisci* to AD 146, that is after the presumed founding-date of the *municipium* of *Bassianae*, also occurring during Hadrian's reign (§ 2.2.2.2). The community of the *Breuci* (§ 2.2.1.6) was also likely preserved, though diminished, since it is difficult to imagine that *Cibalae* covered the whole territory of the community, which appears to have been rather vast. In addition, the community of the *Cornacates* still existed in the middle of the second century. The *civitas Eraviscorum* is epigraphically attested throughout the third century.

All these examples speak to the continued existence of *civitates* in this area. After the founding of towns, tribal communities might have been left with reduced territories, but they would continue to exist as administrative and political units. It can be safely assumed that this was the case also with numerous communities which cannot be linked to any sort of urban structure. Their administrative status did not change after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, at a time when the significance of the sharp contrast between towns of differing legal statuses had already begun to fade.

In conclusion, it would do well to note that this topic, by its very nature complex and extensive, in many ways exceeds the more modest limits imposed on this book. Many questions and problems were left aside so that the results of the main direction of my research could be presented as succinctly and effectively as possible. Hopefully, the documentation collected for these purposes, as well as the book itself — whatever its limitations — will prove themselves useful in further research.