Studies in the roman province of Dalmatia

Wilkes, J. J.

STUDIES IN THE ROMAN PROVINCE OF DALMATIA

Thesis submitted to the University of Durham

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

J.J. Wilkes

St. Cuthbert's Society

Volume One.

April 1962

This study was undertaken while the author held a Ministry of Education State Studentship at the Department of Archaeology in Durham and, since October 1961, a Research Fellowship in the University of Birmingham.

I would like to record my debt of gratitude to my supervisor Professor Eric Birley and Dr. J.C. Mann of the Department of Archaeology in Durham.

In the Spring and early Summer of 1960 I spent some time travelling in Yugoslavia, and here I would like to thank some of the many people who helped me to carry out my research. In particular I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Grga Novak, President of the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences in Zagreb; Professor D. Rendić-Miočević and Mr. M. Zaninović of the University of Zagreb; Dr. Esad Pašalić of the University of Sarajevo; Dr. Dimitri Sergejevski and Miss Irma Čremošnik of the Museum in Sarajevo; Dr. B. Gabričević and Dr. N. Nikolanc of the Archaeological Museum in Split; Dr. M. Suić of the Museum and Historical Faculty in Zadar. Without the generous co-operation of many of the above it would have proved impossible for me to have visited many of the key sites in Dalmatia which lie far away from public transport routes. On this point especially, I would like to thank the Secretaries of the Communes of Zadar and Sinj for placing vehicles at my disposal.

For assistance in the preparation of this thesis I would like to acknowledge the help of Mr. C.D.N. Costa and

Dr. J.D. Eshelby of the University of Birmingham, and Miss Christine Pittam of the University Library in Birmingham for undertaking the typing.

The absence of a map calls for explanation. For points of topography only detailed maps of the largest scale would be of any value. However, all the places referred to are recorded on Kiepert's map in CIL III (suppl ii taf. VI), and in the very few instances where this is not the case more precise details of location with regard to neighbouring centres are given.

CONTENTS Volume I

Volume II

Abbreviations

AA4	Archaeologia Aeliana (fourth series), Newcastle upon Tyne.
AE	L' Année Épigraphique, Paries.
AEM	Archaeologische-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn, Vienna.
Arch.	Archaeologia, London.
Arch. Iug.	Archaeologia Iugoslavica, Belgrade.
BD	Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata, Split; after 1927 Vjesnik, see below.
B. Jhb.	Bonner Jahrbuch, Bonn.
Ber. RGK	Berichte der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission. Frankfurt am Main/Berlin.
CAH	Cambridge Ancient History.
CIG	Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, Berlin.
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Berlin; volumes in this series are cited by Roman numerals and the prefix CIL is usually omitted.
CQ	Classical Quarterly.
EE	Ephemeris Epigraphica, Berlin.
FHG	Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, ed. C. Müller.
FS	Forschungen in Salona I (1917 ed. Gerber), II (1926 ed. R. Egger), Vienna.
GGM	Geographici Graeci Minores, ed. C. Müller.
Glasnik	Glasnik Zemalskog Muzeja u Sarajevo, Sarajevo; old

	series until 1943, new series (cited NS) commencing 1945.
Holder	Altceltischer Sprachschatz, A. Holder, Leipzig, 1896.
HN2	Historia Nummorum, B.V. Head, second ed. 1912.
IGR	Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes, ed. R. Cagnat, Paris, 1901-21.
ILS	Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, ed, H. Dessau, 1892-1916.
Inscr. It.	Inscriptiones Italiae.
It. Ant.	Itinerarium Antoninianum, ed. O. Cuntz, 1927.
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies.
Jhb A.	Jahrbuch für Altertumskunde, Vienna.
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies.
MRR	The Magistrates of the Roman Republic, ed. T.R.S. Broughton, two vols. 1951-2.
Not. Scav.	Notizie degli Scavi di Antichita, Rome.
Num. Chron.	Numismatic Chronicle.
ÖJh	Jahreshefte des Österreichischen archaeologischen Instituts, Vienna.
Peutinger	Die Peutingersche Tafel, ed. K. Miller, Stuttgart, 1916.
PIR	Prosopographia Imperii Romani, ed. Dessau, Klebs, v. Rohden, 1897-8.
PIR2	Prosopographia Imperii Romani, second edition, ed. E. Groag, A. Stein and others (now A-H), 1933-.

RE — Pauly-Wissowa (Kroll-Mittelhavs-Ziegler), Realencyclopädie.

Réch. Salon. — Récherches à Salona, I (1928), II (1933), Copenhagen.

Spomenik — Srpska Kraljevska Academija Spomenik, Belgrade.

Strena Buliciana — Strena Buliciana (Festschrift for F. Bulić), Split/Zagreb, 1924.

Vjesnik — Vjesnik za Archeologiu i Historiju Dalmatinsku, Split, 1927- (formerly BD q.v.).

WMBH — Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und Herzegowina, Sarajevo/Vienna 1893-1913.

Ztschr. f. Numism. — Zeitschrift für Numismatik.

Chapter I: The Greek background of Illyria

A good indication of the extent of Greek influence in Illyria before the known period of active colonisation is the evidence for trade which we possess in the literary and archaeological sources. On the whole the general nature and quantity of this evidence suggests great caution in estimating the position of Greeks in the area before the fourth century. This applies particularly to the literary evidence for trade in the early period.

Theopompus, writing in the middle of the fourth century, records a tradition that pottery from Chios and Thasos was found in the bed of the river Naro, while a pseudo-Aristotelian source mentions an emporion in the Adriatic to which merchants came from as far away as Pontus (1). The evidence of Theopompus must be considered suspect, since it was clearly an item of information which he used to support his belief that at some point the Adriatic and the Black Sea were connected or at least came very close to one another. Following a suggestion of Evans, Casson seems to have accepted that Greek imports reached the hinterland of Illyria by a transpeninsular route via the Danube valley, rather than by sea and then inland from the Adriatic coast. Apart from these two sources the evidence for such a trade route is almost non-existent. In support of the route, Casson mentioned the discovery of silver coins of Thasos and Paeonia at Janjevo in Old Serbia between Niš and the valley of the Albanian Drin. As Beaumont notes, the Paeonian coins can mean nothing since Paeonia itself is not far away, while the Thasian are far more likely to

have arrived via the Vardar and Morava route than from the Adriatic or Pontus. The story of Theopompus, hardly believed by Strabo who records it, is totally unsupported by any archaeological evidence from Illyria. The idea of the underground river may however be taken from observation of the behaviour of rivers in the karst country of the Dalmatian hinterland, where it is by no means uncommon for a river to disappear into the ground and reappear on the other side of a ridge of mountains (2).

Greek trading activity appears to have begun along the Dalmatian coast during the earlier part of the sixth century; small quantities of Corinthian pottery are found on the islands, while imported Greek weapons and helmets, mostly assignable to the fifth century, are known from the region of the river Naro. Other examples are known from Brač, Trogir and the Lika in the far north of the region (3).

The principal route from the coast into the interior of Bosnia through the gorge of the Naro to the north of Mostar is not an easy one, although an alternative route into the Sarajevo region exists via Nevesinje. Greek imports are known from the interior but we cannot be certain whether the Greek traders were able themselves to penetrate to the region, or whether the traffic was in the hands of middlemen. Objects of Greek manufacture found in the interior include helmets from Glasinac (s. of Sarajevo), Donja Dolina and Gorica on the Save, while bronze greaves come from Sanskimost in the Sana valley, From Glasinac and Gačko in Hercegovina come rings of silver and bronze showing undoubted traces

of Hellenic workmanship. In return for these imports the Illyrians could provide cattle, corn and salt, commodities which were valuable to settlers on the islands (4).

The undoubted evidence of Greek trading along the Illyrian coast convinced Beaumont that there existed small trading settlements on the islands as early as the sixth century, although the only settlement of which any record has survived is the Cnidian foundation on Corcyra Melaina. Indeed he went further and suggested that all the Greek settlements may well have been in existence long before the traditional date of their foundation in the fourth century. He concludes, "Some of the names mentioned below may be those of fourth-century settlements, but the majority were in all likelihood founded earlier, when the Adriatic trade was more important. If there is no reason to favour any other date, the late sixth or early fifth century is most probable" (5). To complement this view of the course of Greek settlement in Dalmatia Beaumont devotes an appendix to an attack on the traditional view that the burst of it in the early fourth century along the Illyrian coast was due almost entirely to the activities of the tyrant Dionysius I of Syracuse. This problem is treated in a following section but the value of the pre-fourth century imports of Greek objects as evidence of permanent settlements on the islands is doubtful. Weapons and helmets, items highly prized in any primitive society, are quite likely to have been brought over large distances and cannot be considered valid evidence for such permanent settlement on the islands. What is needed is pottery in fairly large quantities and this is not to be found; after an

exhaustive search Beaumont could only note a dozen or so items of pre-fourth century imported Greek pottery (6). In the opinion of the writer it is going beyond the evidence to regard the later colonies as having arisen from earlier trading settlements founded as early as the sixth century. Certainly more excavation is needed on the sites of the Greek cities and until our knowledge of their history is increased by such discoveries we must be content to admit ignorance concerning the earliest occurrence of permanent Greek settlement in the region.

The earliest Greek settlement along the Dalmatian coast of which we have definite record in our literary sources is that of a Cnidian colony on Corcyra Melaina (mod. Korčula), so-called because of its thick sub-tropical vegetation and to distinguish it from its more famous namesake to the south (Corfu). Early in the sixth century the Cnidians placed the Corcyraeans in their debt by saving some 300 boys from the cruel vengeance of Periander the tyrant of Corinth (7). The resulting friendship between the two states was confirmed by a Cnidian colonising venture in the Adriatic during the early years of the sixth century (8). The name of Corcyra, probably taken in honour of the colony's patron, may also indicate that a certain proportion of the colonists was from Corcyra. The site of the Cnidian foundation is quite uncertain. Most of the island is rocky and covered with pine forest and there are only three places where any land exists sufficient to support a settlement. The modern town of Korčula is situated at the NE. corner of the island commanding the narrow strait between the island and the mainland peninsula of Pelješac, and is situated on

the main N-S. shipping route through the islands. The site of the city, a small peninsula with two excellent harbours, is ideal for a Greek colony. If the settlement was made with the intention of providing a port of call for traders travelling N. along the Dalmatian coast, then no better site exists on the island. Up to the present time, however, no archaeological discoveries have been made to support the location of any Greek settlement at Korčula itself. Another excellent site for a city is Lumbarda at the SE. of the island, some five miles from the city of Korčula, where the Issaeans settled a colony in the fourth century. Here also a harbour exists that would have served a Greek city. The Issaean settlement at Lumbarda complicates the location of the Cnidian since, while it is most unlikely that two cities existed so close to each other, it is not impossible that the Issaean settlement was merely reinforcement of the old Cnidian city. The land at Lumbarda was the property of a family of Pullus and Dazus when the agreement with Issa was drawn up (9) and they may well have been descendents of the old Cnidian colonists. The third possible site for a colony on Corcyra Melaina exists at Velaluka at the W. end of the island. There are no traces of any ancient remains, although in the nineteenth century a pot was discovered which Beaumont believed to be Corinthian (10). The area can support a far greater population than either Lumbarda or Korčula, as in fact it does today. The most important evidence for the location of the Cnidian settlement at Velaluka is the evidence from the coinage. The

fourth century coinage of Corcyra Melaina bearing the legend KOPKUPAIΩN carries an ear of corn upon it; the only place on the island where corn can be grown is on the wide plain at the W. end in the region of Velaluka and Blato (11).

The course of Greek colonisation along the Illyrian coast in the early fourth century is bound up with activities of Dionysius I of Syracuse in the whole of the Adriatic. The traditional view has been that almost all the Greek cities along the Dalmatian coast owed their existence to the ambitions of the Sicilian tyrant. From this belief was drawn the conclusion that until the intervention of Dionysius little or no colonisation had taken place in the region. Beaumont, whose main thesis is that the volume of known trade with the Adriatic is sufficient to establish the existence of Greek trading settlements along the Illyrian coast, strongly challenges the traditional view that the policy of Dionysius was all-important and in fact directly responsible for the Greek colonies of the early fourth century (12).

Diodorus, who is our sole historical source, records under the year 385 B.C. that Dionysius of Syracuse decided to settle cities in the Adriatic sea in order to gain control over the Ionian sea, thus safeguarding the route to Epirus and to provide harbours in the region for his own ships. As part of this policy of expansion of his influence in Epirus he dispatched aid in the form of weapons and armour to the Illyrians, who were at war with the Epirote Molossians. At the same time that these events were

taking place, continues Diodorus, the Parians acting in accordance with an oracle, sent a colony to the Adriatic and with the co-operation of Dionysius settled it on the island of Pharos (mod. Hvar). He then remarks that 'not many years previously' Dionysius himself had sent a colony to the Adriatic and founded a city at Lissus. Under the heading of the following year Diodorus adds some detail on the fortunes of the Parian settlers on Pharos. The natives on Pharos, who had been allowed by the Greeks to remain in their stronghold on the island, took offence at the presence of the Greeks and called for help against them from the Illyrians on the mainland; these crossed to the island in their small boats and slew many Greeks until Dionysius' governor at Lissus sailed against them with triremes and defeated them, taking many prisoners (13).

The traditional view involves the emendation of the text of Diodorus at two separate points and interprets the passages as referring to the colonisation by Dionysius of Issa (mod. Vis, Italian Lissa, the outermost of the central group of Illyrian islands) rather than Lissus (Albanian Lesh, Italian Alessio, at the mouth of the Albanian Black Drin). It has been put thus by Bury, 'It was the ambition of Dionysius to make his influence supreme in the Adriatic and make it a source of revenue by collecting dues from all ships sailing in the gulf, ... the great work of Dionysius was to found Issa and Pharos on neighbouring islands; Syracusan colonists were planted on Issa, and Pharos is said to have been a Parian colony under the auspices of Dionysius' (14). Beaumont

believed that an equally good case could be made for accepting the reading of Diodorus, namely, that Dionysius' settlement was at Lissus at the mouth of the Drin. He believed that a preference for Issa on the grounds that help for the Parians on Pharos could have come ~~from~~ far more easily from Issa than from Lissus, far to the south, is dependent on proving the case than Dionysius had plans to control the Adriatic. On the other hand, he believed that a foundation at Lissus was far more in keeping with Dionysius' known objective of controlling the Ionian Sea and in addition would furnish a good base for his schemes on the mainland of Epirus. He further adds that Dionysius probably merely sent an eparch and some mercenaries to control an already existing settlement at Lissus, and that the intervention on behalf of the Parians on Pharos was personal initiative on the part of the governor (15). In spite of the plausibility of Beaumont's arguments on the Adriatic enterprise of Dionysius as a whole, especially with his supposed settlements on the Italian coast, formidable difficulties exist which remain unexplained by his solution. Issa was a Syracusan colony which was almost certainly in existence at the time of the colonisation of Pharos, although no traditional date is known for its foundation (16). Beaumont believed it to be a fifth century foundation, probably as an indirect result of stasis. It is very difficult to understand why no mention of this thriving city occurs in our source (accepting of course Diodorus as he stands) when Dionysius settles Parians on a neighbouring island and sends his fleet to help them when they are in difficulties with the

Illyrians. Certainly in the course of the fourth century Issa settled a colony of her own on Corcyra; it may be that she was compelled to go there rather than to the more obvious Pharos where the land was occupied by the Parians under the aegis of Dionysius. Could it be that the Parians were intended to reduce the influence of Issa which was little disposed to be a satellite of the tyrant in the metropolis? On these grounds we are justified in examining very carefully the text of Diodorus and giving serious consideration to the old emendation, which would solve the problem by making Issa a foundation, or possible a conquest by mercenaries, of Dionysius. Secondly the immediate context, with the reference to the foundation made a few years before at Lissus (or Issa), is the Parian settlement on Pharos rather than any enterprise in Epirus. The manner in which Diodorus makes the passing reference suggests that it was in the immediate vicinity of Pharos.

Whatever plans Dionysius did or did not have in the area there is clear evidence of strong Syracusan influence in the two principal cities of the Dalmatian coast, most notably in the coins which both minted in the fourth century (17). Further details of the history and economy of the cities can only be supplied by further archaeological investigation on the sites.

Until the period of Roman intervention on the E. shore of the Adriatic we have no records of the fortunes of the Greek states along the Dalmatian coast after the initial surge of settlement in the early fourth century. Indeed the only record that they were able to survive and even to prosper consists of the coin-series minted by the two principal states, Issa and Pharos. The coinage of Corcyra Melaina, mentioned above, is most probably assignable to the Cnidian foundation there and is the earliest Greek coinage known from the area. The quantity of inscriptions belonging to the pre-Roman period from the two islands of Issa and Pharos is not large, and for the most part consists of family tombstones bearing lists of names with patronyms. In the case of Pharos there has been found part of a decree which may well belong to the earliest years of the city (18).

According to Diodorus, the Parian colonists met with opposition from the natives on the island who called for aid from the tribes on the mainland, an invasion which was defeated by the ships of Dionysius of Syracuse. An inscription from the site of the ancient Pharos, Starigrad in the NW. corner of Hvar, records the dedication of arms taken in battle by the Parians and their allies from the IADASINOI. Brunšmid connected this name with Illyrians, or more correctly Liburnians, dwelling in the region of the later Roman colony of Iader (mod. Zadar.); consequently it was not possible to connect this campaign with that of 384 B.C. against the Illyrians on the adjacent mainland. In a recent paper D. Rendić-Miočević seeks to identify this people with the

IA]DASTIN[OI recorded on an inscription of 56 B.C. and suggests that they were a small Illyrian tribe living in the immediate neighbourhood of Salonae, where a trace of their name has survived in the river Iadro, the stream which springs from the base of the Mosor mountain and supplies water for the whole area. With the Iadasinoi located on the mainland opposite Pharos there is a very strong case in identifying them with the Illyrians who attacked in 384 B.C. (19). Another similar record of a campaign is a fragmentary decree concerning a thanksgiving embassy to Delphi and is probably assignable to the early years of its history (20).

The inscriptions from Issa consist mostly of tombstones and it is on a neighbouring island, Corcyra Melaina, that the most interesting document concerning the history of Issa has been recorded. At Lumbarda parts of a decree have been found, referring to the settlement of a colony from Issa at some period in the fourth century (21). The problems which the settlement poses concerning the fate of the earlier Cnidian colony have already been noted and need not concern us here. The settlement may be the result of an increase in population with a consequent shortage of land or more probably the product of political unrest or stasis. The inscription opens with a statement that the details of the settlement have been agreed between the representatives of Issa and the family of Pullus and Dazos who were the owners of the land of Lumbarda. The two names, paralleled in Thessaly and Macedonia, may belong to descendants of the Cnidian settlers or,

less probably, to natives of the islands (22). On the whole, although they are similar to Illyrian names occuring on Latin inscriptions of a later period, it is more than likely that Corcyra was a possession of Issa and the agreement was drawn up between Issa and wealthy magnates who owned the land at Lumbarda. The surviving portions of the stone record the amounts of the land allotted to each settler, both inside and outside the town walls, and also makes provision for allotment of unoccupied land. The remainder and more fragmentary part of the inscription consists of the names of the colonists divided under the heading of the three Doric tribes, Dymanes, Hylleis and Pamphyloi. Issa, being a Syracusan colony, naturally retained the Doric tribes and as late as 56 B.C. employed the Doric calendar. Even clearer indications of Syracusan influence in the colonies of the Adriatic is illustrated by the coin-series minted by these states in the fourth century.

The earliest coin-series of Issa and Pharos are modelled on the heavy coin-types issued by Syracuse. The coins of the earliest series bear a head of Zeus, a series supplanted at the end of the fourth century by coins bearing the heads of Persephone and Artemis. At Issa the earliest series bears the legend IONIO(S), perhaps referring to an older name of the island, and is supplanted at the end of the fourth century by a series bearing 'Nymphae' portraits, a type of coin very similar to the Artemis and Persephone types of Pharos (23).

There are two other groups of fourth century coins known from the Greeks cities along the Dalmatian coast but not belonging to any

of the known settlements of the region. From the island of Pharos a number of fourth century coins are known bearing the legend HERAKL, indicating a city called Heraklea which was presumably situated on Pharos. No other record is preserved of this city, and judging from the absence of later coinage it had disappeared before the end of the fourth century. Ps-Scylax, writing about the middle of the fourth century, records a city called Heraklea in a context which suggests that it was in the area of the Corcyra of Alcinous (mod. Corfu) and it is most unlikely that it could have been at Rogoznica, a small coastal village between Trogir and Šibenik, as Novak has suggested (24). The second group of coins which may belong to another otherwise unknown Greek settlement is a number of the fourth century series of Issa and Pharos which bear a countermark DI or in one case DI. It is of course an open question whether these legends refer to a city at all but there really does not seem to be any alternative. Novak expands the name to DIM[OS] and suggests that it was a dependent city of Pharos or Issa and was given the right of countermarking coins for its own revenue purposes. As with Heraklea, it appears to have gone out of existence by the third century (25). Stephanus Byzantinus mentions a certain Anchiale, a Parian colony in Illyria; there is no indication of its location except a reference to a gulf in which there is (presumably an island) Scheria. Beaumont attempts to site it in the region of the Naro estuary, equating Scheria with Corcyra Melaina, and, needless to say, dates it to the fifth or sixth

century (26).

In the middle of the first century A.D. the Elder Pliny writes of multorum Graeciae oppidorum deficiens memoria nec non et civitatium validarum (27) in his section on the province of Dalmatia. Modern scholars, from Evans onward, have always been ready to give the fullest possible weight to any scrap of evidence for the existence of Greek cities in the area. Even the most recent studies, for instance the work of Beaumont and the Yugoslav scholar Novak, are illustrations of this trend still at work. Bouthoe and Epidaurum are two cases in point. In connection with the former a tradition exists that Cadmus journeyed to the Adriatic, where he is reputed to have become king of the Enchelaei. There is a tenuous connection with Bouthoe (mod. Budva) and on these grounds the existence of a Greek city has been assumed. There is no coinage and not even the tiniest scrap of archaeological material has been found to support the existence of a Greek city at Budva. Far from it being a congenial site as Beaumont describes, the coast is probably the most inhospitable in Europe with mountains rising almost sheer out of the sea to a height of over 1,500 metres, while the amount of rainfall is astronomical (28).

It was Evans who first outlined the case for the existence of a Greek foundation at Cavtat, about 50 km. along the coast N. of Budva, where the Roman colony of Epidaurum was later founded. The name may be Greek and the site, a small fertile peninsula with two excellent harbours, was ideal in every way for a Greek city; but, remembering that the site is not mentioned by any literary

source until Caesar, who refers to it as one of his praesidia during the civil war, the case for a Greek colony at Epidaurum is not strong. Beaumont believed that the archaeological material which Evans cited was sufficient to 'clinch' the existence of a Greek city there, but it is so small in quantity and scattered that it adds nothing to support his thesis. In very recent years some archaeological discoveries have been made in the more northerly of the two harbours, since the coast has sunk a metre or so since Roman times. Complete amphorae of the Roman period have been recovered and some traces of structures noted; nothing has been found, however, to support the case for a Greek city. As in the case of Bouthoe, there is no coinage belonging to Epidaurum. Perhaps Casson is nearer the truth when he suggests that, although a native Illyrian settlement, it became Hellenised as a result of contact with the neighbouring Greek islands and may even have been the mainland station for Greek traders operating in the hinterland, which can be reached by a not too difficult route starting from Epidaurum, and that its status was similar to the mainland possessions of Issa at Tragurion and Epetion to the N. The earliest inscriptions from the site are Latin and belong to the period of the Roman colonia (29).

Greek settlement may have spread to some of the smaller islands; the Elaphites, between Melite and the coast, may have had Greek inhabitants, as may also Melite itself. By the time of Augustus, however, Melite had become a pirate stronghold (30).

In the S. of the region there are two sites which have been

suggested as possible Hellenic settlements on archaeological and other grounds. Some 9km. NE.of the modern town of Titograd (formerly Podgoric in Montenegro) is the remarkable site of Medun, crowned with a series of ancient and medieeval fortifications, which has been identified as the Meteon Labeatidis terrae of Livy, one of the strongholds of the Illyrian kingdom. The quality of the ancient fortifications suggested to Casson that here might have been an Hellenic settlement. This type of fortification, showing distinct Greek influence, is found at other places on the Illyrian coastline, and rather than suggesting Greek settlements, indicates the presence of Greek technicians, perhaps procured from Pharos or Issa. As Beaumont suggests, the high quality of the construction, local limestone shaped into well-fitting polygonal blocks, may have been the work of Greek contractors or a Greek overseer with Illyrian workmen. According to the plan made by C. Prashniker, one of the walls of the fortification encloses an area at least 160 metres in length (31). The second site where a Greek settlement has been located is Lissus (mod. Albanian Lesh) at the mouth of the Black Drin. Its connection with the enterprise of Dionysius in the early fourth century has already been discussed, and in spite of a lack of any definite evidence it is more probable that Issa was the colony of Dionysius which Diodorus mentions, rather than Lissus. Once this connection has been removed there is no evidence that any Greek city existed at any time at Lissus. The impressive ancient fortifications which still survive are far more typical of an Illyrian hill-fort than a

Greek city, although (as in the case of the fort at Medeon) the walls were constructed with advice and help from Greek technicians. There is no trace of Greek products amongst the finds known from the site, although, as the amount of excavation which has taken place is so small, there can be little value in this argumentum ex silentio. The evidence from the coinage is more positive however; there is no coinage of the fourth century from Lissus comparable to that of Pharos or Issa. A small number of coins are known of the third century which illustrate clearly the Illyrian character of the place. In the period of the Civil War it was one of the more important Caesarian bases with a loyal conventus of Roman citizens. As in the case of Epidaurum and Bouthoe, no Greek inscriptions have been found at Lissus (32).

At this point it is perhaps desirable to evaluate the Greek settlement in the Adriatic, before we pass on to the complicated story of the incorporation of the region in into the world empire of Rome. In spite of the remarks of Beaumont, it is clear that the coast of Illyria offered little inducement to Greek settlers, with the notable exception of the central group of islands. In the north the coast is extremely inhospitable and in the winter the Bora, a cold wind from the N., blows down the coast with great ferocity. As a result of this many islands and headlands in northern Illyria are completely bare of any vegetation whatsoever. In the south of the region equally formidable deterrents exist for coastal cities of the Greek fashion; the region between the Boka Kotorska and around Drač (ancient Epidamnus-Dyrrhacium) receives one of the

heaviest rainfalls in Europe; part of the coastline is a sheer cliff while to the south a good deal is malarial swamp. The conditions which approach nearest to the climate and vegetation of Greece and Sicily are found on the central group of islands where were settled the principal cities of Issa, Pharos and Corcyra Melaina. The climate is superb and still produces the best wine of all Yugoslavia. Outside of this small localised area of Greek colonisation, due for the most part to the ambition of Dionysius of Syracuse, there is no positive evidence for Greek settlements. In the third century the Greeks of the Dalmatian coast found their existence threatened by the steady growth of the power of the Illyrian kingdom to the south, based on the fortresses of Lissus and Scodra; Greek domination of the sea traffic in the Adriatic was challenged and the route to the Aegean insecure. By the second half of the third century the Illyrian power had become the scourge of W. Greece down as far as the Peloponnese. When a promise of salvation came with Roman intervention the Greeks were not slow to demonstrate their loyalty.

Chapter I: Notes.

1. Theopompus recorded by Strabo vii 5, 9 p. 317; Ps-Aristotle, De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus, 104.
2. Casson, op. cit., citing Evans in Arch. xlviii 62. On the question of the overland trade route to the Adriatic, cf. Beaumont, op. cit., Appendix II, ii, 199f.
3. Beaumont op. cit., 186.
4. Glasinac, WMBH i 78, fig. 48; Donja Dolina, WMBH ix 95; Gorica, WMBH viii 1 seqq; Sanskimost, WMBH vi pl. I-III; Gačko, WMBH iii 289 fig. 8; Glasinac (ring), WMBH iv 26 fig. 58. cf. Casson op. cit. 319. For possible produce of Illyria, De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus, 138 (salt and cattle); Strabo vii 5, 7 (p. 317) (salt).
5. op. cit. 187.
6. collection of the evidence, note 186.
7. Herodot. iii 49; Plut. De Herodoti Malignitate, 860 B seqq.
8. Ps-Scymnus 421; Strabo vii 5, 5 (p. 317); Plin NH iii 152. Beaumont, op. cit., 173 fl.
9. see below p. 11.
10. op. cit. note 127, citing AEM ix 33, note 5.
11. Head, HN2, 317.
12. Beaumont, op. cit. Appendix III 202seq., 'The Adriatic Enterprise of Dionysius of Syracuse'.
13. Diod. xv 13; 14, 2.
14. CAH vi 129, cf. remarks of Casson, op. cit., 316. The text of Diodorus is Λίσσον (13, 4.) and Λίσσῃ or Λίσῃ (14,2). The case is

put by Beloch GG. III i, 118, note 2. cf. A. Bauer, AEM xviii 133. The most recent study is by G. Novak in Serta Hoffilleriana (Zagreb 1940), 111sqq. 'Die Kolonisatorische Tätigkeit Dionysios des Älteren in der Adria', where he follows the traditional view that it is Issa to which Diodorus is referring. He adds further the point that there was no evidence up until the time of his writing of any Greek finds from the site of Lissus.

15. Beaumont believed the walls known at Lissus to be Greek and of fifth century date, cf. op. cit., 184 and note 179. On the topography of Lissus see note to this chapter 1.

16. Ps-Scymnus, 413-4, calls it a Syracusan colony.

17. On the coinage of these and other Greek cities see below p. 124.

18. Inscriptions of the Pre-Roman and Roman periods from Issa and Pharos are collected by Brunšmid, op. cit. nos. 1-6, (Pharos) and 7-26, (Issa). No significant addition has been made to this collection, published in 1898.

19. Brunšmid, op. cit., no.3 [=CIG II 1837c], Φαρίοι ἀπὸ Ἰαδαδίνων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων τὰ ὅπλα . The lettering is fourth century and the inscription appears to be almost complete apart from an additional line below of which only an S can be read.
D. Rendić-Miocević, 'Contributions á l'ethnographie et á la topographie de la côte Dalmate dans l'antiquité; Les Iadastines', Vjesnik lii (1950), 19-34 (French summary 317.).

20. Brunšmid, op. cit., no.4. [= CIG II 183b] from Starigrad.

21. Brunšmid, op. cit., 2ff. with discussion and restorations. For a text cf. also Ditt. SIG3 141 and a photograph is given by G. Novak in Vjesnik liv (1952) 9, fig.1.

22. Mayer, Die Sprache der alten Illyrier, Wien 1957, 281, s.v. Pullus, cites examples from Macedonia and Apulian coins. Latin instances; CIL III 3111 Solentia, (Šolta Dalmatia), III 3215, 13 (lamp) Salonae; III 6008, 48 Savaria; III 14114 Haudin. On Dazos cf. op. cit. 114, examples from Thessaly, coins from Salapia and Arpi.

23. Coinage of Pharos, Brunšmid, op. cit., 40ff; Issa, op. cit., 58ff. cf. also Head HN2, 317.

24. Herakl(ea) coinage, Brunšmid, op. cit., 54ff. citing Ps-Scylax 22 (GGM i 28). Novak, 'Dimos i Herakleia', Strena Buliciana 655-8, (French summary xxxi). cf. D. Rendić-Miočević, 'Quelques remarques sur les monnaies de Dalmatie', 1st Congress of Numismatics, Paris (1953), ii 83-87., suggesting that DIM is the countermark of a ruler.

25. Coinage, Brunšmid, op. cit., 52ff. dating it to the middle or second part of the fourth century. Novak, op. cit., 655f.

26. Stephanus Byzantinus, s.v. Ἀγχίαλη; Beaumont op. cit., 188, n.201.

27. NH iii 144.

28. Bouthoe, cf Ps-Scylax 25. (GGM i 32). On the Cadmus legend in Illyria, cf. Beaumont, op. cit., Appendix I, 196f.

29. Epidaurum, Bell. Alex. 44. Beaumont, op. cit., 188, cites Patsch in RE (vi 61) for the archaeological evidence for a Greek predecessor to Roman Epidaurum; Patsch in turn refers back to the

observations of Evans in the nineteenth century (Archaeologia, xlviii 6.),' There have been discovered on the site of Ragusa Vecchia (= Serb. Cavtat) indubitable records of Hellenic intercourse ... among the coins I have noticed several pieces of Dyrrachium and Apollonia of the third century B.C., in one case an autonomous coin of Scodra, dating to about 168 B.C., and I myself have picked up a small brass coin of Boeotia. A few years since there was dug up a pale carnelian intaglio in the perfect Greek style, representing Apollo Agyieus, guardian of roads and streets, leaning on a pillar and holding forth his bow'. Beaumont is only able to add an archaic Herakles found inland in Popovo Polje- hardly of relevance to Epidaurum as it just as likely to have reached there through the valley of the R. Naro. Cf. also Casson, op. cit., 318.

30. A suggestion of Casson, op. cit., 315. Melite is mentioned by Ps-Scylax 23 (GGM i 30) and Agathemius 23 (GGM ii 484) who mentions it as one of the more notable Illyrian islands along with Issa, Corcyra Melaina and Pharos: sacked by Augustus, App. Ill 16.

31. Meteon, Liv. xliv 23, 32. Casson, op. cit., 316; Beaumont, op. cit., 185. The site was planned and photographed by C. Prashniker and A. Schober, Archaeologische Forschungen in Albanien und Montenegro, (Schriften der Balkankommission, Antiq. Abt., Heft viii, Wien 1919), 3-8 with plan fig. 7.

32. Cf. notes 14 and 15. The remains at Les were planned and photographed by Praschniker and Schober, op. cit., 14-27,

with plan fig. 22. In their account of the walls they assume that the passage in Diodorus (xv 13) is a description of Dionysius' fortification in his new Illyrian colony. It is clear that there is a lacuna in the manuscript and that the building works referred to are at Syracuse since the R. Anapus is mentioned. The second and third century coinage of Lissus is discussed by Evans in Num. Chron. N.S. xx 269ff., cf. J.M.F. May, JRS xxxvi (1946), 48f. On the topography of Lissus in connection with its capture by Philipp V in 213 B.C. see below note.

Chapter I: Bibliographical note.

R.L. Beaumont, "Greek influence in the Adriatic before the fourth century B.C," JHS. lvi (1936), 159-204.

J. Brunšmid, Die Inschriften und Münzen der griechische Städte Dalmatiens (Abh. d. Arch-epigr. Seminars d. Univ. Wien, Heft xiii, 1898).

S. Casson, Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria. Oxford, 1926.

G. Novak, "Das griechische Element in Dalmatiens Städten," Limes-Kongress Carnuntum (Römische Forschungen in Niederösterreich, Band III, 1956), 117-125.

Chapter I: Note on the topography of Lissus.

The basic archaeological and topographical study of the region of Lissus is that carried out by C. Praschniker and A. Schober during the early years of the First World War (Archaeologische Forschungen in Albanien und Montenegro, Schriften der Balkankommission, Antiquarische Abteilung, Heft viii (1919), Vienna.). Lissus was identified with the modern town of Lješ (Italian Alessio) on the lower part of the Albanian Drin. Here rises a flat-topped hill some five hundred feet high which controls not only the river crossing at Lješ but all the flat country around the mouth of the Drin. Acrolissus, the fortress besieged by Philip V of Macedon in 213, has been identified with the Mali Šelbuemit (app. 1250') a short distance inland from Lješ. Polybius' account (viii 13-14) describes how Philip, despairing of taking Acrolissus due to its great natural strength, concentrated on attacking the city of Lissus itself. However the garrison of Acrolissus threw away their advantage by a rash assault and Philip took advantage of the unexpected opportunity to take Acrolissus, from which he took Lissus with little difficulty in a few days. The political advantages of Lissus were considerable; from this base he confidently expected that he would be able to meet with the Carthaginian fleet under Mago and join forces with Hannibal in Italy.

There can be little doubt that the above locations of Lissus and Acrolissus are correct and are much to be preferred than previous theories which sought to locate Lissus amongst the sands at the mouth of the Drin (cf. the bibliography cited by Fluss in

RE xiii 731ff.). The two hills of Lješ and Mali Šelbuemit are the only possible places which fit with the account of Polybius; no such natural features exist any farther down the River Drin. The archaeological evidence from the two hills strongly supports the topographical evidence. At Lješ an almost intact circuit of fortifications still exists today. They show definite Greek influence in their construction and may well date from the third century; on the Mali Šelbuemit less complete traces of the same type of fortifications were traced by Praschniker and Schober.

The problem of Lissus and the Drin has been re-examined by J.M.F. May (JRS xxxvi [1946], 54-56 with map. fig. 5.). The historical sources speak of Lissus as a harbour at the time of Caesar (BC. iii 29,3; 40,5). May concluded that the harbour of Lissus must have been distinct from the city of Lissus (=Lješ) and is to be located near the mouth of the Drin although most probably distinct from Nymphaeum (mod. Shjen i Drin), a small harbour a few miles to the north of the Drin where ships were stationed during the Civil War (Caes. BC. iii 26, ultra Lissum milia passuum iii*). May believes that Lissus itself could not have been used as a harbour in the time of Philip since then the main volume of the waters of the Drin flowed out by Scodra and reached the sea in the River Bojanna. There is no doubt that May is correct in believing that considerable changes in the river geography of the region have taken places since Antiquity, and that it is quite possible that the Drin was not as great a river in Antiquity as it is known to have been until 1857, when

abnormal floods sent its waters into the Adriatic again through the Bojanna. Strabo definitely states that the Drin was navigable as far inland as the territory of the Dardani, which must surely indicate that Lissus may well have had its own harbour at Lješ. The evidence of the plan of the fortifications at Lješ, which include not only the summit of the hill but also extend down to the waterfront of the modern town, suggests that a harbour existed there.

Chapter II: The Kingdom of Illyria (230-167 B.C.).

The history of the kingdom of Illyria in the period 230-167 B.C. is closely connected with one of the great East-West struggles of the ancient world, that between Rome on the one side and Macedon and Syria on the other. In the early stages the Illyrian state was dealt with as an independent power, although some scholars have sought to treat Roman policy in the Adriatic as being governed by elaborate schemes of world empire from the beginning. With regard to Illyria in particular every Roman advance has been seen as a calculated attack on the Antigonid monarchy by detaching one of its more potent allies. The weight of recent opinion is against this rather extreme view, perhaps not uninfluenced by the diplomatic manoevring of the European powers in the early years of this century, and sees the two Illyrian campaigns before the Second Punic War as 'police actions' against the menace of organised piracy- belated measures in response to frantic lobbying from trading interests- and that it was only after the dramatic change to a Western policy by Philip in 217 that the Romans began to regard the Adriatic, and the Illyrian kingdom in particular, as spheres where the Macedonian might be able to mount an invasion of Italy from the East. The Roman alliance with Aetolia, in effect carrying the war to Philip's own doorstep, rendered any plan he had for operations against the Romans in Illyria harmless and the area sank into insignificance as the 'schwerpunkt' of the struggle moved to the East. After a duration

as loyal client of Rome the Illyrians fell back into their old habits of piracy and, perhaps without realising it fully, forfeited her status with Rome as a cliens. Some rather shady and obscure contacts with Perseus gave the Romans full justification, in their view at least, to treat the last Illyrian king Gentius as an ally of Macedon and send a Roman force to defeat him. As will be shown, nothing illustrates more clearly the insignificance of the Illyrian power than the settlement imposed and the eagerness of the patres to forget about it after 167 B.C.

As may not be unexpected, nobody has a good word to say for the Illyrians, least of all the Greeks who had suffered so much from their attacks along the W. coasts, while the Roman annalists can hardly be blamed for doing other than their duty, to record the history of their republic in patriotic fashion. Our main source, Polybius, a member of one of the leading Achaean families, hated the Illyrians as much as anybody and makes no secret of his lack of interest in them, and it hardly likely that the Roman 'Official' history of Q. Fabius Pictor added much about them. Most of the secondary sources are demonstrably based upon the works of Polybius together with the Roman annalists.

During the middle years of the third century the kingdom of Epirus went into swift and fatal decline, due for the most part to the endemic affliction of the whole Greek world, internal political strife and revolution. In its great days it had been one of the powers of the world; Alexander, an uncle of Alexander the Great, emulated the exploits of the Macedonian in the Adriatic and raised

his country to the peak of its power. In later years Pyrrhus, one of the greatest of all the Hellenistic soldier kings, invaded Italy and showed the Legions a quality of fighting far superior to any they had met previously. After fruitless years in Sicily he turned his attentions to Greece proper and suffered ignominius death in the streets of Argos. After the death of his son Alexander II about 240 B.C., Epirus virtually disintegrated and the situation encouraged the reviving Illyrian power under Agron, son of Pleuratus, to recover lost territory in the south (1).

The royal line of the new Illyrian power came from the Ardiaei, an Illyrian tribe driven southward from the interior by Celtic pressure in the fourth century. Their original homeland may have been on the central Illyrian coastline around the R. Naro, from whence they spread southeastwards along the coast as far as the region of the Albanian Drin (2). In the course of the expansion they became noted for their skill with ships among the harbours and inlets of the Illyrian coast, as the Greek and Italian traders found to their cost in later years. Their vessels, known as lembi to the world, were small galleys with a single bank of oars and a low freeboard, but sufficiently roomy to accommodate fifty fighting men in addition to the crew. In order to attain extra speed they had no ram in the usual fashion of the time but a prow tapered to a point (3). In a set naval battle they could not match up to a well managed fleet of triremes, as the events of 384 B.C. showed when Syracusam ships defeated the Illyrians who were attacking the Parian

colonists on Pharos, but for quick raids upon merchant shipping and raids upon cities along the coasts of Epirus and Acarnania they had no equal. It was the efficient manner in which they used their own ships that made the Illyrian kingdom's entry upon the stage of Greek affairs with the defeat of the Aetolians, self-acclaimed saviours of Greece from the Gallic scourge half a century before, appear very dramatic and ominous to the Greeks.

It is important to bear in mind how small in relation to the area of the later imperial province of Dalmatia was this early political unit we call Illyria; although we have no definite evidence on the area of Ardiaean conquests the main areas under their control are not too difficult to distinguish. On the north they bordered on the Delmatae, by far the largest tribe of central Illyria, while on the coast they seem, at least in a later period, ~~appear~~ to have subdued the Daorsi. Inland they did not spread beyond the ridge of the mountains or even inland along the valley of the Drin; in this quarter their neighbours were the Dardani. To the south before the conquests of 231 B.C. they probably did not control territory any distance far south of Lissus; here they bordered the Parthini and the Greek city of Epidamnus (4).

It was as an ally of Demetrius II of Macedon that the Illyrian fleet made its first impact in the struggle between that king and the Leagues of Greece. One of the results of the decline of Epirus was that Acarnania achieved her independence and immediately became a prey to Aetolian ambition. Demetrius, wishing to counter the activities of his arch-enemy, enlisted Agron and his

Illyrians to aid the Acarnanians since he himself was pre-occupied with troubles on his northern frontier. In return for a subsidy Agron sailed southward with an Illyrian force of five thousand men aboard a fleet of a hundred lembi and attacked an Aetolian force beseiging the town of Medion. The Aetolians were vanquished and the Illyrians return home northwards with large quantities of booty. During the following winter (231/230) Agron died and his energetic widow Teuta undertook the command of Illyrian forces and ~~who~~, emboldened by the successes of the previous season, undertook an expedition which amounted to organised piracy. After raids upon Elis and Messenia they attacked the Epirote capital of Phoenice and captured it with the help of a garrison of Gallic mercenaries. The Illyrian dynast Scerdilaidas advanced southward with a land force into Epirote territory and a force which attempted to relieve the capital was scattered. Desperate appeals for aid were sent to the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues but before these could get to grips with the invaders, the Illyrians had to return home and put down a revolt. The Illyrians do not appear to have had any clear notions of conquest but were content to carry home with them all the booty they could manage (5). The 'conquests' of Teuta in the raid are not known and perhaps it is misleading to attempt to assess the success of the raiders by formal treaties concerning the cession of territory. The important fact was that an obscure barbarian power had completely ravaged one of the states which only half a century before reckoned itself one of the powers of the world and in addition dealt very

efficiently with the best soldiers of Greece. The Greeks were clearly shattered by this experience and made no secret of their revulsion at the conduct of Demetrius in letting loose this scourge upon Greece.

The activities of Teuta in 230 interfered with the trade route across the Ionian Sea from S. Italy to the opposite coast. For many years this trade route, now used by many allies of Rome, had suffered from the activities of pirates based upon the Illyrian coast but never on this scale. Even, worse, a few of the raiders looking for additional booty while the main force was attacking Phoenice attacked and killed some Italian traders as well as taking prisoners and booty. Our sources give full weight to the rightful indignation of the senate who at last stirred themselves to send an embassy to Teuta and complain about the attacks on Italian citizens (6). The motives behind the embassy of the Coruncanii, sent to Teuta early in 229 B.C., have been investigated by many scholars with widely differing results. The Roman 'Weltpolitik' is not under examination here but in the writer's opinion there is no need to look beyond the immediate area of the Adriatic to explain the Roman purpose. Holleaux explains the whole campaign, with its enormous forces, as illustrating a fear of Macedon but, as more recent studies have suggested, there is no need to look beyond Illyria to explain why at this time the Roman Senate was galvanised into activity. As Badian has shown (7), it was the immediate prospect that Illyria was becoming a great power in her own right that drew Rome to intervene beyond the Adriatic. The Italian merchants would have lost no chance

of bringing home to the patres the appalling ravages of Illyria and would have demanded that action, and firm action, be taken against the Illyrians. It is an open question whether or not Rome at this early stage saw herself in the role of champion of Greek cities against the barbarian, although the attitudes she took up after Teuta had been defeated strongly suggests that she took it as a duty to extend the umbrella of 'clientela' to the cities of Epirus as she had done some years before in Sicily.

Undeterred by the threatened attack from the West, Teuta continued her series of raids along the coast of Epirus and further South. The attack on Epidamnus failed but, undaunted, the queen passed southward to besiege the island of Corcyra, once the Athens of the West, but now a shadow of her former greatness. As affairs progressed a joint appeal for aid was sent to the Leagues by Apollonia, Epidamnus and the Corcyraeans. With some support from the Acarnanians the Illyrians defeated a naval force from Achaea and Aetolia at Paxos, a small island to the S. of Corcyra. Demetrius of Pharos, a Greek who had made himself master of the old Parian colony and thrown in his lot with Teuta, was put in charge of the garrison when Corcyra surrendered (8).

The events of the First Illyrian War are soon recounted, illustrating clearly how Roman forces dealt effectively with a power that in previous years had all Western Greece trembling. The Roman commanders, Cn. Fulvius Centumalus with the fleet and L. Postumius Albinus with the land force, the consuls of 229 B.C.,

attacked not the homeland of Teuta but her newly-acquired possessions. Whether or not, as Badian suggests, Teuta's activity earlier in the year was a calculated defence against a Roman attack from the West; it was defeated by the treachery of Demetrius of Pharos, her garrison commander in Corcyra, who handed over his command to the consuls and then proceeded to act as their adviser during the following campaign. Apart from some nameless Illyrian strongholds the territories detached from Teuta consisted of those which had suffered most from recent raids; Corcyra, Epidamnus and Apollonia among the Greek cities as well as the inland tribes of the Parthini and Atintanes were received in fidem by the Roman commanders. In the far north the Syracusan colony of Issa was struggling for her independence against the Illyrians when the Roman embassy and the declaration of war occurred. For Issa, Roman intervention was most opportune and with the discomfiture of Teuta in the South she sought confirmation of her freedom by giving herself in fidem to Rome. Teuta withdrew to the deep recesses of the Boka Kotorska and confined herself to her stronghold of Rhizon. Early in the next year she made a treaty and, according to Polybius, gave up most of Illyria (9). The internal affairs of the Illyrian kingdom after 228 are badly reported by the sources, which are in conflict at almost every point of detail. It is clear that Teuta disappears from the scene and that the most powerful figure in the area is Demetrius of Pharos, now a Roman cliens. Dio tells that Teuta resigned

her regency over Agron's heir Pinnes (not mentioned by Polybius) to Demetrius while Appian states that Pinnes retained all his possession excepting those surrendered to the Romans. At any rate the result of the campaign was to deprive Illyria of her recent conquests and place the kingdom under the supervision of a Roman cliens, thus bringing abruptly to an end a glorious interlude of organised brigandage (10). In spite of this the central area of the realm between Lissus and the Naro had not been touched. The status of those states who gave themselves into Roman protection has been the subject of dispute, a question outside the scope of this discussion (11). The idea of these states enjoying a libertas precaria with the legal status of dediticii (12) has now been rejected in favour of an extra-legal form of association without treaty developing into the application of clientela, a moral association between a weaker and stronger party, to the field of foreign diplomacy. The nature of Roman obligation towards the liberated conquests of Illyria was clear to the Senate even if not exactly clear to the states themselves; as in the case of the cities in Sicily they were free of garrisons or tribute and enjoyed their own laws but were expected to give any aid and support ~~to~~ that Rome should ask of them. In the first winter after the campaign the consul L. Postumius Albinus had already augmented the Roman expeditionary force with contributions from the allies in Epirus. The three southernmost cities form a compact group- ports probably thronged with Italian merchants- and must soon have become centres of Roman

influence; the word protectorate has been used to describe their situation. The two inland tribes who became friends of Rome, the Parthini and the Atintanes, are not known to have been involved in the War and the Atintanes were situated to the south well outside the area of conflict. Thus, as Badian remarks, they were just two among a number of other tribes who made a special effort to obtain Roman friendship. It is difficult to accept the theory that the Illyrians retained conquests in the hinterland behind Epidamnus and Apollonia once they had lost the command of these harbours; the imposition of a 'Fahrtgrenze' upon the Illyrian navy, preventing any more than two vessels sailing south of Lissus, must have completely removed the possibility of a repetition of the events of 231 and 230 B.C. and had the effect of detaching any Illyrian territory S. of Lissus.

The outcome of the First Illyrian War was very satisfactory for Rome. The disturbing power of Illyria had been curbed, her Italian allies placated with the guaranteed security of the Epirote ports and finally Rome had acquired the reputation as a defender of Greek Cities against the barbarian. One wonders what the reaction was of the Macedonians who heard the herald of the consul proudly announce to the Greeks the great deeds done by them on behalf of their Epirote cousins (13).

For ten years after the defeat of Teuta Rome took no interest in affairs across the Adriatic; the settlement had secured her main object- neutralisation of the Illyrian pirate menace- and she was

content. Demetrius seems to have appeared to them as a reliable ally (14) and providing that he kept his Illyrians under control, ~~and~~ Rome took no apparent interest in his activities in Greece. After a shaky start Antigonos Doson has raised Macedonian power in Greece to a height not reached since the death of Antigonos Gonatas. Doson was glad to avail himself of the opportunity of reviving the alliance with Illyria, so successful in the years of Demetrius II. His victory over revolutionary Sparta at Sellasia in 222 was owed to the fighting qualities of his Illyrian ally (15). Between Sellasia and the death of Doson a year or so later, Demetrius was in a position of great strength; if Rome regarded the revival of the alliance between Macedon and Illyria with suspicion then she gave no sigh to her client. For his part Demetrius must have felt himself free from any obligation to justify his conduct with the Romans. Doson died in 220 and his Hellenic League collapsed with him; his successor was a youth of untried military ability. According to the version of Polybius in his section on Roman affairs, Demetrius chose this moment to sail southward with a fleet of lembi and attack cities in alliance with Rome, relying for support upon his Macedonian ally. Polybius adds that Demetrius was encouraged by Roman difficulties with the Gauls in the north and was threatened with an outbreak of war with Carthage. As Badian has pointed out, almost none of these conditions existed at the time when Demetrius made his attack upon Roman allies; the Gauls had been vanquished and there was at that time no definite knowledge of

trouble with Carthage (even if Demetrius was aware of conditions in Spain) while Philip of Macedon was struggling desparately to reassert Macedonian power in Greece in a bitter war with the Leagues. Oost suggests that Demetrius' activities are to be credited 'only to his insouciant rashness' similar to other Illyrians. But Demetrius was no headstrong barbarian; his military prowess had gained great influence with Macedon, while in the years after 219 he showed himself a competent advisor to Philip.

Polybius' account of the Second Illyrian War clearly represents the official version given by the senator Fabius Pictor to explain Roman conduct. In his section on Greek affairs Polybius gives more detail on Illyrian activity in 220. He records that Scerdilaidas, presumably the same dynast last heard of in command of Illyrian land forces in 230 B.C., in company with Demetrius of Pharos, sailed with 90 ships past Lissus, touched first at Pylos and then proceeded to pillage the Cyclades. None of the cities in amicita with Rome (for instance, Corcyra, Epidamnus and Apollonia) are known to have been attacked by Demetrius but he is credited by Appian with attempting to detach the Atintanes and the Parthini from the Roman alliance (16). The war of 219 was declared against the personal power of Demetrius; Rome did not remonstrate when he allied himself with Antigonus, but a few years later, with trouble threatening in Spain, the senate could not countenance an unruly and ambitious cliens in charge of the Illyrian navy operating in the Adriatic. Scedilaidas, a partner in the raid of 220, was not interfered with,

even though he had concluded an alliance with Philip, and is allowed to consolidate his power when Demetrius is off the scene. As with the campaign of 229, that against Demetrius was entrusted to the consuls of the year-L. Aemilius Paullus and M. Livius Salinator. We do not know the size of the Roman expedition, but it may well have been as great as the force sent against Teuta (17). An attack was launched upon the two centres of Demetrius, Dimale, in or near the territory of the Parthini who dwelt in the hinterland between Lissus and Dyrrhacium, and Pharos the Greek island state that was his personal stronghold (18). The two places were soon taken, although Demetrius managed to make his escape from Pharos to the Macedonian court. Once Demetrius had been removed from the scene Rome was happy to leave the area in almost the same condition as she left it in 229. The amicitia of her allies was probably confirmed while Pinnes, the titular sovereign of Illyria, was allowed to remain in possession of his kingdom, but was probably made to pay 'costs' for the war (19). Pharos and Dimale were probably admitted to the Roman friendship. Illyria 'proper' had not been touched; Scerdilaidas, probably based on the area of Scodra and Lissus, was untouched by the Roman intervention. Had Rome been seeking to strike a blow against Macedon then Scerdilaidas, already in alliance with Philip, would have been the obvious target. Onee the offending vassal was removed Rome was happy to forget about Illyria (20).

Scerdilaidas saw no threat to his position in the removal of Demetrius; he kept to his alliance with Philip until he realised that

the Macedonian was quite unable to make any payment for his services. Seeing this he attempted to recoup some of his expenses by plundering Pelagonia and Dassaretia, part of Philip's kingdom (21). After peace with the Leagues was agreed at Naupactus in 217, Philip, hearing of Hannibal's victory at Lake Trasimene, diverted all his energies to the West, a policy advocated by Demetrius of Pharos ever since he arrived as a refugee from Roman arms. As a result, Scerdilaidas was faced with the full force of Macedonian power and lost all his recent gains, while Philip established himself in Epirus on the upper valleys of the Apsus and Genusus (22). Before he could be sure of his position in the region Philip realised that he must have a bridghead on the coast- one of the Greek cities perhaps- and before he could secure this he had to possess sea power on a scale to combat the Illyrian lembi, so effective a few years before in the service of his father. Early in 216 with his own fleet of 100 lembi Philip sailed into the Adriatic. Scerdilaidas who saw the expedition as an attack directed against him appealed to Rome realising that she would regard most seriously any attempt by Philip to establish himself upon the coast of Epirus. Wishing to find out more about the developments, the senate sent a flotilla of ten ships to make a reconnaisance; at the site of them Philip, expecting the whole Roman fleet, panicked and abandoned the expedition (23). After this episode a small Roman fleet was permanently stationed off the SE. of Italy to keep an eye on Philip's movements (24).

After a year of inaction Philip, now in alliance with Hannibal, resumed his offensive in Epirus. In 214 with his reconsituted fleet of 120 lembi he made one more attempt to secure a footing upon the coast; after capturing Oricus he laid Apollonia under siege. The prompt action of Valerius Laevinus relieved Apollonia, and Philip was forced to burn his fleet and retreat overland. With a Roman fleet now patrolling Illyrian waters Philip abandoned hope of forcing a bridgehead and concentrated on conquering Illyrian territory in the interior (25). We are ill-informed of Philip's Illyrian conquests in the years following 214; he advanced northward and pressing on reached the Adriatic at Lissus, one of the strongholds of the Illyrian kingdom, thus cutting off Scerdilaidas from his allies (26). The situation across the Adriatic was transformed when the alliance between Rome and Aetolia was signed; the Romans now entered the full arena of Greek affairs and as a result the centre of interest passes eastwards away from Illyria. Until peace is made at Phoenice in 205 our sources give us no indication of the extent of Philip's conquests in the northwest. It is most unlikely that he held on to Lissus and his other more remote conquests for very long; certainly he must have abandoned them by 208, since to retain them after the defeat of the Carthaginian fleet, which occurred in that year, would have been wasted effort. Without naval forces Lissus was of little value for an attack on Italy (27). The armistice of Phoenice was an attempt by the senate to achieve a settlement with Philip on the basis of the status quo; it involved

the surrender of some areas once in amicita with Rome, notably Atintania. The position of Illyria is not clear. Not long before 205 Scerdilaidas was succeeded by his son Pleuratus who was to prove himself the most pro-Roman of the Illyrian kings; what the extent of his territory was after Phoenice is unknown but he may have been awarded the Parthini as well as his inherited dynasteia, presumably around Lissus and Scodra (28). One of the facts that seems to have been ignored by modern scholars is that apart from the short occupation of Lissus by Philip the main area of Illyria remained untouched by either Macedonian or Roman troops and suffered hardly at all from the ravages of the war in contrast to other peoples further south. The main effect of the war upon Illyria was to transform it from a completely independent force, able to intervene in Greek politics as their interest dictated, to a buffer state between the two great powers whose territory became the object of treaty bargaining. Pleuratus who probably had not experienced the great days of the state at the time of alliance with Macedon, was probably more ready to face this fact than his father and seeing how Rome dealt with defecting allies resigned himself to the role of a dutiful client. For the Romans, Phoenice can hardly have been an agreeable occasion; yet the prospect of smashing Hannibal justified closing down operations in all other theatres for the time being at least. It is not our purpose here to enquire into the causes of the second Macedonian War, although the uneasiness over the settlement must have provided at least one inducement for the senate to declare war against Philip.

Rome's obvious lack of interest in Eastern affairs seems to have encouraged Philip to make encroachments on the territory of Roman allies. In the conference before Cynoscephalae in 197 B.C. Flamininus demands that Philip hand back to the Romans territories he had mastered since the peace in Epirus. This may refer to advances made by Philip in Illyria and Badian has made out a strong case to show that the passage refers to territory acquired in contravention of the treaty rather than in accordance with it as Zippel, and later Holleaux, believed (29). If during the years of the great offensive Rome was forced on military grounds to ignore complaints made by her allies against Philip, with the accompanying loss of prestige and respect, then amongst other things the opportunity to reopen the eastern front on a wider scale offered an opportunity to make amends for the results of her indifference after Phoenice towards her Illyrian and Epirote allies.

The remainder of the history of the kingdom of Illyria is the story of two kings, Pleuratus and his son Gentius. The fortunes of these two rulers of a Roman client state differ greatly; Pleuratus is hailed as an ally of Rome and compared with Masinissa; Gentius, the ineffectual ally of Perseus, sees his realm dissolved and his family led through the streets of Rome adorning the triumph of a Roman magistrate (30).

The story of Pleuratus is soon told. After the peace of Phoenice, the last occasion on which his father Scerdilaidas is mentioned,

Pleuratus is sole ruler of Illyria. We have no definite evidence for the size of his kingdom; after the peace he probably received some of the more northerly of Philip's conquests such as the Parthini but none of the old conquests of Teuta or Scerdilaidas. His strongholds were probably at Lissus and Scodra although we can only infer this from evidence of Gentius' kingdom. It is likely that Philip did make encroachments after the peace of 205, as has already been noted, and it seems more than likely that Pleuratus was one of his victims (31). On the outbreak of the Second Macedonian War, Pleuratus offered his services to the consul Sulpicius Galba but these were politely refused (32). There is no record that the Romans availed themselves of what must have been a very useful military force at any time during the course of the War. Perhaps they considered it undiplomatic to let loose such a force upon Greece as Demetrius II had done many years before, in view of Greek bitterness towards that alliance. It is not inconceivable that Rome deliberately played down her friendship with Pleuratus to avoid offending her Greek friends; there must have been many people alive at the time who recalled only too well the ravages of the Illyrian fleet in 231 and 230 B.C. We hear more of this hatred of Illyria in the reign of Gentius. At the conference after the defeat of Philip Pleuratus was allowed to join the proceedings as an ally of Rome and was awarded some of Philip's conquests around Lychnidus (33). The value of this award cannot however have been great; the area was remote and access from

Illyria difficult. It is clear that there were two main motives behind this award. In order to weaken Macedon it was necessary to remove some of his more outlying conquests; in the case of Lychnidus it was an ideal region to award to Pleuratus for his moral support and would cause no outcry among the Greeks. Secondly, the alliance with Illyria was very useful for providing information on events across the Adriatic and her navy was not a force which Rome would have wished to have set against her. An Illyria allied with a strong Macedon in the early second century could have caused no small inconvenience for Rome especially if ~~they~~ she were able to interfere with the vital sea route across to Epirus. As well as attempting to conciliate Pleuratus with grants of territory Rome was careful to see that the Illyrian fleet was kept well away from the key region of Apollonia and Epidamnus, the area of Illyrian ambitions in past years.

The Romans succeeded in retaining the loyalty of Pleuratus and had such confidence in his good intentions that his aid was accepted in the War with the Aetolian League and Antiochus of Syria. In 189 B.C., when M. Fulvius was operating in Aetolia, Pleuratus ravaged the coasts of the enemy with a fleet of 60 ships (34). On his northern frontier Pleuratus appears to have acquired new territory. Apart from the Greek islands of Issa and Pharos there is no evidence that the power of the Illyrian kingdom extended beyond the Naro, if indeed it reached that far until the reign of Pleuratus. Polybius remarks that the Delmatae, who had remained

loyal to Pleuratus, revolted soon after Gentius had ascended the throne (35). The Delmatae (~~known more frequently as the Dalmatae~~) were by far the largest tribe of central Illyria; in the N. they extended as far as Liburnia and the territory of the Iapydes, while in the S. they probably were not far removed from the N. bank of the Naro. It is unlikely that this allie;ance was anything but nominal, while it is not inconceivable that the connection was merely an alliance on equal terms which for some reason or another the Dalmatae were not disposed to renew. The Daorsei (or Davorsii), a smaller Illyrian tribe who dwelt on the lower reaches of the Naro, acknowledged the Illyrian kingdom and are named in the settlement of 167 as subjects of Gentius who deserted to the Roman side. This alliegence probably dated from the time of Pleuratus (36).

In 181 Pleuratus was dead and his son Gentius ruled in Illyria; at the same time a complete change comes over the relations between Rome and the client kingdom. On two separate occasions Gentius is accused before the senate for the old Illyrian profession of piracy. The first of these occasions was in 181, the first mention we have of Gentius, as king of Illyria, when the praetor of that year, L. Duronius who had had a responsibility for protecting the coasts of Istria and Apulia, returned to Brundisium in the following year with some ships of Gentius caught in the act of piracy. Immediately an embassy was sent to Illyria to question the king on the matter but were unable to obtain an audience with the king. Gentius sent a deputation to the senate to explain that at the time of the

Roman embassy he was lying ill in the most distant part of his kingdom and to ask the senate not to pay heed to trumped-up charges made by his enemies. Duronius stated further that injuries had been inflicted upon both Roman citizens and Latin allies in his kingdom and that Roman citizens were being detained in Corcyra. The senate decided that they should be brought to Rome and interrogated by the praetor peregrinus, and until then no answer should be returned to Gentius (37). It is not surprising that Illyrian ships were caught buccaneering in the Adriatic; after all it was their way of life. It is the second charge, that of holding Roman citizens in captivity at Corcyra, that is difficult to comprehend. The famous old Corinthian colony (mod. Corfu) was one of the principal ports in Epirus through which a considerable amount of trade from Italy passed and it is quite inconceivable that it was in the hands of Gentius; after all it was to combat such a possibility that Rome crossed the Adriatic and fought with Teuta in 229 B.C. Could it be that Polybius (from whom Livy probably derived the information) had failed to distinguish between Corcyra and the other island Corcyra Nigra (mod. Korčula) further to the north? In that case it would not be inconceivable for perhaps an Italian ship to have been shipwrecked and then held to ransom by some of Gentius' subjects. Even so the whole affair is decidedly suspicious. Are we to believe that Gentius with all the experience his kingdom had of Rome and her policies suddenly launched a campaign of piracy and attacked and imprisoned Roman citizens? It is not enough to talk of Illyrian 'rashness' and Gentius'

'intemperence' to explain his deeds (38). Furthermore, why do we hear no more of the affair? We hear nothing about Gentius until the hysterical appeal of Issa on the eve of the Third Macedonian War. The last thing we hear is that the praetor peregrinus was ordered to interrogate the prisoners rescued from Gentius; yet we hear nothing at all of the outcome. It is not improbable that the senate found that the charges were 'trumped-up' after all, as the embassy from Gentius had said. Even if Gentius was cleared of these charges against him, however, the episode brought home to him the precariousness of his position as a cliens of Rome, especially now that the final struggle with Macedon was approaching.

The last yearsof Philp V of Macedon would have provided a fitting subject for a Greek tragedy. The forty years or so of his reign had witnessed the complete encirclement of the old Greek World by the armies and statemen of the new power of Rome, once described to him as a'cloud in the West'. In the last ten years or so of his reign every action of his, no matter in what quarter, would end up by being discussed in front of the senate at Rome, to be condoned or censured as the patres thought fit. The climax came with his being forced to murder his own son Demetrius, accused of plotting against the king by his elder brother Perseus who succeeded to the throne when Philip died in 179. Demetrius, very popular with people in Rome, was regarded as the 'Roman candidate' for the throne; his death and the succession of an embittered Persues dashed any hopes for a settled peace with Rome. With Perseus on the throne there was no turning

back and both parties became reconciled to the inevitability of the coming war, a war that was to end for Perseus on the field of Pydna with the destruction of his kingdom and ~~of~~ the end of the Antigonid line (39).

With regard to Gentius, our knowledge of Roman policy towards Illyria is very scanty. For eight years after the affair with the praetor L. Duronius, nothing at all is known of Illyria. In 172 B.C., on the eve of the outbreak of war with Perseus, a delegation from the Greek island of Issa comes before the senate and delivers an almost hysterical attack upon Gentius. They report that Gentius and Perseus were together planning an attack upon Rome and that the envoys from Illyria were spies in the pay of Macedon (40). This action is perfectly consistent with the attitude of the Greeks towards Illyria and it is more than likely that Issa exaggerated in her description of Gentius as an ally of Perseus and that they were planning war commune consilio. When the king's envoys were summoned they were not allowed to give a reply to the charges since they had failed to report to the appropriate magistrate on their arrival in Rome. Whatever the real intentions of Gentius this action by the senate was hardly calculated to conciliate him and encourage him to take the Roman side against Macedon in the coming struggle. Perhaps the action which may have had more to do with Gentius going over to Perseus was the seizure of 54 ships of his fleet in the harbour at Dyrrhacium (hardly an anchorage for a naval power planning war on Rome) by the praetor M. Lucretius (41). A year or so

before the war actually broke out, L. Decimius was sent to Illyria to remind Gentius of his amicitia with Rome - as if he needed any reminding! (42). Thus the evidence which the Roman sources put forward in justification of Rome's treatment of Gentius as all but an enemy seems at best insufficient. It certainly shows how Illyrian dependance upon the favour of the senate was brought home forcibly to Gentius and must have convinced him that whatever the outcome of the war between Rome and Macedon his prospects of reviving Illyrian power in the S. Adriatic were not great. Before we pass on to the sealing of the alliance between Perseus and Gentius, there is one category of evidence which is only available for Gentius and not for any other historically attested ruler of Illyria, namely, the coinage.

Some eighty years ago Sir Arthur Evans published a hoard of Greco-Illyrian coins from Selcë in the Klementi mountains northeast of Scodra. (mod. Alb. Skhöder.) (43). He dated their deposition to the period of the overthrow of Illyria by L. Anicius in 168 B.C. The most important pieces are twelve small bronze ~~pieces~~ coins of Scodra with a very characteristic Macedonian shield motif and two bronzes of Gentius exactly similar except that the legend of Gentius replaces that of Scodra and the style is somewhat rougher (44). Evans believed that the autonomous Scodran coinage dated to the period when ~~he believed~~ it was under the control of Philip during the Second Macedonian War, and that he was forced to surrender this region after Cynoscephalae (197 B.C.), and that it was handed over to Gentius in 197 B.C. whom Evans had to put on the throne as early as then, since the autonomous issues and those bearing the name of Gentius are not separated by any appreciable

interval of time. Apart from the patent contradiction with the evidence of Polybius for the reigns of Pleuratus and Gentius, (even at the end of his reign Polybius refers to Gentius as a young man, thus to begin his rule in 197 is impossible), the interpretation of Evans has been upset by subsequent research into the coinage of the Macedonian kingdom. The Macedonian prototypes from which these Scodran coins were copied are now believed to have not been introduced until 186 B.C., during the closing years of Philip's reign (45). It is for the reign of Gentius that these coins are evidence rather than for the period of the Second Macedonian War. The revised chronology for the Illyrian coins based on the recent study of May is as follows: firstly, Macedonian types struck on behalf of Scodra only; secondly, a brief transitional issue with combined inscriptions of the city and the king (only one imperfect example known); and lastly Macedonian types issued in the name of Gentius alone (46). Admittedly this chronology is conjectural but does not seem to conflict with the historical evidence. It is unlikely, for instance, that the autonomous issues are later than those bearing the name of Gentius, since it is most improbable that Macedonian coin types (executed more finely than the royal issues) would have been produced after the dissolution of the kingdom. As will be seen below, Illyrian coins of the later second century begin to illustrate strong Roman influence. The coins described above were almost all minted at Scodra; there is, however, another group of Gentius' coins showing a more Illyrian character and less Macedonian influence (47). A coin of Lissus almost identical in type to this second group of the king's issues makes it almost certain that his

other mint was at Lissus. Instead of a Macedonian shield design the reverse of the coin bears an Illyrian lembus, presumably referring to the Illyrian fleet based upon Lissus. In itself the fact that Illyria imitated Macedonian coin types at any particular period cannot be held as evidence for close political alliances. It was not uncommon for states in the ancient world to copy coin types of other nations and issue them under their own name. The most interesting feature of the Illyrian coinage is indeed the very fact of its existence. Why at a time when Illyria seemed to be most constricted, their navy subdued and possibilities of conquest in the south blocked by Roman interest in the trade route across the Ionian Straits, does Gentius start to issue a series of coins? Is it possible that the Illyrians, cut off from their old habits of plundering in the S., were forced to turn more to trade and to making themselves more self-suffieient? Whether there is any truth in these suggestions, money appears to have been most important to Gentius and it was the apparent willingness of Perseus to buy him over with a sum of three hundred talents which induced Gentius to make a folorn attempt to disentangle himself from the mesh of the amicitia and clientela of Rome by declaring for Macedon at a comparatively late stage in the struggle.

It was Perseus who made the first move towards securing the alliance between himself and Gentius. Two envoys, one of them an Illyrian exile, Pleuratus by name, were sent to Gentius; the latter met them at Lissus and accepted the alliance but demanded a subsidy before he took positive action. A sum of three hundred talents was agreed upon and Illyrian envoys were sent to the treasury at Pella to collect it (48). According to Livy the envoys were allowed to stamp the money with their own Illyrian

stamp, signare eos (i.e. legatos) pecuniam passus and further on he alludes to pecuniam signatam Illyriorum signo (49); whether or not pecuniam may be taken to refer to coined money there is no way of telling; it is interesting since all the known coinage of Gentius is of bronze. Perhaps the stamping merely involved the addition of a mint-mark to coins of Macedon; if this is the case it would be most interesting to identify ~~such~~ them. Perseus sent a token payment of ten talents to Gentius who immediately opened the conflict with Rome by throwing Roman ambassadors into prison. Seeing that Gentius had committed himself to the war Perseus withdrew the rest of the subsidy (50). Such is the version of the outbreak of the war with Illyria given to us by Polybius. We are unable to challenge its details, although the mysterious subsidy that never materialised is typical of the type of anecdote that circulated in Rome about her more powerful enemies which were later incorporated into the official version of the history. The ensuing war lasted but thirty days, so our sources tell us (51).

Gentius collected a force of 15,000 at Lissus, where presumably what remained of his fleet after Roman 'requisioning' was also stationed. After detaching a force of 1,000 and fifty cavalry under his brother Caravantius to subdue the Cavii, a neighbouring unfriendly tribe who are otherwise unknown, Gentius advanced southward from Lissus and laid under siege Bassania, a city five miles from Lissus and in alliance with Rome. The war against Gentius had been designated as the provincia of L. Anicius Gallus, the praetor of 168 B.C. His force was camped at Apollonia and had been reinforced

by contributions from Roman allies, consisting of 2,000 infantry and 200 cavalry under the command of Epicadus and Algacus, young nobles of the Parthini. At this point there is a break in the text of Livy, causing confusion with regard to the early stages of the war. It seems that Gentius' first move was to send his fleet southwards along the coast to attack Roman bases and cut their supply route across the Adriatic. Appian records that L. Anicius defeated the fleet which had been plundering the coast in the region of Epidamnus and Apollonia (52). Judging from the speedy collapse of Illyria after this defeat it is more than likely that Gentius lost a portion of his land forces, since it was the Illyrian method to send a fleet of lembi equipped with an adequate force of infantry in order to follow up fully any success gained on the sea and also to extend the area of pillaging well inland. Only the loss of most of his forces can explain why Gentius suddenly abandoned his naval base at Lissus and fled northward to his other fortress and capital at Scodra, a natural stronghold surrounded on three sides by rivers, at the S. extremity of the Skardarsko Jezero (Scutari Lake). Here he intended to wait until his brother Caravantius came from the N. with reinforcements; but after an unsuccessful attempt to forestall the Roman siege Gentius despaired of reinforcements and surrendered himself to the praetor. L. Anicius then advanced northward and took Medeon, the Illyrian stronghold at the other end of the Lake. Here he captured Caravantius and Gentius' family, his queen Etleva and two sons Scerdilaidas and Pleuratus, and also released the Roman ambassadors whom Gentius had imprisoned as a declaration of his

alliance with Perseus. L. Anicius returned to Rome the following year to celebrate his triumph; the kingdom of Illyria was now sub dicione populi Romani (53).

The settlement which the Roman senate imposed upon the kingdom is clearly based upon the same policy that impelled the senate to deal with Macedon so leniently after the defeat of Perseus. As Badian remarks, 'Rome was prepared to be generous to harmless ex-enemies' (54). The terms of the settlement are preserved by Livy, xlv 26 (55).

When five legati arrived with instructions Anicius returned to Scodra and, calling together all the chiefs from the 'area of his command', he read out from a tribunal the decision of the senate and people of Rome telling the Illyrians that they were to be 'free'; garrisons would be withdrawn from all strongholds. As in the case of Macedon the settlement makes it clear that to Rome libertas did not automatically include immunitas; even though Rome was not the least interested in undertaking the task of administrating Illyria she was careful to define their position in her own legal and technical terms. In effect what Rome did was to declare all the principal peoples of Illyria 'immune' from tribute on the pretext that they had deserted to the Romans while Gentius was yet undefeated. Issa is the only Greek city whose freedom was guaranteed by the settlement; the omission of any other Greek state, especially Pharos, is ~~difficult~~ surprising. The coin evidence (discussed below) shows that an Illyrian king was minting coins in Pharos during the later second century and it may

be that it was not within the kingdom of Gentius but subject to another Illyrian power with whom Rome had no wish to be involved. In the S. the Taulantii, a people who once ruled an empire, were granted immunitas although this is the first occasion in which they are connected with the Ardiaean kingdom (56). To the E., the Pirustae of ~~the~~ Dassaretia probably dwelt in the mountains bordering on the plain of Metohija and were a renowned mining people in the Roman period (57). The Daorsi refused to supply Gentius' brother Caravantius with reinforcements and earned themselves 'immunitas' (58). The list of peoples who bordered on Illyria and may have at one time or another acknowledged the supremacy of the Ardiaean kingdom is probably an accurate record of those who were a party to the settlement; yet in many ways it conceals more than it reveals. Why are the Parthini not mentioned or even, for that matter, the Ardiaei? If Issa is included why were not the other Greek cities, Epidamnus for instance, parties to the settlement? A war indemnity was imposed on a group of three otherwise unknown Illyrian tribes in the immediate vicinity of Scodra. The Scodrenses, Dassarenses and Selepitani were ordered to pay an indemnity for the war amounting to half of what they had previously paid to the king. Following the pattern set in Macedon the area which Gentius actually controlled was divided into three parts. The extent of two of them is clear. One included the Agravonitae, Rhizonitae and the Olciniatae who inhabited the small coastal settlements which in the Roman period became Acruvium and Rhizon in the Boka Kotorska and Olcinium on the coast further to the S. In the course of the war

the Rhizonitae and the Olciniatae deserted Gentius and were placed under the supervision of praefecti (59); the accolae which Livy also records in this division were probably other smaller centres along the coast between the Boka and the mouth of the Drin such as Bouthoe (mod. Budva). The second group is also explicitly described as the area of the Labeatae in the region of the Lake of Scutari, including Medeon in the north and possibly Scodra in the south. The third division is a problem, due to textual corruption. The ~~latin~~ text is as follows; unam eam fecit quae supra dictam est, alteram Labeatas omnis, tertiam Agravonitas et Rhizonitas et Olciniates accolasque eorum (Liv. xlv 26,15.). Clearly supra dictam is suspect and many scholars have sought to substitute a place name for dictam; Weissenborn and Madvig suggested Issam but this must be rejected on geographical grounds as most unlikely (60). The phrase must refer to another comparatively small region close to the two already mentioned. Zippel suggests Dyrrhacium- most unlikely as the city would have been called Epidamnus at the time (61). C. Müller suggests Pistam, a place noted on the Peutinger table S. of Lissus on the road to Epidamnus (62). The present writer has no new place name to suggest; is it not possible, however, that the text could be taken as it stands and that the third region is in fact that mentioned above - namely, those tribes having to pay a war indemnity? This region, consisting of three minor peoples who are otherwise unknown, was centred on Scodra and would have been comparable with the other two regions. After making the settlement in Illyria L. Anicius withdrew his forces to winter quarters in Epirus.

The history of Roman relations with the independent kingdom in Illyria does not reveal any plan of fixed policy to be applied at every juncture; the senate dealt with every situation as it arose and once the bare minimum of Roman interests had been served the area was left to its own devices. On the other hand with the horizon of Roman foreign policy increasing dramatically in the early decades of the second century, Illyria became just one of the many minor powers of the world whose fortunes were governed by the outcome of great struggles between the major powers. In particular the head-on clash between Rome and Macedon put Illyria on a knife-edge and it was only due to Gentius' bad luck rather than political misjudgement that he ended up on the losing side. The independent power of Illyria, although almost certainly much diminished, had become an anachronism at the time of the Third Macedonian War; in years before, Rome was happy to retain existing power structures and work through native client rulers such as Demetrius of Pharos. Impatience and suspicion on the part of Rome and the apparent inability of the Hellenistic World to understand fully the diplomatic language of the senate all contributed to cynicism on all sides and induced Rome to forsake her old ideals and bluntly make her position clear by force.

There is no evidence that after 167 B.C. Illyria was one of the provinciae to which commanders were regularly allotted. The main objection to such a view is that there was no province to govern; the settlement of 167 B.C. reflects a desire by the senate to forget Illyria as soon as possible (63). The libertas of the Illyrian states was not comparable to that which Rome was accustomed to bestow

upon Greek cities, a libertas which she proclaimed herself ready to uphold. The libertas of the cities in Greece was an open provocation to Macedon; in Illyria it reflects Rome's lack of interest and her willingness to leave herself with the minimum of entanglements. This attitude of indifference is apparent in almost all Roman activity in Illyria until the command of C. Iulius Caesar in 59.

Before we pass on to the campaigns of various commanders in Illyria as a whole, there is one more item of evidence that deserves to be noted in this section although, strictly speaking, it falls outside its chronological limits; this is the coinage of an Illyrian king Ballaios. As a result of finds at Risan (ancient Rhizon or Risinium), Sir Arthur Evans was able to devote a section of his paper on Illyrian coinage published in the Numismatic Journal for the year 1880 to a study of this coinage which is found at two places, Risan and Pharos. (64) The Ballaeos coins which are fairly well executed copies of Greek types, are accompanied by issues made in the name of Rhizon only, as well as barbarous degenerations of Ballaeos and coins of a successor bearing the legend MUN which show clear traces of Roman influence (65). As a group the coins are assigned by Evans to the second century, and this is accepted without reserve by Brunšmid (66); more particularly they belong to the period following the defeat of Gentius and the dissolution of his kingdom. Two autonomous coins bear the legend RIZANOTAN and are typologically earlier than the Ballaeos series and may belong to the years immediately following the peace of 167 B.C. (67). The coins of

Ballaeos seem to have been minted at both of the places where they have been found, Pharos and Rhizon, although it is not difficult to distinguish between the products of the two mints. The two series of the king are contemporary, judging the fact that coins of the Rhizonian type are found at Pharos while Pharian types are known from Rhizon. On the coins from Rhizon the usual legend is BASILEOS BALLAIOS while the regal title is very rare on the Pharian coins where the simple legend BALLAIOS is usual. It is possible that after an interval a revival of Illyrian power was tolerated by the Romans who would hardly have been perturbed by an Illyrian 'pseudo-Philip'. It is possible that this power was extinguished in the year 135 when the consul Ser. Flaccus chastised the Ardiaei and the Pleraei (both dwelling in the region of the Narenta) for plundering their neighbours. It is also possible that the usual pretext of 'piracy' was used to prevent any revival of an Illyrian fleet.

Chapter II: Notes

1. cf.Holleaux in CAH vii, 826.

2. On the Ardiaei cf. Tomaschek, RE ii 615; according to Strabo their homeland was originally around the R. Naro (vii 5,5. p.315) where they are said to have disputed possession of salt-pans with the Autariatae, another Illyrian people who were probably their eastern neighbours. The only known salt-pans in the region are at Oraovica on the upper Neretva to the W. of Konjic. Their southward trek as a result of Celtic pressure is attested in the fourth century by Theopompus (FHG i 284).

3. Lembi, with Illyrian shipwrights to build them, were used by Philip when he created his fleet in 216-4 B.C. Pol. v 109. cf. Ormerod, Piracy in the Ancient World. (Liverpool 1924), 29, 167 note 2. and Grosse, RE xii 1895, s.v. Lembus.

4. Holleaux CAH vii 827. Although probably conquered in the recent wars, there is no evidence to suggest that the Parthini were an integral part of the Ardiaean kingdom.

5. Pol. ii 2-7. The most serious loss suffered by the Epirotes seems to have been Atintania, a region well to the south in Epirus commanding the key area of the Aous-Drynon gorges. The history of Atintania is examined by Holleaux, 110 note 1. with discussion of modern theories.

6. Pol. ii 8.

7. op. cit., 77.

8. Pol. ii 9-10. cf. Badian, op. cit., 77 note 18.

9. In addition to Pol. ii 11-12, the sources for the First Illyrian War are: Dio xii frag 49 (with Zon. viii 9); App. Ill. 8. cf. also Liv. Per. xx; Eutrop. iii 4; Florus i 21. The fasti record the triumph of Cn. Fulvius Centumalus ex Illurieis Degrassi, 78-9 and 549-50. The most serious discrepancy in our sources is Dio's tradition that one of the causes of the conflict was a deditio made by Issa to Rome in return for protection against Agron and Teuta. This is rejected by Holleaux, op. cit., 23 n.6, on two good grounds; firstly, while Polybius has no record of such an episode, he does record Issa being received by Rome in fidem at the end of the war; secondly since Issa was the last place reached in the campaign of 229, it appears very unlikely that the war was started on her behalf. These arguments are accepted by Badian, op. cit, 77 note 20.

10. Badian, op. cit., 79f.

11. On these questions, as on many other points in the course of this section, the analysis of Badian, op. cit., is followed.

12. repeated uncritically by Oost, op. cit., 13.

13. Pol. ii 12, 8.

14. Appian's remarks that Demetrius was allowed to retain only a small number of possessions because of his untrustworthiness is dismissed by Badian, op. cit., 80, as an annalist's ex post facto (App. Illyr. 8.).

15. Holleaux, op. cit., 131-2 note 5, suggests that the alliance had been made as early as 225 since Polybius specifically mentions

the war with the Gauls as one of the factors which induced him to join Doson. Appian is silent on the question but seems to think that Demetrius was in active 'revolt' in the years 225-222. cf. App. loc. cit.

16. The 'Roman' version of Demetrius' activities in 220 is given by Pol. iii 16, 2-5. Its unacceptability has been demonstrated fully by Badian, op. cit., 83f.; Oost, op. cit., 22, does not appear to grasp why it is possible that Demetrius believed that he ran no risk of Roman intervention. Walbank, op. cit., ad. iii 16,2 accepts the Holleaux 'escape route' by describing Demetrius as 'a member of a semi-barbarous people, and so likely to act with what would have been irresponsibility in a Greek or Roman'. Further details on the fateful raid of 220 are added by Polybius iv 16,6f., where Scerdilaidas appears to be the dynast concerned.

17. The sources for this war are; Pol. iii 18-91; App. Ill. 8; Dio xii frag. 53 with Zon. viii 20. The consul Livius is not mentioned by Polybius, and Münzer has suggested that he may have been biased in favour of the Aemilii; Badian, op. cit., 87, note 74, is doubtful, however, and would place the responsibility upon Fabius, no friend of the Livii. De Sanctis, Storia di Roma, III ii 169-170, in an appendix on the sources of Polybius at this point, suggests a Greek rather than an annalistic source with an Aemilian contamination.

18. Dimale, as Zippel, op. cit., 56, first suggested, is to be equated with Dimallum of Liv. xxix 12,3 (in 205 B.C.), then

under siege by the Parthini. It does not seem to have been a port, as Holleaux, following Philippson, RE v 646 s.v. Dimale, rightly notes (op. cit., 135 note 1). As Badian, op. cit., 87, note 75, suggests, Pharos was probably destroyed in 219 but very soon rebuilt. Beaumont, JHS lvi (1936), 188 note 200, believed that there must have been two cities on Pharos; the Parian colony at Starigrad in the NW. of the island, and the stronghold of Demetrius. He considered that the account of the capture given by Polybius (iii 18) cannot be reconciled with the topography of modern Starigrad. After more excavation and topographical research in recent years it is almost certain that Demetrius' castle was at Starigrad. The new evidence is set out by M. Nikolanc, Vjesnik lvi-lix/2 (1954-1957) Antidoron Abramić ii, 52 ff. 'Pharos, les Romains et Polybe', with diagram, p. 57 fig. 1[1].

19. Liv. xxii 33,5, where envoys are sent to demand arrears of 'tribute' in 217 B.C.

20. Fine, JRS xxvi, 'Macedonia, Illyria and Rome (220-219)', concludes that Demetrius can have had no encouragement from Philip in his raid of 220. Indeed why should he have had? Philip's alliance with Scerdilaidas was made in order to obtain naval assistance against Aetolia, as Fine rightly concludes, but there is no trace of any alliance between Philip and Demetrius, as Fine, op. cit., 39, assumed.

21. Scerdilaidas assisted Philip in his campaign of 218, Pol. v 4,5. His attacks on Macedonian territory are recorded by Pol. v 95 1f;

101 1f.; 108 1f. There is no evidence of any Roman influence behind the activities of Scerdilaidas, Badian, op. cit., 88.

22. Pol. v, 101 6f; 108 8. cf. Walbank, Philip V of Macedon (Cambridge 1940), 64f.

23. Pol. v, 109-10.

24. Liv. xxiii 32, 17; 38, 7f. 'non tueri modo Italiae oram sed explorare de Macedonico bello'.

25. Liv. xxiv 40.

26. Pol. viii 13-14b. (Lissus, Dassaretae, Hyscana= Uscana, N. of L. Lychnidus.) Liv. xxix 12,3 (in occupation of Dimale, Parthini and Atintanes at the time of Phoenice). Lissus appears to have been the limit of Philip's northward advance. Zippel (op. cit., 70.) believed that Philip succeeded in reducing the whole of the Illyrian kingdom, a theory based on the inclusion by Livy (xxvii 30,13) of the Ardiaei among Philip's conquests and that the Romans did not have any help from their Illyrian ally for the rest of the war. This is very conjectural; as May, JRS xxxvi (1946), 49f., remarks we do not know that he even took Scodra.

27. May, loc. cit., for similar argument.

28. On Pleuratus, cf. Lenschau, RE s.v. Pleuratos. The importance of the peace of Phoenice (cf. Liv. xxix 12.) as a stage in the development in Roman foreign policy, cf. Badian, op. cit., 91.

29. Pol. xviii 1,14. Philip is required to, τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα τόπους παραδοῦναι Ῥωμαίοις, ὧν γέγονε κύριος μετὰ τὰς ἐν Ἠπείρῳ διαλύσεις,
translated by Livy xxxii 33, 3, 'restituenda ... loca quae post

pacem in Epiro factam occupasset'. The traditional interpretation, based on Zippel, op. cit., 73f and more particularly Holleaux, op. cit., 278 note 1, has been to translate μετὰ as meaning 'after' (= as a result of) and not 'since' (= in contravention of), thus making Flamininus demand lands ceded to Philip by the peace of 205. This view has been attacked by two scholars independently and is shown to refer more probably to gains made by Philip in the years 205-201. As Balsdon shows the context of the passage supports this view (Some questions about Historical Writings in the Second Century B.C., CQ. 47 (1953), 162f.) Badian, op. cit., 91 note 102. cf. also Balsdon, JRS xliv (1954), 35f, Rome and Macedon, 205-200 B.C., and Badian Foreign Clientelae, 61f.

30. Pleuratus' loyalty is acclaimed on two occasions, cf. Pol. xxi 11,7; 21,3. On his relations with other members of the Illyrian dynasty, cf. Lenschau, RE xxi, 237f., s.v. Pleuratos.

31. On possible encroachments by Philip after 205, cf. above note 29.

32. Liv. xxxi 28.

33. Award of Lychnidus, cf. Pol. xviii 47. also Liv. xxxiii 34.

34. Liv. xxxviii 7.

35. Pol. xxxii 18.

36. On the Daorsi and their coinage see below, note 58.

37. Our only source for the incident is Liv. xl 42. The rapid deterioration of relations between Rome and Macedon (Demetrius was put to death at about this time) suggests that the senate

may have viewed with suspicion any attempt by Illyria to cause trouble even if it was only traditional 'piracy'.

38. Every modern scholar accepts without question the Greek (Polybian) portrait of Gentius as brutal, intermperate and cowardly. The same is the case with the description of Demetrius of Pharos, cf. above note 16.

39. For the policy of Rome towards Macedon after 189, cf. Badian FC ch. IV, in particular 94ff. on Demetrius.

40. Liv. xlii 26, 2-7.

41. Liv. xlii 48, 6-8.

42. Liv. xlii 37, 2; for his return to Rome, xlii 45, 8.

43. Numismatic Chronicle (New Series), xx, 1880, 269ff.

44. Evans, loc. cit., autonomous coin of Scodra, 270, n.1 (12 examples); of Gentius, n.3 (2 examples).

45. The works dealing with the revision of the Macedonian coin chronology are noted by May, JRS xxxvi, 50, note 11.

46. May, op. cit., 53, cf. also pl. viii fig. 3.

47. Evans, op. cit., 271,4 and pl. xiii 6, cf. also May, op. cit., 53 and pl. viii 7,8.

48. Pol. xxxviii 8.

49. Liv. xliv 23.

50. Liv. xliv 23; Pol. xxix 2; cf. Appian Mac. xvi.

51. The sources for the war against Gentius are: Liv. xliv 30-32, with Eutrop. iv 6; Dio xxxi 8, 10; Plut. Aem. Paull. xiii 2; Flor. i 29; Appian Ill.9.

52. Appian Ill. 9.

53. Liv. xlv 8; Triumph of L. Anicius, Degrassi, 81, cf. 556.

54. Badian, Foreign Clientelae, 97.

55. Livy's text is clearly based upon the original record. "pacata Epiro divisisque in hiberna copiis per opportunas urbes, regressus ipse in Illyricum Scodrae, quo quinque legati ab Roma venerant, evocatis ex tota provincia principibus conventum habuit. ibi pro tribunali pronuntiavit de sententia consilii senatum populumque Romanum Illyrios esse liberos iubere: praesidia ex omnibus oppidis, arcibus, castellis sese deducturum. non solum liberos, sed etiam immunes fore Issenses et Taulantios, Dassaretiorum Pirustas, Rhizonitas, Olciniatas, quod incolumi Gentio ad Romanos defecissent. Daorsis quoque immunitatem dare, quod relicto Caravantio cum armis ad Romanos transissent. Scodrensibus et Dassarensibus et Selepitanis ceterisque Illyriis vectigal dimidium eius, quod regi pependissent, (inpositum). inde in tres partes Illyricum divisit. unam eam fecit quae supra '' Dictam est, alteram Labeatas omnis, tertiam Agravonitas et Rhizonitas et Olciniatas accolasque eorum. hac formula dicta [in] Illyrico ipse inde Epiri Passaronem in hiberna redit.

56. Fluss RE iv A, 2529. They dwelt in the region to the SE of Lissus in the hinterland behind Epidamnus and Apollonia. cf. Mayer, op. cit., 331.

57. Polaschek, RE xx 1729f. Mayer, op. cit., 264, suggests that

instead of Dassaretiorum, Daesitiatum should be read. This is most improbable; the Daesitiates dwelt faraway in the Upper Basna valley around Sarajevo; see ch. XIV below p. 414

58. On the Daorsi, cf. Strabo vii 5,5, (p. 315); Patsch RE iv, 2231. After the defeat of Gentius they issued their own autonomous coinage, cf. Schlosser, Beschreibung der Altgriechisches Münzen, I, Wien, 1893, 42, with legend DAORSON; cf. also Brunšmid, op. cit., 74f.

59. Liv. xliv 31.

60. Madvig, Emendationes Livianae, 606; Weissenborn-Müller edition, ad. loc.

61. op. cit., 97.

62. Ptolemy, ed. by C. Müller (Paris 1883), 308 ad II 16,3.

63. rightly Stevenson in CAH ix 440.

64. Evans, Num. Chron., loc. cit., 292f. and pl.I.

65. Evans, loc. cit., 294, IV 1-5.

66. op. cit., 76.

67. Evans, loc. cit., 292, 1-2, pl. I 9-10.

Chapter II: Bibliographical note.

E. Badian. 'Notes on Roman foreign policy in Illyria 230-201 B.C.' Papers of the British School at Rome xx (1952), 72-93.
A detailed and extremely valuable analysis of the motives behind Roman policy towards Illyria especially during the wars against Teuta and Demetrius of Pharos. Badian stresses the importance of the Roman conception of clientela, an extra-legal association without treaty, as the principal influence upon Roman policy at a period when Rome was only just beginning to be involved in the complexities of Hellenistic politics. This radical departure from the traditional pattern of study of Roman policy towards the East (i.e. the question whether there was a deep-laid plot to conquer or whether Roman conquest was almost wholly involuntary) has been elaborated in his recent study of the period of Roman expansion, Foreign Clientelae 264-70 B.C. (Oxford 1958).
Most of the literature dealing with Illyria in the late third century B.C. is listed by Badian, PBSR op. cit., 72 and need not be repeated here, except perhaps for the following:

M. Holleaux Rome, la Grèce et les Monarchies Hellenistiques au iiie. siècle av. J-C (Paris) 1921. Still indispensible.

S.I. Oost 'Roman policy in Epirus and Acharnania in the age of the

Roman conquest of Greece' Arnold Foundation Studies volume iv (new series), Dallas, Texas. 1954.

N. Vulić 'Première guerre d'Illyrie', Bulletin de l'Académie des lettres, Académie royale Serb. i (1935) 231ff. cf. also the same article in Eos xxxii (1929) 651ff.

F. Walbank A commentary on Polybius, Oxford 1957.

G. Zippel Die römische Herrschaft in Illyricum bis auf Augustus, Leipzig 1877. In spite of its age this is the only study of the Roman conquest of the Balkans and is still worth consulting.

Chapter III Rome and Illyria (167-59 B.C.)

The victory over Gentius and the resulting settlement imposed on Illyria did not establish a regular 'provincia' across the Adriatic but did secure Roman interests by the very fact that imposing a settlement on various states would give Rome a legal right to intervene should she consider such action was necessary to protect her interests. The defeat of Macedon together with her Illyrian ally had removed the possibility of Illyria being used as a bridgehead for an attack upon Italy from the east as had certainly been in the mind of Philip V when he seized the Illyrian fortress at Lissus in 213 B.C. (see above p. 42). The position which Rome assumed as a result of this settlement must have given considerable encouragement to traders and settlers from Italy who would be sure to use the umbrella of Roman protection on every possible occasion. Rome's alliance with Issa and the confirmation of it granted in 167 B.C. would give that state a better bargaining position with her enemies; previously her great enemy had been the Illyrian kingdom, but when this was removed it was the Delmatae with whom she clashed. This large Illyrian people dwelt on the coast and in the hinterland in central Illyria, between the rivers Titius (mod. Krka) and the Naro (mod. Neretva), and first come into contact with Rome through complaints from Issa. Their distribution and territory is discussed more fully below (~~Section III~~, ch. XIII pp. 363ff).

In 158 B.C. Issa made complaint to Rome that her mainland possessions Epetium (mod. Stobreč, see below p. 329) and Tragurium (mod. Trogir,

see below p. 328),were being molested by the Delmatae. Presumably Issa had felt that she was now able to acquire territory on the neighbouring mainland at the expense of the Delmatae and when the Delmatae naturally resisted such inroads on their territory Issa rushed to appeal to Rome as she had done in 172 B.C. when she made an hysterical attack upon Gentius, accusing him, perhaps with good grounds, of plotting with Perseus against Roman interests (1).

Polybius remarks that the Delmatae had once been subject to the Illyrian kingdom during the reign of Pleuratus but later broke away from their allegiance and attacked neighbouring peoples, making them pay tributes in cattle and corn (2). It is unlikely that any connection between the Delmatae and the Illyrian kingdom amounted to effective domination of the former by the latter although perhaps some of the coastal Delmatae may have been in alliance with Gentius against the common enemy of Issa in alliance with Rome. In addition to Issa the mainland people of the Daorsi who were issuing their own coinage about this time joined in complaints against the Delmatae. The Daorsi had been favoured in the settlement of 167 B.C. as a people who had deserted to the Roman side while Gentius was yet undefeated.

The Roman reaction to Issa's complaints illustrates her interest in mainland Illyria. A commission of investigation under the consular C. Fannius Strabo was dispatched across the Adriatic to enquire into the state of Illyria with particular reference to the conduct of the Delmatae (3). Whether or not the senate considered that the authority of a Roman consular senator would be sufficient to overawe the

Delmatae is not clear but the answer he received must have come as a considerable shock, especially coming from a people who must have been well aware of the power of Roman arms. Fannius reported to the senate on his return early in 157 B.C. that not only had the Delmatae refused to hear his speech but had refused even to observe elementary diplomatic courtesies. They had replied quite bluntly that what went on across the Adriatic was no concern of the Romans. There is no reason to doubt the statement of Polybius that Roman indignation was as much responsible for the subsequent campaigns as any sense of obligation to support her allies in that quarter. The other reason given is more difficult to accept; according to Polybius the senate felt that the years of peace since the defeat of Perseus ten years previously had had a detrimental effect upon the warlike efficiency of the army (probably referring to the scattered Italian allies) and that a rigorous campaign in Illyria was just the way to put things right. We may doubt that the senate thought in terms of training wars at this period ~~while~~ or, with such places as Spain, there was any difficulty in finding warlike employment for Roman forces (4).

The ensuing campaign against the Delmatae was carried out efficiently and, if our topographical evidence is accurate, even brilliantly. Command was entrusted to the consul of the following year, C. Marcius Figulus (5). Our main account of the war is given by Appian (6). At first things did not go too well and while Figulus was establishing a camp he was driven in flight as far as the River Naro. In view of his subsequent success within the same season what is implied by Appian to have been a disaster may have in fact been an

armed withdrawal. At any rate he soon took the offensive and succeeded in laying siege to Delminium, the capital of the Delmatae. If Figulus reached there from the valley of the Naro/Neretva then his probable route was up the Trebižat and then over into Duvnopolje where Delminium lay on the Lib planina near Županac. There is, however, a problem in the topography. There is fairly good evidence that a city, probably called Delminium, existed under the Empire at Županac; following on a suggestion of Evans, Patsch was able to show by archaeological investigation that a settlement of major political importance existed at Županac and was probably the Delminium which possessed its own bishop in the sixth century. It is possible that the Delminium besieged by Figulus (and captured by his successor in the following year) was on a different site from the later city (7). In spite of the statement of Strabo that it was turned into a sheep pasture after its destruction (8), I feel that the evidence for the places being identical is perhaps to be preferred.

Figulus had hoped that an attack late in the season would take them unawares, but he found them in the field ready to meet him. Even though he was able to establish a blockade of Delminium he could make no headway against it ~~had~~ and contented himself with the reduction of minor strongholds in the area. Before he returned to Rome at the end of 156 B.C. he had managed to set fire to part of the fortress but the final reduction was left to his successor, the consul P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica (9).

The immediate resumption of the siege suggests that a force had been left in Illyria to maintain the blockade during the winter of

156/5 B.C. Scipio took Delminium, turned it into a sheep pasture and returned home to celebrate a triumph d]e De[lmateis] (10). One cannot help feeling some sympathy for Figulus who had probably done most of the hard fighting in the first season, and paved the way for Scipio's success. Status is perhaps involved here; the senate would hardly refuse a triumph to a Scipio if he could support his claim in any way. Appian's ommission of the campaign conducted by Scipio is likely to be more the result of poor research on his part rather than the use of a source unfavourable to the Scipiones (see note 28A below p. 90f).

The campaigns of 156-5 B.C. are quite untypical of Roman activity on the opposite side of the Adriatic; with the exception of the poorly reported campaigns of C. Cosconius in 78-76 B.C. (see p. 83f. below), Roman arms never made any progress against the Delmatae until the military exercises of Octavian in 34-33 B.C. and during the Civil War they inflicted some serious disasters on Roman armies while acting as allies of the Pompeians (see below p. 104f. ch. IV). Judged in this light the achievements of Figulus and Scipio were considerable when compared with, for instance, the activities of L. Metellus in 118-7 B.C.

The next Roman activity in Illyria recorded by our sources appears to have been on a considerably smaller scale, but the diplomatic events leading up to the fighting exhibit the same pattern which produced the two-year war against the Delmatae in 156-5 B.C. The evidence for this second war is Appian with a sentence in the epitome of Livy.

In 135 B.C. the Ardiaei and Palarii attacked 'Roman Illyria', as Appian describes it, and when they failed to make amends the senate sent a force of 10,000 infantry and 600 cavalry across the Adriatic under the consul Ser. Fulvius Flaccus (11). When the Illyrians saw this they tried to negotiate, but even so would not meet the senate's demands and the consul was ordered to attack. Although Appian says that the expedition was merely 'a raid' and that he could find no conclusion to it, Livy's statement that Ser. Flaccus subdued the Vardaei (i.e. Ardiaei) may be taken as evidence that the consul accomplished his task. Strabo (12) locates the Palarii (or Pleraei as he calls them) opposite the island of Corcyra Nigra and the Ardiaei opposite Pharos (Hvar, Roman Pharia). The last-named people were once the foundation of the Illyrian monarchy and had probably spread up the coast making encroachments on the territory of the Delmatae; by the time of Pliny they had dwindled to insignificance (13).

In the north of Illyria the mixed Celtic and Illyrian Iapudes were every bit the equal of the Delmatae in military power. Rome had been in contact with the western fringe of this people since 171 B.C. when the senate sent envoys to them and other peoples of the area to apologize for the agressive activities of the consul L. Cassius Longinus (14). The next occasion on which we hear of this people was over forty years later when a Roman consul campaigns against them and is awarded a triumph. In the midst of a political crisis in 129 B.C. the consul P. Sempronius Tuditanus left Rome suddenly and

marched against the Iapudes. At first the campaign went badly and Sempronius was only saved from defeat by the courage of D. Iunius Brutus, hero of the Lusitanian War (15).

The only motive for Sempronius leaving Rome appears to have been the crisis at Rome over the Gracchan land commission since there is no evidence of any trouble in the northeast during the previous years. The role of Iunius Brutus is noted by Livy (16) but is not mentioned by Appian, who states that Sempronius was assisted by Ti. (Latinius) Pandusa (17). The status of Pandusa is not at all clear. Münzer follows a suggestion of Gaebler that Pandusa was a propraetor of Macedonia (18), but this is out of the question since it implies that Roman forces in northeast Italy and Macedonia had already established contact or, at the least, that they could act in concert as early as the second century B.C. Any suggestion that Roman had opened any form of overland communication between Cisalpine Gaul and Macedonia at this period can be dismissed without further discussion. Zippel has the most likely answer when he suggests that Pandusa held some command over troops in N. Italy when he was ordered to assist in the sudden campaigns of Sempronius (19). Of Pandusa's identity virtually nothing is known; the nomen Latinius can be supplemented for senators of later generations while the cognomen Pandusa points to Lucania and Bruttium (20).

Sempronius triumphed de Iapudibus on the first of October in the year of his consulate (21), although other evidence shows that his operations dealt with the Istri as well as other peoples of the

northeast. Pliny records that Tuditanus, who conquered the Histri, inscribed on his statue/ ab Aquileia ad Tityum flumen stadia MM (22) while what appear$ to be fragments of an elogium of Sempronius have been discovered at Aquileia (23). Part of this has been restored to read; [descende]re et Tauriscos C[arnosque et Liburnos ex montib]us coactos. Combined with the evidence of Pliny this shows that his operations covered a greater area than might be suggested by his triumph, although it must be borne in mind that his operations cannot have been very protracted as he was back in Rome enjoying a triumph by October. The reference to the coastline southeast of Aquileia may reflect some naval activity, but we can be confident that Sempronius did not make any serious inroad into the territory of the Iapudes. Such penetration did not occur until nearly a century later when Octavian fought his way through the middle of their territory taking their strongholds by siege (see below ch. IV p. 123ff).

The second series of Roman campaigns against the Delmatae is also connected to some extent with operations in the northeast of Italy and beyond. Appian is our source for the campaign narrative (24). He writes that the Segestani seem to have been subjugated by L. Cotta and L. Metellus, presumably when the two men were colleagues in the consulate in 119 B.C. The Segestani dwelt in the Save valley and their city Segesta was known in later centuries as Siscia (mod. Sisak southeast of Zagreb). It is almost incredible that a Roman army penetrated to this area as early as 119 B.C., even allowing for a large force under the command of both consuls. Yet is would be unwise to doubt the explicit statement of Appian especially as he

makes reference again to Segesta in his narrative of the campaigns of Octavian (25). Appian continues that in the following season Metellus undertook a campaign against the Delmatae for which he celebrated a triumph in 117 B.C. and took to himself the title Delmaticus (26). He states that war was actually declared on the Delmatae while Metellus was still consul (i.e. during 119) and records that his sole motive was to gain a triumph for himself. Metellus was received as a friend and spent the winter among them as their guest at Salonae. It is clearly pointless to speculate on what Metellus actually did although the award of a triumph de De[lma]teis and the mention of a victory in the epitome of Livy (27) suggests that he must have accomplished something. One point can be emphasised, however; he certainly could not have passed overland from the Save valley to have spent the winter of 118/7 in Salonae, as Zippel and some other modern writers have assumed (28). It would be interesting to know why the consuls of 119 B.C. appear to have received no recognition of their great feat in capturing Segesta, a fact which must make us regard Appian's testimony with at least some reserve, while the campaigns against the Delmatae may, as Appian implies, have been merely 'triumph hunting' for one of the powerful Metelli. Again the possibility arises that Appian's source may be strongly biased, in this case apparently against the Metelli. This is certainly more likely than with the omission of the success of P. Scipio in 155 B.C. which was probably due to poor checking of his sources. In this case Appian is well aware of

Metellus' success and may be repeating the sentiments of his source quite uncritically. (See note 28A).

After the campaign of Metellus in 118/7 B.C. we hear of virtually no Roman activity in Illyria for nearly thirty years; the crises of the Jugurthine War and the Cimbric invasions, followed by the Social and Civil Wars, did not afford Roman commanders the opportunity of seeking military glory in such an obscure area.

Appian records that in 84 B.C., when all hope of a reconciliation with L. Sulla had disappeared, L. Cinna and Cn. Carbo 'traversed Italy, collecting soldiers whom they carried across by detachments on shipboard to Liburnia, which was to act as their base against Sulla. The first detachment crossed in safety; the next encountered a storm, and those who reached land escaped home immediately, as they did not relish the prospect of fighting their fellow-citizens. When the rest learnt this they too refused to cross to Liburnia' (29). In an ensuing riot Cinna was murdered and Carbo was forced to recall the troops who had already landed in Liburnia (30).

Commenting upon this episode, in a recent paper as yet unpublished, E. Badian has suggested that the notion that these landings were to provide an advance base against Sulla is far from correct. Sulla was in Greece or Epirus and if the demonrats were hoping to prevent or even to oppose Sulla's landing in Italy, then it was there that troops should have been sent rather than to Liburnia where they would be of no use whatsoever. There was certainly no reason to prevent Cinna, by all account quite a respectable strategist, from

taking troops across from Brundisium to Epirus. As Badian suggests, the only reasonable explanation for this landing in Liburnia is that the democrats were hoping to get their levies into battle practice by some stiff campaigning in Illyria before they were called on to face Sulla's veterans fresh from their victory over Mithridates (31).

The plan was sound and was precisely that adopted by Octavian when he wished not only to give his army some real hard battle practice but to improve his own generalship which had not been at all effective in the war against Sextus Pompeius. The only difference is that whereas Octavian had more time and able lieutenants such as M. Agrippa to assist him, the democrats had little time and far fewer resources.

In a summary of the achievements of Sulla's campaigns in the Balkans during 85 B.C. Eutropius records that he subdued the Dardani, Scordisci, Delmatae and the Maedi (32). No other source connects Sulla with a campaign against the Delmatae and it is likely that Zippel is correct in regarding this as a misprint and that the name of another people closer to his known area of operations in the Eastern Balkans should be substituted; citing Granius Licinianus he suggests Denseletae (33).

In the early seventies we hear of what appears to be a major campaign against the Delmatae. Eutropius records that C. Cosconius, identified by Münzer with a praetorian commander in Apulia, was sent to Illyricum with proconsular imperium where he subdued the greater part of the territory of the Delmatae and captured Salonae in

the course of two years of campaigning (34). Orosius gives a similar account (35). The date of the campaign is not known precisely but Münzer's suggestion of 78-77 B.C. fits in well with the revival of Roman military power after the troubles of the previous decade. Certainly there is evidence that the campaigns were over some time before 74 B.C. (36). The mention of the capture of Salonae is interesting if only to show how much ground Rome had lost in that quarter since the second century, when Metellus spent a winter there as a guest of the Delmatae. The conquest of Salonae by Cosconius appears to have endured and to have opened up the place to Roman and Italian settlement, with the result that a powerful community of traders and settlers existed there by the time of the Civil War between Pompey and Caesar (see below ch. IV p. 103).

There is no justification in connecting a fragment from the Histories of Sallust referring to an invasion of Iapydia at about this period with the activities of C. Cosconius. It is of course possible that when later writers refer to Dalmatia they mean the area of the Roman province and not merely the lands of the Delmatae although in this case the specific statement of Eutropius that Cosconius' principal achievement was the capture of Salonae suggests that ~~in this case~~ only the Delmatae were involved. If we are to seek a commander to connect with the Sallust reference then we have the case of an otherwise unknown P. Licinius, whose army was attacked by Iapudes, feigning to surrender and allowing themselves to be made prisoners before falling upon the Roman rearguard (37).

The little evidence we possess for the history of Illyria in the period 167-59 B.C. shows clearly that the area was never held by the Roman leaders to be of great importance. It was only when Gentius joined Perseus as his active ally that a praetor was sent to deal with him and make a political settlement of the small region around Scodra which comprised his kingdom. The grant of libertas to almost all the peoples of the area and the complete withdrawal of all Roman forces to spend the following winter in Epirus shows that once the ally of Perseus had been dealt with, Rome was content to allow Illyria to go its own way.

Polybius says that one of the main motives behind the campaigns of 156-5 B.C. against the Delmatae was the necessity of maintaining the military efficiency of the Roman army and the forces of the allies. A similar motive almost certainly lay behind other Roman campaigns in Illyria, in particular those of the democrats in Liburnia in 84 B.C. and those of Octavian in 35-33 B.C. The activity of Ser. Fulvius Flaccus in 135 B.C. against the Ardiaei and Pleraei were a punishment for attacks on Roman allies- a raid, Appian calls it- while Sempronius Tuditanus found the Iapudes a most convenient pretext for abandoning a most difficult political situation in Rome.

The campaigns of L. Metellus Delmaticus may well have achieved something more lasting; he is the first Roman commander known to have operated on the central part of the Illyrian coast with a base at Salona. Zippel (op. cit., 180f.) rejects previous theories that Illyria was attached to Macedonia or to Cisalpine Gaul and puts forward the case for Illyria having become an independant command

to which a proconsul was sent if the situation there warranted it. Only one proconsul is known to have operated in Illyria in the period 117-59 B.C. and it may be that this command of C. Cosconius was due to a necessity to deal with a serious situation which had arisen there as a result of Roman impotence during the civil wars. Whatever gains Metellus effected the Delmatae had clearly recovered any losses, since Cosconius' main achievement was the recovery of Salonae where Metellus had spent a comfortable winter in 118/7 B.C. There is no evidence for the institution of any regular provincial command in Illyria under the Republic, if only because no fasti can be compiled.

There is nothing surprising in the lack of evidence for the status of Illyria during the Republic; it lay on no major route and was thus of no strategic importance to Roman campaigns in the Eastern Mediterranean. There was no need to send armies to open up the land route between Italy and the East when the quickest route was by the short sea crossing from Brundisium. A glance at any map of the Illyrian coast immediately shows why; even with modern transport facilities, long stretches of the coast are extremely difficult to negotiate particularly in Liburnia with the ridge of the Velebit and further south where the mountains of Montenegro make the coastline south of Epidaurum extremely inhospitable. A Roman army could never have risked the overland route through Illyria if it had any hope of reaching its destination without serious losses. Roman armies went to Illyria to fight, whether to train an army for a civil war (as with Cinna and Carbo in 84 B.C.) or to salvage the military reputation of

an army or its commander (as with Octavian in 35-33 B.C.).

Chapter III: notes.

1. Pol. xxxii 9.

2. Pol. loc. cit; this is the earliest mention of the Delmatae by an ancient source.

3. Pol. loc. cit; on C. Fannius Strabo, consul 161 B.C. and apparently novus homo, cf. MRR i 446.

4. Pol. xxxii 13.

5. On C. Marcius Figulus, cf. MRR i 447.

6. Appian Ill. 11; the campaigns were described by Livy, cf. epit. xlvii, and are also referred to by Florus i 25.

7. On Delminium see below ch. XIII p. 371f..

8. Strabo vii 5,5 p. 315.

9. Florus, loc. cit., records only the campaign of Figulus and seems to imply that he destroyed Delminium by fire (incensa urbe); the omission of the campaign of Scipio in 155 B.C. suggests that he may have been using the same faulty source as Appian.

10. The campaign of Scipio is well recorded: Frontin. Strat. iii 6,2; Zon. ix 25; Ampelius xix 11; auct. de vir. ill. 44,4; Liv. epit. xlvii; Obseq. 16; Strabo vii 5,5, p. 315. cf. MRR i 448. His triumph is attested on the fasti triumphales (Degrassi 82f cf. 557) under 155 B.C: [P. Cornelius] P.f. Cn.[n. Nasica a.ÞXCIIX cos. II d]e De[lmateis .....]. This disproves the later tradition recorded by Ampelius and auct. de vir. ill. that Scipio refused his triumph cf. MRR i 449 note 1. The suggestion that the two campaigns recorded in our sources are in fact a duplication of

the same episode is quite untenable since both are attested by the evidence of reliable sources, Polybius for Figulus and Livy and the fasti triumphales for Scipio. The suggestion of a duplication was put forward by the Hungarian Josef Salanki, 'Figulus oder Scipio' in Arch. Értesito 1940, 258-60.

11. Appian Ill. 10, cf. Liv. epit. lvi.

12. On Ser. Fulvius Flaccus cf. MRR i 488. Livy, epit lvi, states clearly that Fulvius Flaccus cos. Vardaeos in Illyrico subegit.

13. Strabo, vii 5,6 p. 315, is our source for the location of these two peoples; he sets the Pleraei (presumably the Palarii of Appian) on the mainland opposite Corcyra Nigra and the Ardiaei opposite Pharos (mod. Hvar, Roman Pharia). The piratical Ardiaei had apparently spread northward along the coast from their original home in the south. On their insignificance by the first century A.D. cf. Pliny NH iii 143 where he refers to them by their later name of Vardaei (as Livy, loc. cit.).

14. Liv. xli 1-5, 6 1-3, 7 4-10, xliii 1 4-12, 5 7-10. cf. MRR i 416.

15. Liv. epit. lix. For the internal politics cf. Last, CAH ix 42f.

16. loc. cit.

17. Appian Ill. 10.

18. Münzer, RE xii 927 n.6, follows Gaebler in Ztschr. f. Numism. xxiii 162f.

19. Zippel, op. cit., 136.

20. Under Tiberius we have Ti. Latinius Pandusa, legate of Moesia succeeded by Poppaeus Sabinus, Tac. ann. ii 66; cf. also XIV

Aricia, Ti. Latinius Ti.f. Pandusa IIIIvir viarum curandarum. The cognomen Pandusa points to Lucania or Bruttium, cf. RE xii 927.

21. Degrassi 82f. cf. 559, C. Sem[p]ronius C.f. C.n. Tuditan. a. ÐCXXIV cos de Iapudibus k. Oct.

22. Plin NH iii 129. The MSS read M stadia but MM (app. 250 miles) must surely be restored.

23. CIL I(2) ii 652,653, cf. Ojh. x (1907) 264.

24. Appian Ill. 10 for the consuls against the Segestani and 11 for Metellus against the Delmatae.

25. Appian Ill. 22.

26. Appian Ill, 11.

27. Degrassi 83 cf. 560 cf. also Eutropius iv 23,2, postea L. Metello et Q. Mucio Scaevola coss. de Dalmatia triumphatum est. Liv. epit. lxii.

28. Zippel, op. cit., 137.

28A. The principal source for the history of Illyria in the second half of the seaond century B.C. is the Illyrike of Appian, who was a civil servant in the time of Antoninus Pius. Down to 167 B.C. he is probably following Livy or Polybius and is reasonably reliable and complete. After that period, however, he has some extraordinary omissions and remarks on more than one occasion on how difficult he found it to compile evidence for the wars and the history of the peoples involved.

He gives details of the exploits of C. Marcius Figulus in

156 B.C. and judging from his reference to a retreat as far as the River Naro was following a source that gave some reasonable topographical detail. Yet Scipio's success in the following year is nowhere recorded. He dismisses the minor campaign against the Ardiaei and Pleraei in 135 B.C. as a mere raid, saying that he could discover no conclusion to it, although the epitome of Livy leaves little doubt that the author recorded a victory, possibly with some details. Sempronius Tuditanus is mentioned and Appian supplies the information about that general being assisted by the mysterious Ti. (Latinius) Pandusa (Ill. 10). Metellus against the Delmatae in 117 B.C. is dismissed scornfully as mere triumph-hunting and Appian mentions no other campaign there until the time of Caesar. The omission of any reference to Cisconius in 78-76 B.C., information about whom was taken from presumably Livy by Eutropius and Orosius, is perhaps confirmation that Appian was not following Livy. Furthermore his arrangement is topographical and not chronological; the war of 135 B.C. precedes that of Figulus against the Delmatae in 156 B.C.

Perhaps the key to the problem of the inadequacy of Appian's work for the later second century is the large amount of space given to the campaigns of Octavian in 35-33 B.C. (ch. 16-30) for which he drew upon the memoirs of Augustus himself. Here he is forced to revert to a chronological pattern. There is little doubt that he was far happier paraphrasing the narrative of Augustus than attempting to construct any form of history of

Roman wars in Illyria during the second century. The incompleteness of his account of the wars of 156-5 and 135 may be due to nothing more than careless checking of his sources; the remarks about Metellus' activities in 118-7 B.C. may, on the other hand, be a reflection of an 'anti-Metellan' source of the later first century B.C.

29. Appian B.C. i 77-78.

30. Appian BC i 78.

31. Dr. E. Badian drew my attention to this episode and kindly allowed me to consult the text of his paper read to the Roman Society on Tues. 1 Nov. 1960, entitled 'Waiting for Sulla'.

32. Eutropius v 7.

33. Zippel, op. cit. 161-2, cites the following passage in Granius Licinianus (xxxv p. 28 ed. Flemisch), quo Dardanos [et] Denselatas caesis hos[tibus], quī Macedoniam ve[xa]bant, in deditionem recepit.

34. Eutropius vi 4. On the chronology cf. MRR ii 88 note 4 and on the identification of C. Cosconius with the praetorian commander in Apulia in 89 cf. Münzer, RE iv 1667 n. 3.

35. Orosius hist. adv. paganos v 23,23.

36. The campaigns were certainly over well before 74 B.C. when M. Atilius Bulbus, convicted of maiestas for tampering with Cosconius' legions, served as a juror in the trial of Oppianicus, cf. Cic. Pro Cluentio 71-2 and 97; Verr. i 39. cf. also MRR ii loc. cit.

37. Frontin. Strat. ii 5,28. Münzer, RE xiii 221 n.27, can discover no obvious identification for this P. Licinius.

CHAPTER III: T A B L E

Grants of imperium in Illyricum 167-60 B.C.

Name	praetor	consul	dates and title in Illyricum		triumph
L. Anicius Gallus	168	160	158-7	praetor, propraetor	de rege Gentio et Illurie[is. 167
C. Marcius Figulus	169	I 162 II 156	156	consul	————
P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica	by 165	I 162 II 155	155	consul	d]e De[lmateis 155
Ser. Fulvius Flaccus	by 137	135	135	consul	————
C. Sempronius Tuditanus (Ti. Latinius Pandusa)	132	129	129	consul	de Iapudibus 129
			129	?	
L. Caecilius Metellus Delmaticus	by 122	119	118-7	(consul) proconsul	de De[lma]teis 117
(L. Cornelius Scipio Asiagenus	86?	suff.83		(praetor of Macedonia in 85)	
C. Cosconius	89?		78-76?	proconsul	
(L. Culleolus	60?		59?	(procos in Illyricum ?)	addressed by Cicero in letter, Epp. xiii 41, 42. cf. MRR ii
[P. Licinius]				proconsul?	

Chapter IV: Illyria in the Civil Wars (59-39 B.C.).

In 59 B.C. the tribune P. Vatinius brought forward the Lex Vatinia de Caesaris provincia which set aside the senate's selection of consular provinces for the following year and conferred upon C. Iulius Caesar an imperium for five years in Gallia Cisalpina with the command of an army of three legions to which, on the sudden death of Metellus Celer, Gallia Transalpina was added with its own legion (1).

There are two possible reasons why Illyricum should have been added to the provincia of Caesar: it is possible that at the outset of his command he saw his military project as an advance north-eastward from Cisalpina, and considered that titular authority in Illyricum would not only provide a base for possible operations in the interior beyond the line of the Julian Alps, but would also avoid any chance of his being censured by a suspicious senate for exceeding the interpreted boundaries of his command; or secondly, the addition of Illyricum was merely a continuation of the precedent by which any judicial or administrative questions which cropped up amongst the allied states and Roman conventus on the central and southern part of the eastern shore of the Adriatic would be dealt with by the proconsul in Cisalpina, since he would normally be the most conveniently situated magistrate with imperium for this task. While the evidence is not sufficient for us to be certain on this point, there does exist some indications that the latter solution is more likely. If there was any deliberate intention on Caesar's part to secure the conjunction of Cisalpina and Illyria, it is difficult to see what his object was; an imperium in Illyricum would

have meant a war against the Delmatae or another equally formidable Illyrian tribe in a terrain which is one of the most difficult and inaccesible in all Europe. Militarily there can have been no point in seeking a second base for operations against the Pannonians beyond the Alps in what at the time constituted the Roman provincia of Illyricum; indeed if Casear did have any designs upon the western half of the Balkan Peninsula then the province he should have sought was Macedonia, where successive prononsuls had been pushing the limits of Roman power northwards into what is now Serbia. On the other hand the lack of any titular authority in Illyricum would no more have deterred C. Caesar in 59 B.C. from pushing into Iapydia or along the valley of the Sava as a proconsul in Cisalpina than it did Sempronius Tuditanus in 129 or Aurelius Cotta in 119 from operating in those very areas.

As has been shown in an earlier section Illyricum was an area which could be assigned to a magistrate when a particular situation demanded it. In the first century B.C. there is only one definitely attested instance of such a command - that of C. Cosconius after the first Civil War when, after many years of inactivity, an attempt was made to recover the ground lost since the successes of Metellus Delmaticus some forty years before. However, even if there was no inclination to conquer, some provision had to be made for dealing with local affairs on the other side of the Adriatic. For more than a century many small states had become clientes of Rome and would look to her for protection from external enemies and for arbitration in disputes with neighbours.

It is more than likely that this task regularly devolved upon the proconsul in Gallia Cisalpina and that its inclusion in the text of the lex Vatinia was merely a formal title connected with this duty. In the opinion of the writer the clearest support for this view comes from our evidence for Illyricum for the ten years during which it formed part of Caesar's command and which at this point it would be proper to examine.

The first mention which occurs in our sources of Caesar's interest in Illyricum is included in Caesar's own summarised account of his activities in the winter of 57/56 B.C. With the successes against the Germans and the Belgae in the season of 57 it must have seemed a suitable time to Caesar to pay some attention to the other region of his imperium, namely, Illyricum. At some time before the campaigning season of 56 opened Caesar, having disposed his legions in winter quarters among the tribes in the north-east of Cisalpina, had set out for Illyricum with the object of visiting the tribes there and of becoming acquainted with the country. Unfortunately, before he achieved anything the news of the revolt of the Veneti, threatening the safety of the younger Crassus and his legion, reached Caesar and he was forced to leave the region (2). There is no means of telling where exactly Caesar was intending to go in Illyricum in the early part of 56. It is possible that he was planning an eastward march into Iapydian territory from Aquileia, but on the whole an excursus into the Julian Alps or their vicinity in mid-winter can hardly have been considered - even by a general of Caesar's calibre. On the other hand it could be that Caesar

was intending to take ship from Aquileia and sail down the Illyrian coast until he could touch at Salonae or Narona, the principal centres of Roman and Italian influence in the region, and by doing so acquaint himself with the geography and meet the peoples in the area. It has been suggested, earlier in this section, that there was no military need for Caesar to have Illyricum attached to his provincia but that it occurs in the wording of the lex Vatinia merely as the customary inclusion of the administrative responsibility for the allied states along the coast; viewed in this light, Caesar's activity in the close season of 57/56 may be interpreted as willingness on his part to carry out his responsibilities. The two pieces of evidence from this area seem to strengthen this view of Caesar's activity in Illyricum.

The first of them is a Greek inscription (unfortunately fragmentary) which records an embassy by allied states in Illyricum sent to Caesar and heard by him at Aquileia on 3 March 56 B.C. (3). The inscription is headed by the Roman consular date of 56 B.C. and the date of the Roman calendar. Then follows the dating according to the priesthoods of Issa, and then the names of the delegates who put Issa's case before Caesar at Aquileia. Next the inscription records that a certain G. Gavenius G.f. Fab. spoke about the freedom of the Issaeans and their friendship with the Roman people. Unfortunately at this point the stone is broken and of the following decree only two very meagre fragments remain, the general sense of which indicates that the decree was a confirmation of Issa's status as a civitas libera et immunis with a

specific mention of free access to the mainland, where for many years she had settlements established. The implications of this inscription for the history of the city of Issa is discussed in another section, but its mention here is justified by its obvious importance for the nature of Caesar's connection with Illyricum. If he was in Aquileia dealing with the administrative problems concerned with that area of his command, then he obviously had been in Cisalpina sufficiently long to journey to Illyricum and get to know the region. If this is the case, the news that the Veneti had revolted cannot have reached him before 3 March, since he would hardly have wasted time in Aquileia hearing wordy speeches from the representatives of Greek allied states from Illyria. Unfortunately Caesar's own account clearly indicates that his plans for an Illyrian trip were cut short by the sudden news of the revolt of the Veneti. There is a possible solution to the difficulty. The date at the head of the decree is clearly that when the terms of the decree were announced by G. Gavenius on Caesar's behalf at Aquileia, and it need not imply that Caesar was actually present when the terms were announced. It is not impossible that the delegation had made their speeches many months before, in his presence, and that after he had made the main decision ~~he~~ left the detailed wording and clauses dealing with minor local problems to be worked out by one or two of his staff, before he started on his planned visit to Illyricum which was cut short by the news from Gaul and had finally to be abandoned. Thus at the time the terms of the decree were being solemnly read out to the delegates at Aquileia Caesar was probably

in Gaul, preparing for the campaign of the forthcoming summer against the Veneti. An indication that some interval may have elapsed between the arrival of the delegates and the announcement of the decree is given by the use of the aorist tense of πρεσβε[υ]σάντων.

The second item of evidence for the year 56 or thereabouts is an inscription in Latin from Issa (4). A certain Q. Numerius Q.f. Vel. Rufus is described as a leg(atus), and Mommsen identified him with the Numerius Rufus who was tribune of the plebs in 57 (5). He was one of Caesar's agents at Rome and with Atilius Serranus opposed the return of Cicero from exile in that year. It is hardly surprising that, when Cicero had returned and was beginning to regain his old position, a transfer to a legateship on Caesar's staff Issa was thought desirable for Numerius. On the inscription it is recorded that he financed the rebuilding of a porticus from his own pocket. It is not unlikely that when Caesar realised that the continued operations in Gaul did not allow him sufficient time to deal with Illyrian affairs he sent Numerius to the area and delegated to him some powers of administration; Issa, Rome's oldest and most famous ally in Illyricum, was the obvious centre for such an official.

It is two years later before we hear of any further activity by Caesar in connection with Illyricum. According to Caesar himself, after completing judicial circuits in Gaul early in 54 B.C., he travelled to Illyricum, hearing that the provincia was suffering from raids by the Pirustae. On his arrival he ordered troops from all the allied states to assemble at a certain place; hearing this the Pirustae

sent envoys to disclaim any public responsibility for these raids and to announce that they were willing to make reparations to the injured parties. When informed of this he ordered them to give hostages for their good faith, and when they had done this he nominated arbitrators to assess the extent of damages to be paid, and after completing the assizes there he returned to Gaul (6). This can hardly have been any more than a fleeting visit to deal with administrative questions and in particular the activities of the Pirustae, who dwelt in the mountains of N. Albania around the Drin, (7) since no mention is made of his bringing any legions but rather a specific mention that he held a levy among the allies.

The incident of the Pirustae is described as merely the most important matter that arose in the course of his Illyrian visit; he certainly showed no inclination to use the activities of Illyrian tribes as a casus belli. Another matter involving the Liburni and the Delmatae, two major peoples of Illyricum, illustrates clearly Caesar's lack of interest in Illyricum for a campaign.

The final piece of information concerning Caesar's dealings with Illyricum during his Gallic proconsulate comes from Appian in his section on the Delmatae (8). He tells that at a time when the Delmatae were prosperous they captured Promona from the Liburni, a mountain stronghold on the modern Promina mountain near Drniš on the banks of the Čikola river on the borders of the territory of the Liburni and the Delmatae (9). The Liburni sought help from the Romans and in particular from Caesar who happened at that time to be near. He ordered that Promona should be

restored to the Liburni, and when they refused sent a force against them which, according to Appian, was destroyed by the Illyrians. Owing to the approaching struggle with Pompey, Caesar was unable to take any further measures against the Illyrians. The last statement of Appian suggests that the episode occured at the end of Caesar's command and the two possible occassions on which he was near to the region were in the winter of 53/52 B.C. and early 50 B.C. (10). The mention of an approaching civil struggle strongly suggests that the appeal for help from the Liburni occurred in 50 B.C., the Delmatian capture of Promona having taken place in the previous year (51 B.C.). There is no mention of the campaign against the Delmatae in Caesar's own writings and it is more than likely that the troops who were defeated by the Delmatae were levies from Roman allies in Illyricum led by a Roman officer under instructions from Caesar. There is no evidence that Caesar led any of his legions into Illyricum, and there is certain evidence that when trouble was brewing with the Pirustae in 54 B.C. he judged the local levies to be sufficient to deal with any opposition. From this time the Dalmatae increased their power greatly, took an active part in the Civil War on the Pompeian side and later resisted ferociously the forces sent by Caesar to pacify them.

What little evidence is available seems to support the view that the inclusion of Illyricum in the provincia of Caesar in 59 B.C. was an administrative technicality, signifying that the proconsul in Cisalpina was responsible for affairs concerning Roman allies in the area. He was

able to fulfil this task during the winters which he spent in Cisalpine Gaul. His manner of dealing with the Pirustae can only be interpreted as part of such a duty and shows that once a suitable solution had been found which safeguarded the interests of Roman allies, then Caesar was content to leave well alone.

In 49 B.C. the whole world was engulfed by the civil struggle between Caesar on the one hand and Pompey and the senate on the other; almost every area of the Roman world witnessed struggles between the forces of both sides. In all the principal theatres of the war the Pompeians, after initial successes against legates, were defeated by Caesar in person. In Illyricum the outcome was decided without the personal intervention of Caesar himself- not because the area was of no importance but rather that Caesar's generals, after many defeats, struggled through to superiority over the Pompeian forces although they were able to make little headway against the native peoples of the interior.

At the outbreak of the civil war Roman power in Illyricum was at a very low ebb; if we are allowed to believe Appian the situation must have been very serious. He says that although the Liburni were received <u>in fidem</u> by Rome, apart from a strong protest against the Dalmatae for taking Promona no aid was given; thus it was hardly surprising that the Pompeians found little difficulty in striking alliances with the Illyrians.

The first round of the struggle in Illyricum was an unqualified disaster for the Caesarians. Early in 49 B.C. C. Antonius, brother of

the triumvir, was placed in charge of the northern part of the Adriatic and the coast of Illyricum, together with ~~L. Domitius Ahenobarbus~~ P. Cornelius Dolabella (cos suff. 44 B.C.). There is no evidence that their forces had any ships, a fact which makes Antonius' decision to place all his forces upon the island of Curicta (mod. Krk), when the Pompeian admirals C. Octavius and Scribonius Libo appeared in the Adriatic with large naval forces, difficult to comprehend. Dolabella, who may have had a fleet of some sort, was defeated and no more is heard of him in the campaign. Meanwhile the forces of Antonius were besieged, and in spite of notable heroism on the part of various contingents the whole army surrendered with its commander. The remainder of the Caesarian forces were encamped on the opposite mainland and were forced to be spectators of Antonius' surrender. The commanders on the shore were Basilus and the historian Sallustius Crispus. According to Orosius, presumably copied from Livy, fifteen cohorts were captured and taken to Pompey in Greece (11). Apart from one or two passing reference there is no account of this disaster in the Civil War of Caesar which we possess today; it is not improbable that the account of the Illyrian disaster has not survived- there are certainly many gaps in the text whence the passage may have been lost. The topography of the campaign of 49 B.C. has been studies by Veith as his contribution to the Bulić Festschrift (12). On the W. and N. side, the terrain affords almost no shelter for an army, due to the action of the winter winds in the area; the most probable site for the camp of Antonius is on the E. of the island where the peninsula Bejevac extends towards the mount-

ainous coastline of the mainland. This identification is strongly supported by the evidence that Octavius' attack on the forces of Antonius was visible to the forces of Basilus and Sallustius, whose troops were probably on some of the small inlets on the opposite coast- for instance Kraljevica or Sv. Jakov.

The defeat of Antonius and the surrender of his force gave the Pompeians complete mastery at sea, which Octavius immediately attempted to exploit by an assault on some of the Italian communities along the Illyrian coast which, no doubt because of the Pompeian alliance with the native tribes, held loyal to Caesar. His first attack was upon Salona, an account of which is given by Caesar in his Commentaries; the language of Dio suggests that it occurred very soon after the victory over Antonius- probably in the latter part of 49 (13). Octavius's first achievement after the victory at Curicta was to secure Issa as a base, thus strengthening greatly his sea power in the Adriatic. When threats and persuasion failed to move the conventus of Roman citizens at Salona Octavius laid siege to the town. By the usual desperate measures, liberation of slaves and arming of women, the settlers held off the attacks of Octavius's forces and at length attacked, breaking the blockade and forcing Octavius to return to Pompey at Dyrrhacium without having weakened Caesar's control of the mainland in spite of absolute command at sea. After the decisive victory of Caesar at Pharsalus (June 48) the Adriatic became one of the areas in which opponents of Caesar gathered to continue the struggle (14). To guard against such activity and also to start the difficult task of

regaining some of the former Roman power on the mainland Caesar had sent Q. Cornificius as quaestor pro praetore with two legions (15). Caesar is full of praise for this commander who clearly had one of the most difficult and unrewarding tasks ever assigned by Caesar to a subordinate. His time was mostly taken up by establishing garrisons and then protecting them against attack from the interior; unfortunately we might have been able to appreciate the achievements of Cornificius more fully if Caesar had included even a modicum of geographical detail. In view of the fact that the Delmatae are mentioned specifically ~~mentioned~~ by Caesar as having been in league with Octavius we can fairly safely assume that it was against these people that Q. Cornificius was operating (16). Furthermore it is related that Cornificius achieved a naval success with ships loaned to him by the Iadestinoi, a tribe who may have dwelt on the coast of Liburnia where the colony of Iader was later founded (17). As time went on, however, the Adriatic became more and more the refuge for Pompeians and Caesar, realising that the name of Pompey would keep people fighting on, ordered A. Gabinius to advance to the aid of Cornificius (18).

According to Appian, Gabinius set out with a force of 15 cohorts and three thousand cavalry to march from Italy to Illyricum by the land route around the N. of the Adriatic. On the present evidence this is the first clearly attested instant of a Roman force marching by the land route to Illyricum, and the failure of Gabinius to preserve more than a remnant of his force from the attacks of the Illyrians is not surprising; the bold plan of such a march clearly points to Caesar

himself- probably the only Roman general who could have succeeded in such a manoevre. Appian remarks that the victory over Gabinius was the high-watermark of Illyrian power (19).

Gabinius arrived in Salona at about the end of 48 or perhaps in the early months of 47; almost all the conditions were against him, the weather was bad, and he had no access to the sea due either to storms or Pompeian admirals. With supplies short Gabinius was forced to undertake campaigns in the difficult and barran hinterland behind Salona, but he made little or no headway against the Illyrians. On his side his losses were serious- four tribunes, thirty-eight centurions and upwards of two thousand other ranks were killed, says Caesar. After lingering on for some months Gabinius eventually succumbed to disease at Salona-hardly a fitting end for a man of such energy and ability. The death of Gabinius at the end of the winter of 48/47 gave the Pompeian C. Octavius new hope of conquering the remaining Caesarian strongholds, which were thwarting his ambition to make Illyricum a centre for resistance against Caesar. Cornificius, whose situation was now desperate, began to send urgent appeals to P. Vatinius, who had been left behind at Brundisium in charge of disabled veterans when Caesar made the crossing to Epirus early in 48 B.C. With great energy Vatinius set to improvising a war fleet from the merchant and supply ships that were at Brundisium; many of the veterans had by now recovered and were drafted to the ships to act as marines. Early in the season of 47 B.C. they ~~sailed~~ sailed across the Adriatic to challenge the naval power of M. Octavius. At that time Octavius had already begun

his all-out campaign against the Caesariani in Illyricum by laying siege to Epidaurum, according to Caesar a place where one of his praesidia was situated (20). Epidaurum (mod. Cavtat on the coast S. of Dubrovnik) later became a Roman colony- possibly due to Caesar- and it is not unlikely that here as at Salonae there was a settlement of Roman citizens, whose strong support for Caesar would make it an ideal site for a base of Cornificius. Indeed there is no evidence to connect Q. Cornificius with Salonae, which we know was the base of Gabinius in the previous winter. From an inscription of the period of Tiberius we know that the route from Salonae to the fortress of Andetrium was known in later time as the Via Gabiniana, suggesting very strongly that the main weight of Gabinius' campaigns from Salonae was directed against the Dalmatae to the N. and N.W. of the city (21). Perhaps Gabinius and Cornificius were never able to establish contact between their forces, since, owing to enormous losses, Gabinius' southward march was halted at Salonae, while Cornificius (perhaps based on Narona which we known was the base of one of his successors, P. Vatinius) was unable to make any headway northward.

Augmenting his fleet with a few warships from Achaia, Vatinius sailed over to Illyricum and came within reach of the Pompeian fleet while they were besieging Epdiaurum. The battle was fought in the narrows between some islands and the mainland, with the ability of Vatinius to make the fullest advantage of his veterans' fighting skill at close quarters ~~to win~~ winning the day for the Caesarians. Caesar states that the battle was fought near an island called Tauris- generally identified with Šcedro, between Hvar and Korčula, although at least

two other scholars favoured Šipan near Dubrovnik on the ground that Scedro was too far away from Epidaurum (22). It should be noted that Caesar does not state exactly where the fleet of Vatinius reached the Illyrian coast, but merely states that on hearing of its arrival Octavius was forced to leave the attack on Epidaurum. After the battle Octavius fled to that harbour from which he had come before the battle, remaining there for three days. There is no indication where this harbour was, although the two best ports in the region were at Hvar and Korčula which, since his power was clearly based on the fleet and the mainland was closed to him, were probably his ~~other~~ two principal possessions apart from Issa. On the third day he sailed to Issa, which had probably been the centre of his power and had served as winter shelter for the fleet and, presumably after collecting what remained of his adherents, set sail for Greece, Sicily and then Africa where he continued the struggle. There can be no doubt that the enterprise of Vatinius saved the Caesarians much trouble by finally defeating the Pompeians in Illyricum, showing clearly that he was by no means the ineffective character that Cicero makes him out to be. Vatinius returned to Rome and held a consulship in the latter part of 47 although the exact dates are uncertain (23).

We do not know for how long Q. Cornificius was continued in his command in Illyricum; soon afterwards he held the praetorship and is next heard of in 45 holding a special praetorian command for Caesar (24). His successor was P. Sulpicius Rufus whose presence in Illyricum is attested by a letter from Cicero in 46 B.C. Cicero asks Sulpicius, who

is addressed as imperator, if he can help in tracing a certain Dionysius, one of his slaves who had run away and was last seen at Narona by M. Bolanus, one of his friends, who would give Sulpicius all assistance in tracing him (25). Of his work in Illyricum we known next to nothing, except that he was awarded a Supplicatio. In the account of the African campaign (which ended at Thapsus in Feb. 46) there is mention of seven cohorts of legionary veterans who had fought in the fleet with Sulpicius and Vatinius (26). This can only refer to campaigning in 47 and points strongly to Sulpicius having already taken over in Illyricum in that year- perhaps as soon as Vatinius returned to Brundisium ~~when he left for~~ on his way to Rome to hold a consulship. There is nothing otherwise known about the career of Sulpicius to prevent his going to Illyricum with Vatinius in 47. He appears to have left the province either late in 46 or in the early months of 45, when he was succeeded by Vatinius.

Late in 46 or early in 45 P. Vatinius was sent to Illyricum as proconsul with three legions 'together with many cavalry' (26). Appian continues that the Illyrians were eager to regain Roman friendship since they feared ~~that his~~ Caesar's plans for campaigning against the Getae and the Parthians, and that when the death of Caesar was known and the threat of invasion removed, their attitude towards Vatinius changed abruptly to open hostility. When he attacked them (presumably the Dalmatae, since Appian mentions them specifically in this context) he was repulsed with the loss of five cohorts and a tribune named Baebius. Finally Vatinius and his army arrived at Dyrrhachium, when the senate transferred his army to M. Brutus together with the army of Macedonia.

Such is the account of Appian; not the least of its difficulties is the suggestion that the Illyrians, in particular the Dalmatae, had anything to fear from Caesar's plans to attack Parthia or the Getae. Our evidence for Vatinius' proconsulate is supplemented by the correspondence between him and Cicero. There are three letters from Vatinius and one from Cicero for the period between the 11 July 45 and January 44 (27). In the first of these Vatinius refers to reports which he had sent earlier to Rome to inform the senate of his achievements, and asks Cicero's support when the senate considered them with a view to awarding a supplicatio (28). Clearly for some reason or other Appian's source is biased against Vatinius, giving a deliberately false version of his achievements. In the same letter Vatinius also mentions Cicero's runaway slave, about whom he heard when he arrived in the province- presumably the matter was referred to him by his predecessor, Sulpicius. Vatinius states that he will do his utmost to return the man to Cicero even if he has fled outside the bounds of his provincia. His headquarters in Illyricum were at Narona (mod. Vid) near the mouth of the River Naro, where inscriptions attest a commercial settlement with quasi-municipal institutions in existence at this period (29).

The senate apparently awarded Vatinius a supplicatio for his work in Illyricum, since in a letter to Cicero from Narona dated 5 December 45 he refers to the decree of the senate and says that as soon as he heard of it he advanced into 'Dalmatia' (30). He captured six oppida by storm, one of which he took four times. Eventually he was

forced to give up these conquests, owing to the onset of bad weather, and he laments to Cicero how unfair it is to have to abandon captured towns and a war that was virtually won. These campaigns based on Narona presumably took place in the latter part of 45, and the coming of winter about the end of November put an end to his hopes of achieving success that season. His reference to snow and frost indicates that he had penetrated at least some distance into the interior, since such conditions are almost unknown on the coast in the area of Narona. It is by no means impossible that this resourceful legate had managed to cross the Dinara ridge and penetrate to the heart of the Dalmatian territory. The final letter in the correspondence with Cicero shows a rather embittered Vatinius complaining about Caesar's apparent refusal to grant him his triumph, which in his opinion he had more than earned, pointing out that current ideas underestimated considerably the power of the Dalmatae, whose cities numbered sixty rather than twenty as was commonly supposed (31).

The contents of this correspondence between Cicero and Vatinius shows clearly that Appian's version of the latter's proconsulate is grossly misleading. Far from being sent to receive hostages from a cowed people he was faced with an uphill struggle against the Illyrians almost as soon as he arrived in the province. Many months before the murder of Caesar, Vatinius had been awarded a supplicatio and he sincerely believed that by the winter of 45/44 he had achieved sufficient to be awarded a triumph; it was not until over two years

had passed, however, that he obtained his triumph 'de Illyrico' (32).

With the murder of Caesar in March 44 B.C., Vatinius was left in Illyricum with an army which, according to Dio at least, did not have all that high an opinion of him, especially after a couple of seasons hard campaigning against the Delmatae. In an attempt to prevent Brutus from securing Dyrrachium he marched southward out of his provincia and threw himself into the town as C. Antonius had already done at Apollonia (32). According to Appian the senate transferred the troops of Vatinius to M. Brutus, while Dio states that they deserted to him of their own accord when he approached Dyrrachium. Livy adds that both Illyricum and its army fell under the power of the Conspirators (34).

Vatinius celebrated his long delayed triumph over the Illyrians on the last day of July in 42 and then disappeared from history. It is difficult to attempt to make a fair assessment of his work during his Illyrian proconsulate. Judging from his brilliant intervention in 47 when he rescued the Caesarians from a threat of the greatest danger, and the references to his campaigning in the snow of Dalmatia in the winter of 45/44, he may well be the first Roman commander to have seriously set about reducing the interior by an advance based upon the Naro. It was no fault of his that he was unaware of the necessity of securing the line of communication from Siscia down the Sava valley to Sirmium and then southward along the Morava to Macedonia, before the pacification of Bosnia, Hercegovina and Montenegro, an area comprising some of the most difficult country in Europe, could be achieved.

The division of the Empire effected at Brundisium in the latter part of 40 B.C. gave the western provinces, apart from Africa, to Octavian and the eastern provinces to Antony. The line of demarcation was fixed at Scodra, the capital of the old Illyrian kingdom, emphasising how great a physical and psychological barrier were the mountains of Montenegro and N. Albania (35).

Command in Macedonia, Antony's only major European province, was given to C. Asinius Pollio, patron of Virgil and consul ordinarius in 40 B.C.; his mediation had brought the two leaders to terms at Brundisium. As proconsul in Macedonia he began campaigning immediately against the Parthini, an Illyrian tribe who dwelt in the hinterland behind Dyrrhacium (36). According to Appian it was Antony's intention to avoid his troops idling away their time in hiberna by sending them on winter manoeuvres against peoples on the fringe of Macedonia where they could be kept in training and enriched with booty to keep them out of mischief. The Parthini were a particular object of these campaigns since they had shown a strong attachment to M. Brutus (37). According to Dio, Pollio dealt with the Parthini in a few battles and triumphed over them on 25 October in either 39 or 38 B.C.; the fragmentary state of the fasti forbids certainty. The language of Appian suggests the earlier date, while Dio implies that it was not a long campaign (38).

Two other sources connect Pollio with a war against 'Dalmatians': Florus, in a section entitled 'Bellum Delmaticum', states that he confiscated their flocks, weapons and lands, while Horace addressed him as Delmaticus in an Ode composed in his honour (39). What Florus

is referring to is by no means clear, while Horace is merely looking for a suitable title to call him without making too serious an error of fact; 'Parthinicus' would have meant very little to his readers and would probably have been confused with 'Parthicus'. This does not constitute sufficient evidence to connect Pollio with a Dalmatian war unheard of in our other sources; nor is this surprising since, as Antony's proconsul in Antony's province, he was nowhere near the Delmatae.

Scholiasts on Virgil's Fourth Eclogue, attempting to explain the name of Pollio's son Saloninus, connect him with Salonae and state that the child was named after the Illyrian city, Pollio having just captured it. In spite of the fact that Pollio's capture of Salonae is accepted by most modern authorities (with the notable exception of Mommsen), Syme has little difficulty in showing that not only is the nomen Saloninus not connected with Salonae (the adjective of the place is Salonitanus) but that no amount of manipulation of the evidence of Dio and Appian can bring Pollio to Salonae in connection with a campaign against the Parthini; Salonae the Caesarian stronghold of Roman citizens during the Civil War, may well have been a colony by this time. One modern scholar has put forward a theory that Pollio travelled from Cisalpina down through Illyricum and into Macedonia. This is inconceivable; such an advance would have been beset with immense difficulties and, if he had escaped without serious defeat, would have given his admirers a wealth of material from which to compose their Odes of praise (40).

Chapter IV: notes.

1. The reference for the grant of imperium to Caesar in 59 are collected by Broughton, MRR ii ad loc. There is some variation in the sources about the exact terms of the Lex Vatinia: Gallia Cisalpina with Illyricum and four legions for five years, Plut. Caes. 14; Pomp. 48,3; Cat. Min. 33; Crass.14,3; Illyricum and Gallia Cisalpina with three legions for five years and Transalpina added with another legion, Dio xxxviii 85: Cisalpine Gaul with four legions for five years, Appian BC ii 13; Gallia Cisalpina with Illyricum 'adiecto' and Gallia Comata added later, Suet.Caes. 22; Galliae for five years, Vell. Pat. ii 44,5; the three provinces of Gallia Transalpina Cisalpina and Illyricum with Gallia Comata added afterwards, Oros.vi 7,1. None of the sources above directly contradicts the suggestion that the attachment of Illyricum was anything else than the normal administrative sphere of a proconsul in Cisalpina.

   Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer, consul in 60, had been dispatched to Gallia Transalpina on the outbreak of war there, cf. Münzer, RE iii 1210.

2. BG ii 35 (late 57); iii 7, (early 56).

3. The text and references to discussion of this inscription are given in Ch. XII note 2 p. 351

4. III 3078 (12 2759), from the walls of Vis: Q. Numerius Q.f. Vel. Rufus Leg. patron. portic. reficiund. de sua pecun. coer. idemqueprob.

5. The Numerius Rufus of the above inscription is almost certainly the man who was quaestor in Africa in 60, cf. ILS 9482 from Utica. In 57 he was tribunus plebis and alone of the college with Atilius Serranus opposed the recall of Cicero from exile. His legateship in Illyricum at this period clearly suggests strong political connections with Caesar, cf. Münzer, RE xvii 1326f.

6. BG v 1 (early 54).

7. On the Pirustae below ~~ch.~~ cf. E. Polaschek, RE xx 1729 ff ~~p.~~ .

8. Appian Ill. 12.

9. On Promona cf. ~~ch.~~ ch. X ~~below p.~~ below p. 279 ff. .

10. BG vii 7,1 (53/52); viii 50 (51).

11. The sources for the defeat of C. Antonius are: Appian BC ii 41, 47; Dio xli 40; xlii 11,1; Florus ii 30-33; Oros. vi 15,8-9; Liv. Epit. cx; Lucan Phars. iv 402-581. The three passing references by Caesar are BC iii 4,2; iii 10,5; 67,5. On the Chronology cf. the discussion by Zippel op. cit., 203ff.

12. G. Veith, 'Die Kampf von der Caesariani in Illyricum', Strena Buliciana, 267ff. On the emendation of BC iii 10,5, where the MSS read Corcyra, to Curicta, cf. Adcock, CAH ix 653 note.

13. B.C. iii 9; Dio xlii 11; Orosius vi 15, 8-9.

14. The account of the 'bellum Octavianum' is given in Bell. Alex. 42-47.

15. For the career of Cornificius cf. Münzer RE iv 162ff. 8.

16. BC iii 9, (M. Octavius) ibi concitatis Dalmatis reliquisque barbaris Issam a Caesaris amicitia avertit.

17. On the Iadertinoi below p. 261f.

18. The sources for the campaign of Gabinius are: Bell. Alex.43; Appian Ill 12, cf. 25,27; Appian BC ii 58-9; Dio xlii 11; Plut. Ant. 7,1; Cic. Ep. ad Att. xi 16,1 (2nd June 47).

19. App. Ill. 12; καὶ ἐς χρημάτα τότε μαλίστα καὶ ἄλλην ἴσχυν ἐκ τοσῶνδε λαφύρων ἐστήσαν.

20. Bell. Alex. 44.

21. cf. below p. 185 .

22. Veith, Strena Buliciana, loc. cit., arguing for Ščedro (Torčula). In the same volume (275f.) N. Štuk suggests Šipan following an earlier discussion by Tomaschek, cited by M. Fluss, RE A iv 2548, on the grounds that Ščedro is too far away from Epidaurum. The place is recorded otherwise only by Peutinger, Tauris, between Pharia and Corcyra Nigra.

23, The career of Vatinius in the years 47-42 is discussed at length by Gundel, RE viii A 511ff.

24. Münzer RE loc. cit., 1625 for his praetorship.

25. Cic. Epp. ad Fam. xiii 77 (46). On Sulpicius cf. MRR ii 299; he was praetor in 48.

26. App. Ill. 13.

27. Vatinius to Cicero Epp. ad Fam. v 9, 10, 10b. Cicero to Vatinius v 11.

28. Ad Fam v 9 dated 11th. July 45.

29. On Narona see below pp. 333ff .

30. Ad Fam. v 10b.

31. Ad. Fam. v 10a dated Jan. 44.

32. Celebrated July 31st. 42 B.C.

Fast. Triumph. P. Vatinius P.f. procos de illurico pr.[k. Sex. a DCCXI].

Fast. Barb. P. Vatinius de Hilurico prid. k. Sex. triumphav[it], palmam dedit.

33. Dio. xlvii 21,6.

34. App. Ill. 13; Liv. Epit. cxviii. cf. Appian BC iv 75; Cic. Philipp. x 13; Plut. Brutus 25; Vell. Pat. ii 69, 3-4.

35. Dio xlviii 28,4; cf. 1 6,4-5; Appian BC v 65, with specific mention of Scodra as the line of demarcation.

36. On Asinius Pollio, cf. Groag in PIR2 i 251, n. 1241 and Syme, Roman Revolution, 5f. The campaign against the Parthini is recorded by Dio xlviii 41,7. Contemporary authorities confirm the location of the Parthini in the mountains of N. Albania behind Dyrrhacium: Strabo vii 7,8 (p. 326); Caesar BC iii 11; 41,42. Plin NH iii 145, a Lisso Macedonia provincia. gentes Partheni et a tergo eorum Dassaretae. Pomp. Mela, ii 3,55 Partheni et Dassaretae prima eius tenent, sequentia Taulantii, Encheleae, Phaeaces. The problem is complicated by the discovery of inscriptions bearing the dedications I O Partino and I O Par. at Užice in W. Serbia on the western fromtier of Moesia Superior; cf. Polaschek, RE xviii 2044 and below ch. XIV p. 415f.

37. Appian BC v 75.

38. Triumph; C. Asinius Cn.f. Pollio pro cos. an [.....] ex Parthineis VIII k. Novem. (Fasti Triumphales); the missing date

may be either [DCCXIIII] or [DCCXV].

39. Florus ii 25; Horace Odes ii 1,16.

40. The linking of Pollio's infant son Saloninus with his capture of Salona is discussed at length by Syme, CQ xxxi (1937), 39ff, 'Pollio, Saloninus and Salonae'. His conclusion are followed here. The theory that Pollio reached Macedonia from Cisalpine Gaul via Illyricum was advance by Ganter, 'Die Provinzialverwaltung der Triumvirn', Diss. Strassburg (1892), 71ff. and is wholeheartedly rejected by Syme, op. cit., 43. The ethnic of Salonae is Salonitanus, cf. Mayer, 291 citing III 2108, 8804; XVI 11 witness on diploma from Herculaneum; Steph. Byz. s.v. Σάλωνα, πόλις Ἰλλυρίας, τὸ ἐθνικὸν Σαλωνίτης.

Chapter V: The Augustan Conquest (39 B.C.-A.D.9).

Three series of campaigns were needed to establish Roman power in the Western Balkans with a frontier on the R. Danube. They were (1) Octavian's campaigns in 35-33 B.C., (2) the Bellum Pannonicum of 12-9 B.C. and (3) the great Pannonian 'revolt' of 6-9 A.D. As a result the route from N. Italy through Siscia and Sirmium and on to Asia Minor was secured, a route which in later years was to form the bridge between the eastern and western halves of the Empire; when the bridge collapsed, East and West went their separate ways. The Roman position in the Balkans was transformed from two senatorial provinces (Macedonia and Illyricum) into three large commands under legates of the emperor with a combined force of seven legions. One of these commands became known later as the province of Dalmatia (previously Illyricum Superius) incorporating not only the civilised Adriatic littoral but a triangle comprising some of the most difficult country in Europe, most of Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina and Montenegro, together with a good slice of Western Serbia. The conquest of Illyricum is the achievement of the Principate of Augustus, a goal which had to be attained if the empire was to be welded together into a whole (1).

The historical sources for the final conquest of the region which later became the province of Dalmatia are not only meagre and fragmentary but in many aspects patently misleading, particularly with regard to the first series of campaigns- the Illyrian operations of Octavian in the years 35-33 BC. (2) The later wars were conducted by his legates; this one he fought in person. Appian devotes over

half of his work on Roman Wars in Illyria to the campaigns of Octavian in 35-33; as he himself states he had difficulty in finding anything at all about the earlier wars; for these, however, he had the Autobiography of the Emperor himself with many eyewitness descriptions of battles and sieges together with a wealth of topographical detail. As a result, the achievements of Octavian have beem magnified out of all proportion and the extent of his conquests exaggerated. The details included in Dio's narrative, although nowhere as complete as Appian's version, show that he too was using the same source.

Appian gives lists of tribes who were either defeated in battle or made some sort of formal submission during the years 35-33 B.C. There is a clear division between those tribes against whom Octavian campaigned in person and those who are merely mentioned as having submitted, with no further details of campaigns against them; 'Augustus recorded his own exploits and not those of others', remarks Appian (3). The detailed narrative which Appian reproduces deals with campaigns against the Dalmatae, the Iapudes (on both sides of the Alps) and the Pannonian tribes in the immediate area of Segesta (Siscia). We have precise details of the movements of Octavian in the course of these campaigns, yet many of the tribes whom Appian lists as having submitted to him were far removed from the regions where he fought and their conquest was presumably the work of his legates. Naturally the most important campaigns were those of Octavian himself and take pride of place in the record; those of his legates were the 'side shows' and examination of these other tribes confirms this.

The first group of peoples mentioned were conquered 'with one

blow' δι' ὅλης πειρας . With the exception of the Taulantii and possibly the Oxyaei, all the tribes named are not mentioned in any other historical source and were clearly of no great importance (4). They form a fairly compact group in the extreme south west corner of Illyricum, some of them perhaps surviving as peoples of the conventus of Narona. Pliny remarks that about a hundred years earlier there were as many as eighty-eight civitates known, but that by his time the number had fallen to less than twenty (5); perhaps the names Appian copied from the record of Octavian were those of peoples who were grouped together into larger units for administrative purposes in the early years of the provincial government. The Taulantii mentioned in this context must be an offshoot from the famous people of that name who once dwelt far to the south behind Apollonia. Appian also refers to this same people when in another place in the Illyrike he mentions Taulantii as bordering upon the Delmatae. No details of any military action against these peoples are given by Appian.

Of the second group of tribes mentioned five out of six are known; their conquest required a 'greater effort', ἔργῳ μείζονι (6). In contrast with the first group they are spread over a very wide area, ranging from the Carni and Taurisci, Alpine peoples on the north-east fringe of Italy, to the Docleatae and the Glintidiones who dwelt in the far south of Illyricum, belonging in later times to the conventus of Narona. Dio singles out the Taurisci alone of all these peoples for mention along with the Iapudes, Delmatae and Pannonii as the tribes against whom Octavian principally campaigned. It is possible

that in the course of the advance to Siscia the main force led by Octavian did fight with outlying groups of the Taurisci although in the detailed account they are not mentioned by name. Their pacification by Roman forces belongs to a later period. Two other tribes, the Hippasini and the Bessφi, are recorded by Appian as having submitted in this group; the former people are unknown while the latter is the name of a notable Thracian tribe dwelling in the valley of the Hebrus [mod. Marica] (7). Thracian elements are found among the ethnic names of Illyricum particularly in the south; Appian's Bessφi may fall into this category. A fleet was active in the Adriatic; the inhabitants of the islands of Corcyra Nigra and Melite were sold into slavery while the Liburni were deprived of their ships because they practised piracy (8).

All the above peoples are said by Appian to have submitted to Octavian in the course of his campaigns in Illyricum. By far the majority are not heard of elsewhere and were presumably insignificant; some were famous and have long histories. No distinction is made between them apart from the amount of effort which was necessary to 'conquer' them and no information whatsoever is given about the campaigns against them. Appian may have copied them from a list which Augustus subjoined to his Autobiography as tribes subdued by his legati or, less likely, he may have been using some other official document. Whichever is the case there is a clear distinction between the lists of conquered tribes as given above and the campaign memoirs of Octavian himself which occupy almost all of the large amount of space which Appian gives over to the wars of 35-33 B.C.

Appian's geographical broadmindedness allowed him to include in his Illyrike campaigns against the Salassi, a people who occupied the Duria valley [Dora Baltea] leading up to the Gt. St. Bernard (9).

After the defeat of Sextus Pompeius in 36 B.C., Octavian may have set out for his Illyrian campaigns by sea, sailing up the coast and stopping on the way to chastise the pirates. The first campaigns he made were against the Iapudes dwelling 'within the Alps' who are to be located in the Lika, a large barren polje in southwestern Croatia. Two tribes, the Moentini and the Avendeatae, surrendered at his approach while a third and more powerful, the Arupini, fled first to their stronghold Arupium and then to the woods. Octavian ~~Augustus~~ took it but did not burn it, but after they had submitted to him he allowed them to re-occupy it (10). From here Octavian crossed the 'Alps' to attack the Iapudes dwelling 'on the far side of the Alps'. The division of the Iapudes into two groups, each dwelling on one side of the mountains is found in other sources. The 'Alps' referred to are the ranges of the Velika and Mali Kapela and Plješivica which, although nowhere reaching alpine height, are thickly wooded and constitute a formidable physical barrier. The route across these mountains was steep and rugged with the Iapudes making full use of the forest to lie in ambush. By marching his troops in parallel columns along the valleys and ridges he was able to forestall these tactics and avoid serious losses. The first stronghold he captured in this region was Terponus, which Veith has located at Gornji Modruš at the south-east end of the Velika Kapela (11). Octavian captured it but, as

with Arupium, did not destroy it, allowing them to retain it when they submitted. It was indeed a bold general who left such strongholds intact within striking distance of his supply lines. From here he arrived at Metulum, the chief stronghold of the Transalpine Iapudes, which he proceeded to besiege. The site of Metulum has been a subject of fierse controversy although Veith's suggestion of the Vinič̌ica mountains near Munjava has met with general acceptance. Schmid's attempt to place it at St. Michael between Trieste and Ober Laibach (slav. Verhnika) is impossible since not only would it make nonsense of Appian's account of an advance from the Lika to the Upper valley of the Save, but the place is not even in Iapudian territory (12). After a difficult siege, of which Octavian gave a fairly detailed description, Metulum was taken with the usual heroics on the part of the commander. There is a striking resemblance here to one of the sieges of Alexander the Great, that at the city of the Mallians in the Indus valley. The leader is trapped by leaping down on his own amongst the enemy and the siege-works collapse under the weight of loyal troops who scramble to save him (13). As with Alexander Octavian is wounded, but not quite so seriously; in order to avoid panic, however, he has to exhibit himself alive to the army from one of the siege-towers. The capture of Metulum brought the Transalpine Iapudes under Roman rule for the first time. A garrison was left under M. Helvius while the main part of the force pushed on eastward into the Save valley towards Segesta (Siscia) [mod. Sissak].

Appian states that Octavian advanced for eight days through

Pannonian territory to reach the Segestani, a tribe which had only been attacked by Roman commanders on two occasions previously (one was probably L. Aurelius Cotta, consul 119 B.C., who is credited with the capture of Segesta) (14). Octavian's motive for capturing Siscia was, according to Appian, to secure a base for a campaign against the Dacians and the Bastarnae, as much out of the question as Dio's report that he was planning an expedition to Britain at this time (15). A force of 25 cohorts was left to garrison Segesta through the winter under Fufius Geminus, who, in spite of some difficulties, succeeded in maintaining his position until the following spring (16). On the approach of winter Octavian went back to Rome with the intention of returning to Illyricum the following spring.

The campaigning season of 34 B.C. was spent in operations against the Delmatae, who, since their victory over Gabinius, had not laid down their arms for ten years. The threat of attack from Octavian caused them to combine their forces under one general, Versus, forming an army numbering upwards of twelve thousand fighting men. According to Dio, the first campaigns were made by M. Agrippa; these cannot have taken place in the previous season (35 B.C.) since we know that he was at the siege of Metulum (17). Perhaps his task was to prepare the ground early in 34 B.C. for the main advance under Octavian. The latter's first objective was Promona, a stronghold on the eleven hundred metre high Promina mountain near Drniš. Originally, it had belonged to the Liburni but had been captured by the Dalmatae about twenty years previously (18). A detailed description of the siege of

Promona by Octavian is given by Appian; in the course of it a cohort was visited with the traditional punishment of decimation for deserting its post in the face of the enemy (19). With the fall of Promona the united force of the Delmatae broke up into small bands and fled into the forest. Next he captured Synodion (Sinotion, acc. to Strabo) which lay on the edge of the forest in which Gabinius had been ambushed. After burning Synodion (probably in the region of Balijina Glavica, the site of the later Municipium Magnum(20)) he advanced into a long and deep gorge (probably the Čikola), avoiding the danger of ambush by occupying the heights on each flank as he advanced along the valley. While besieging Setovia (21), Octavian was injured and on recovering returned to Rome to hold the consulship for 33 B.C., leaving Statilius Taurus in charge in Illyricum. Strabo adds the names of two more Dalmatian strongholds captured by Octavian; Ninia (perhaps near Knin a few miles to the north of Promona) and Salo (22). If Salo is the same place as Salona, then the conventus civium Romanorum must have been expelled at some period after the Civil War and the colony must be a new foundation of Octavian in this period. No mention of Salona being captured is given by Appian in his account; if Augustus had mentioned it in his memoirs then Appian would hardly have ommitted it while mentioning other more insignificant places such as Synodium or Setovia.

After resigning the consulship on 1 January 33 Octavian returned to Illyricum as triumvir (23). After a winter of Roman occupation the Delmatae were ready to submit, promising to give hostages, to return the

standards taken from Gabinius and to pay the tribute which had not been paid since the death of Caesar. The last item was presumably some kind of indemnity to cover the cost of the campaign. After the submission of the Delmatae, Octavian advanced against the Derbani, who surrendered without any resistance. This people are not known elsewhere, but in view of the fact that Appian implies that they were neighbours of the Delmatae, they may be located somewhere inland on the southern side of the Naro (24). Appian adds that other tribes also surrendered to him although he was unable to reach some owing to his sickness. With this Appian ends his account of Roman Wars in Illyricum.

The account in Appian of the Illyrian war of Octavian in the years 35-33 B.C. gives an amount of topographical and military detail such as we possess for very few wars in the whole of Ancient History. Appian's source for this account was the Autogiography of the Emperor himself, (perhaps modelled on Caesar's Commentarii), the accuracy of which can hardly be questioned. The chief centres of his campaigns were, in the first year (35 B.C.), the Iapudes and the Segestani and in the second year (34 B.C.) the Delmatae; for the period of the whole war sufficient topographical detail is supplied to enable us to trace the itinerary of Octavian on the map with some accuracy. It is a great surprise that such an amply described episode should in the past have been given widely differing interpretations. G. Veith, following upon the earlier work of Kromayer, produced a careful study of the campaigns in relation to the topography of the region and has shown that it is possible to work out almost exactly Octavian's own route; and he has

identified, in many cases with near certainty, the native Illyrian strongholds whose sieges are recorded in Appian (25). In the first season Octavian's campaigns reached the immediate area of Siscia but did not extend into Bosnia, let alone N. Serbia. Those of the second year were attacks upon strongholds of the Delmatae in the immediate hinterland of Šibenik and Split and did not involve crossing the Dinaric Alps. The other peoples named by Appian were for the most part of lesser importance and spread over a wide area from the Alps in the N. to the borders of Montenegro and Albania in the S. In 1932 E. Swoboda, following upon earlier work by N. Vulić the Serbian scholar, produced a detailed study of the campaigns of 35-33 B.C. and sought to show from the sources that Octavian conquered a much larger area, corresponding roughly to the later imperial province of Dalmatia (26). This area included not only all of the modern republics of Bosnia and Montenegro but also a considerable slice of Serbia and the valley of the Save as far as Belgrade. The main support for this interpretation comes from vague statements in Appian and Dio concerning the extent of Octavian's conquests: Appian states that Octavian subdued the whole of the land Illyris while Dio states that, after the Pannonians around Segesta had been conquered, the remainder of Pannonia submitted also (27). In the case of Dio it is clear that he is taking terms like 'Dalmatia' and 'Pannonia' to refer to the imperial provinces of those names; he himself had actually been a governor of Dalmatia in the early third century (28). Swoboda has clearly equated the Illyris of Appian with the area later included

within the province of Dalmatia; yet nowhere in the accurate and detailed narrative of Appian are the major Illyrian peoples who inhabited what is now modern Bosnia and Montenegro mentioned. They were the Ditiones (239 decuriae), the Maezaei (269 decuriae) and the Daesitiates (103 decuriae), whose strength and ferocity gave the Roman State its most severe foreign war since the time of Hannibal in the Pannonian 'revolt' of A.D. 6-9. As Syme has pointed out, the Illyris of Appian must be a very much smaller area than the later province of Dalmatia, consisting of Iapydia, and a chain of Illyrian peoples along the hinterland of the Adriatic coast, of which by far the most powerful were the Delmatae in the hinterland of Salonae(29). A passage in Strabo and another statement in Appian show clearly that in the period before the provincial boundaries were drawn, at the end of the reign of Augustus, the tribes who dwelt in what formed in later years the province of Dalmatia were reckoned as Pannonians (30). Furthermore, it was only possible for Octavian to have penetrated into Bosnia and western Serbia if he had control of the Save valley; for such an enterprise, control of the line Siscia-Sirmium was vital, as the war of A.D. 6-9 clearly shows. It was only when Tiberius, based on Siscia, made contact with the Balkan army of A. Caecina and M. Plautius Silvanus that any advance southward into the valleys of Bosnia could be contemplated. If Octavian had advanced any distance along the Save he would have come up against the Breuci, who dwelt in the Middle Save Valley (31), one of the most powerful of all Pannonian tribes. The Breuci are nowhere mentioned in connection with the wars of 35-33 B.C. and our fairly detailed knowledge

of Octavian's movements excludes the possibility of large-scale campaigning along the Save, since soon after the capture of Siscia he returned to Rome and spent the following season campaigning against the Delmatae.

If the extent of Octavian's operations has been overestimated, there is no reason to underestimate the practical value of his real achievments. The pacification of the Iapudes and the establishment of Roman control at Siscia, a key base in later Balkan wars, was no mean achievement for a single season's campaigning. The suggestion of an expedition against the Dacians and the Bastarnae may be discounted, although from the defensive point of view a base at Siscia could forestall any advance into Italy from the north-east, whether by barbarians in the pay of M. Antonius or others attempting to repeat the exploits of the Cimbri. Octavian's work in Iapydia apparently endured; we know of no further trouble from this fierce and hostile people (32). In Dalmatia his work was no less in importance; until Octavian appeared the Delmatae had seen off every Roman force sent against them since the time of Caesar. In the event of civil war they would have taken full advantage of the situation, as they had done during the war between Caesar and Pompey. While the propaganda value of the recovery of the standards taken from Gabinius by the Delmatae must undoubtedly have been great (33), for Octavian, the knowledge that he would not have to suffer disasters comparable to those of Gabinius when preparing to defend Italy against invasion from the East, must have been more satisfying.

Passages in two ancient sources speak of other motives behind these

campaigns, bearing more upon the position of Octavian as a military commander in the West. Dio stated that Octavian campaigned against the Pannonians, not because they had done any wrong, but because he wished to give his soldiers battle practice to keep up their efficiency, with all expenses paid by the defeated tribes as tribute to the state. Velleius adds that Octavian feared that the efficiency of his forces would decline through idleness and so led them on hard campaigns in Illyricum to increase their endurance (34). The sieges of Metulum, Segesta and Promona provided a considerable test for Octavian's forces; in the course of the last siege a cohort which had deserted its post in the face of enemy attack was dealt with in the ruthless traditional manner of decimatio, every tenth man being put to death together with a third of the cohort's centurions (35).

For seventeen years following the close of the campaigns of Octavian we have no evidence for any Roman activity in Illyricum. It is not impossible that a small garrison was left behind there by Octavian to prevent any outbreak of trouble from the Delmatae or the Iapudes, although there is no hint of such a measure in any of our sources.

In the division of the provinces between Caesar and the senate in 27 B.C. Illyricum fell to the senate and was administered by a proconsul (36). This command, together with the other Balkan province, Macedonia (which was also under a proconsul), was the only major military command which remained the senate's responsibility for any length of time after 27 B.C. The region witnessed the last military exploits of independent proconsuls acting on behalf of the senate. In

eastern part of the peninsula the proconsul M. Crassus (grand-son of the triumvir) pushed the boundaries of Roman power as far as the Danube- the last, but by no means the least, of the wars of the Roman senate. Crassus commanded in Macedonia, but in the west the command in Illyricum produced no comparable activity. Until the period of the Bellum Pannonicum (12-9 B.C.) only one proconsul, actually in Illyricum is known to us. Dio states that in 16 B.C. Pannonii, in company with Norici, overran Istria. The Pannonians were worsted by P. Silius Nerva (cos. 20 B.C.) and his legates and made a treaty with the Romans, proceeding to give them assistance against the Norici. Dio adds a passing reference to 'uprisings' in Dalmatia and Spain being quelled in a short time (37). An inscription from Aenona in Liburnia attests the presence of Silius as proconsul: 'P. Silio P.f. pro cos. patron. d.d.' (III 2973). The patronage of Aenona was undertaken by at least one other governor of Dalmatia, L. Volusius Saturninus legate from before A.D. 34 to 40. (It is possible that Aenona may not have been a city but rather a vicus of the colony of Iader, and that in fact Silius Nerva and Volusius Saturninus were patroni of Iader.)

After the wars of Octavian the next major Roman activity in the Western Balkans was a series of campaigns lasting from 13 or 12 B.C. to 9 B.C., generally known as the Bellum Pannonicum (38). Compared with the detail on the earlier wars our sources give us virtually no information on the course of the war, and what is given amounts to no more than vague generalities. As a result the war receives little space in studies on the Roman conquest of Illyricum, pride of place invaribaly going to the great

'rebellion' of A.D. 6-9. The date of the outbreak of the Bellum Pannonicum is not definitely known; under the year 13 B.C., Dio states that although winter was approaching, M. Agrippa made a campaign in Pannonia where trouble was brewing, having been sent out with a maius imperium by Augustus. The Pannonians, on learning that he was approaching, gave up their plans for a rebellion (39). In the previous year (14 B.C.) Dio states that they had revolted and been subdued (40). A corrupt passage in Velleius seems to connect M. Vinicius (cos. 19 B.C.) with Agrippa's campaign in 13 B.C. and it has been suggested that he was responsible for suppressing the 'revolt' of the previous year (41). In the following year Agrippa died and, as in many other spheres, his place was taken by Tiberius. The year 12 B.C. witnessed the renewal of war against the Pannonians on a grand scale; with the aid of the Scordisci (a powerful Celto-Illyrian tribe who were centred on the lower Save and who can only have been recently subdued) he ravaged their territory, selling many into slavery, and at the end of the year was awarded an ovatio. Suetonius states that Tiberius conquered the Breuci and the Dalmatae, the former tribe dwelling on the middle Save between Siscia and Sirmium (42). It is possible that the main result of the campaign was to establish Roman control of the route along the Save valley, thus for the first time opening the land route between Italy and Macedonia; as the history of later Roman campaigns shows, the route was vital for any assault upon the powerful Illyrian tribes dwelling to the south in the wooded valleys of Bosnia. For the next three years Tiberius is found campaigning in Illyricum against Pannonians and Dalmatians; the first of these campaigns suppressed

a major revolt among both the peoples, while the second and third (10-9 B.C.) dealt with only local rebellions. Tiberius' achievements are summarised in the Res Gestae of Augustus (ch.30): Pannoniorum gentes qua[s a]nte me principem populi Romani exercitus numquam ad[i]t, devictas per Ti. [Ne]ronem, qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus, imperio populi Romani s[ubie]ci protuli que fines Illyrici ad r[ip]am fluminis Dan[u]i. The question is, who are the gentes Pannoniorum referred to in this passage? As Syme has pointed out, the term Pannonian was probably applied to a wider area than that which became known later as the province of Pannonia; in particular, it embraced the great tribes of Bosnia, who were later included in the ~~later~~ province of Dalmatia. Assuming that Pannonia north of the Drave surrendered without any great struggle, Syme has equated the Pannonii of the Res Gestae with these Bosnian tribes (Ditiones, Maezaei, Daesitiates etc.) and argued that the Roman penetration of Bosnia began with Tiberius' campaigns in 11 B.C. (43). He would in fact attempt to explain the Bellum Pannonicum as the predecessor, albeit less thorough, to the War of A.D. 6-9. Owing to the lack of definite evidence this interpretation, in spite of the very powerful topographical arguements supporting it, must still be regarded as conjectural. Nobody now disputes that Bosnia can be invaded only when one has command of the Save valley; as Syme remarks this fact has influenced Balkan history down to the twentieth century. To attribute large scale campaigns to Tiberius in 11 B.C. is another matter however. We do not know the exact size of the forces which were available to him in Illyricum; it is possible that the number of legions may have been as

high as five, but the size of the army can not have been as great as the force needed to crush the revolt of 6-9 A.D. which for a time consisted not only of the five legions of Illyricum but the three legions of the army in Moesia as well (44). Finally the reference in the Res Gestae to extending the boundaries of the Roman empire to the Danube, mentioned in the same context as the victory over Pannonians, hardly suggests campaigning in Bosnia similar to that which occurred in A.D. 6-9.

The area annexed in these campaigns was included in the newly constituted imperial command of Illyricum, while command over the army to the East was transferred from the proconsul of Macedonia to an imperial legate a few years later (45).

In the years following the Bellum Pannonicum it is Germany rather than Illyricum which holds the pride of place as a theatre of war. Roman arms had pushed forward across the Rhine as far as the Elbe and the whole forces of Germany, Raetia and Illyricum were co-ordinated in the grand strategy to push the boundaries of Roman power as far as the line running from the R. Elbe to Czechoslovakia and the Danube. The culmination was to be the advance against Maroboduus and the conquest of Bohemia; the assault was to be made on all sides, the armies of Germany and Raetia were to join with the army of Illyricum in the heart of Germany. This would have been the crowning achievement of Roman arms in Europe. In A.D. 6 all was ready and the advance had begun into Bohemia; suddenly the news arrived that all Illyricum had revolted and that Italy was threatened in a manner unknown since the days of Hannibal or the Cimbri. The march against Maroboduus was called off and peace was made only just in time for Roman troops to be released

for the campaign in Illyricum far to the south.

The original outbreak of the revolt occurred among the Daesitiates, a powerful Illyrian people dwelling in central Bosnia in the region of Sarajevo (46). Velleius implies that it was the Pannonians who rebelled first but Dio specifically states that the man originally responsible was Bato of the Daesitiates (47). Roman citizens were overwhelmed, traders massacred and a large detachment of vexillarii (veterans still serving with the colours) was exterminated to a man (48). There was near panic in Rome and fears that the enemy would appear in Italy were expressed openly by Augustus. Within a short time the Breuci, the powerful people dwelling astride the Save, joined in the war with the Bosnian tribes under the leadership of another Bato (49). The defection of the Breuci was a major disaster; with the loss of control of the route along the Save valley the whole power of Rome in the Balkans hung in the balance. As the Pannonians realised, the only way to consolidate their position was to seize the two principal strongholds at each end of the Save, Siscia and Sirmium. The Pannonian Bato appears to have realised this and his first move was to attack Sirmium; the other Bato, instead of aiming for Siscia and the route over the Julian Alps into Italy, for some reason preferred to drive southward over the Dinaric Alps and attack the partially romanised hinterland behind Salona. His attacks extended along the whole coast of Illyria reaching as far south as Apollonia (50). In spite of this, however, the rebellion was now doomed, for the fatal delay had allowed Tiberius to return from the war against Maroboduus and secure Siscia with an army of five legions. Bato realised this too late and, after failing to halt the twentieth legion under

Valerius Messallinus leading the advance to Siscia, turned eastward and joined his Pannonian namesake in the assault on Sirmium (51).

Immediately the news of the revolt was known the legate of Moesia, A. Caecina Severus (cos. suff. 1 B.C.), with an army of three legions advanced westwards to save Sirmium; this he did in a desperate battle near the Drave with the aid of his Thracian allies. Failing to capture Sirmium the rebels withdrew to the nearby mountain range, the Alma mons (mod. Fruška Gora NW of Belgrade), where they constituted a constant threat to Roman possession of Sirmium (52). A. Caecina was unable to winter at Sirmium as raids on his province by the Dacians and the Sarmatians forced him to retrace his steps eastwards. The policy of the Roman commanders in A.D. 6, Tiberius in the west and A. Caecina in the east, had assured Rome of eventual victory over the Pannonians. Roman possession of Siscia and Sirmium forced the barbarians to retreat for the winter to strongholds in the mountains, where famine and cold would diminish their numbers and reduce their efficiency. In the early stages, when the barbarians would be thirsting for a battle, the obvious policy was to remain in the strongholds until the fervour of the enemy had subsided. The sound strategy employed in the first crucial months of the war reveals Augustus' marshals as men of the highest military calibre.

The shock of the Pannonian war and the rapid measures necessary to stop it spreading had clearly strained the existing military resources almost to breaking point. If the revolt was to be put down more troops were needed urgently. Military morale was very low and recruits for the legions were hard to find amongst Roman citizens. Veterans were recalled,

'volunteer' battalions were formed from slaves and freedmen, requisitioned from their owners for the purpose. Velleius the historian remarks that he was responsible for transporting some of these reinforcements to Tiberius at Siscia in the winter of A.D. 6/7, while more were brought over later by the young Germanicus (53). The price was now being paid for Augustus's earlier drastic reductions of the Roman armies, which had allowed no provision for a reserve to meet such a crisis as the Pannonian war and rested on the assumption that each provincial command was capable of dealing with any trouble occurring within its particular sphere.

In Moesia the size of the army was increased to five legions, the additional two being brought from the Eastern provinces by M. Plautius Silvanus (cos. 2 B.C.), (54) who now appears to share with A. Caecina the command against the insurgents from the eastern side. By the beginning of the campaigning season of A.D. 7 the two branches of the army were ready to move towards each other along the Save valley. In the east the army of Moesia was confronted by the combined force of the insurgents under the command of the two Batos. Their situation of the Fruška Gora (if, of course, they were still there at the end of the winter) enabled them to attack at will any attempt to move westward from Sirmium. A battle was fought at the Volcaean Marshes, probably on the Save not far westwqrds from Sirmium; the engagements was within a hair's breadth of becoming a major disaster and was only saved by the discipline of the legionary, whose training triumphed over the undisciplined ferocity of the Illyrians. The army moved on westwards and joined up with Tiberius' force which had been moving eastwards from Siscia to meet them. Velleius states that the total strength of the united

armies was ten legions, seventy auxiliary cohorts and fourteen cavalry alae together with a force of ten thousand veterans (55).

This large force was only kept together for a few days in order to allow the Moesian army to recover from the rigours of the march. Tiberius then ordered it to return along the route by which it had come and escorted it most of the way with his own army. Caecina had to return to his duties in Moesia and command of the force left at Sirmium was given to M. Plautius Silvanus. With the re-establishing of Roman power along the Save valley Tiberius was able to return to winter at Siscia with every confidence that, as soon as it was over, the Pannonians would come to him as suppliants weakened by famine and the figours of a hard Central European winter.

The wisdom of Tiberius' strategy was proved when early in the next year (A.D. 8) the Pannonians capitulated at the Bathinus river. This cannot be located with any certainty; the Bosna seems unlikely since it lies mostly outside the territory of the Breuci who surrendered at this time. A more likely area is in the country between the Save and the Drave, and attempts have been made to identify it with minor rivers such as the Bošut near Vinkovci in Western Serbia (56).

As a reward for his surrender and betrayal of his rival leader Pinnes, Bato was allowed to become chief of the Breuci. Almost immediately, however, he was captured by his namesake, Bato the Daesitiatan, and put to death. As a result, many of the Pannonians who had capitulated at the Bathinus were induced to take up arms again, but they were soon suppressed with little trouble by M. Plautius Silvanus, who commenced a

systematic devastation of Pannonian lands from his base at Sirmium. The rebellion of the Breuci and other Pannonians in the Save valley had now been crushed and the centre of operations moved to the wooded valleys of the Bosnian tribes among whom the original revolt started. Realising that the Save valley was lost to him, Bato retreated southward and, occupying the high mountain passes, made raids into the territory towards the Adriatic. The crisis of the war was now well past and the final season (A.D. 9) was given over to the ruthless pacification of the last remnants of the rebellion in Southern Bosnia and Montenegro: the Bellum Dalmaticum, Velleius calls it. For the winter A.D. 8/9 Tiberius was able to return to Rome, leaving M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. A.D. 6) in charge at Siscia (57).

Although reference to specific details of the movements of commanders are given both in Velleius and, more fully, in Dio, they are not sufficient to provide a clear picture of the war of A.D. 9. According to Dio, Tiberius (we do not know exactly where he was in Illyricum in this year; he may have been commanding a force on the Adriatic side of Illyricum) divided the army into three divisions; one under M. Plautius Silvanus, based on Sirmium and presumably penetrating Bosnia from the north-east; M. Aemilius Lepidus, commanding the Siscia army and advancing through Southern Croatia and into Bosnia; the third division was commanded by Tiberius himself with the young Germanicus on his staff (58). His base was presumably somewhere in Dalmatia and his task was specifically to hunt down Bato, the leader of the rebellion, who was sheltering in the many strongholds in the hinterland of Salonae

Velleius gives some detail of the march of M. Aemilius Lepidus from his winter quarters in Siscia to join his commander-in-chief in Dalmatia; he advanced against peoples who had not been affected by the war and who were therefore all the more fierce. He fought through country of the most difficult kind inflicting great losses upon all those who barred his way, burning houses, devastating crops and slaying the people. At length, laden with booty and rejoicing in victory, he reached Tiberius (59). Since we know from Dio that Tiberius was operating in the region of Salonae; it is fairly certain that Aemilius Lepidus' route was overland from the Save valley to somewhere south of the Dinaric Alps (Syme suggests that his destination was Burnum, near Knin) (60); if this is true then he must be given the credit for being the first Roman commander to lead a force overland from the Save valley to the Adriatic littoral. Unfortunately, we have no evidence of the progress of the force under M. Plautius Silvanus, which was probably advancing into Bosnia from his base at Sirmium. If anything his task was more difficult since the distance of his march, probably along the Drina valley, was greater and the country more inhospitable than that through which Aemilius Lepidus had passed. Tiberius' campaigns in the south are more fully reported, due mainly to the fact that he was accompanied by the famous Germanicus and it is to the latter that Dio gives most of the credit for the Roman successes.

Germanicus captured two strongholds, Splønum and Raetinium; neither of these can be identified with any certainty. Raetinium may have been at Bihać near the headwaters of the Una, while Splønum is known as a city

from a later inscription (61). (Yet there is a serious objection to the location of these places so far to the north. Dio clearly states the Tiberius marched in company with Germanicus and the location of these two strongholds in the Una valley would imply an advance by the two men southward along the river; if Tiberius was based in the south this could hardly have been possible. Furthermore Dio's description of the pursuit and capture of Bato clearly implies that Tiberius never advanced over into Bosnia but in fact probably moved along the near hinterland, reducing Illyrian fortresses.)

Finally Tiberius trapped Bato in Andetrium [mod. Gornje Muč], only twenty miles inland from Salonae and proceeded to besiege the place (62). Dio remarks that so severe had been the campaign that it was Tiberius who was in trouble for lack of supplies rather than those within the stronghold. It is clear that the hard campaigning of the last three years had placed a great strain upon the discipline and efficiency of the Roman army. Desertion spread to such an extent that within the fortress of Andetrium there was a sizable fraction of renegades, who attempted to prolong the struggle even when the natives themselves were desirous of suing for peace. Even among the troops themselves Tiberius fact a near mutiny, during the rigours of the siege. Before Andetrium fell Bato succeeded in escaping, only to surrender himself to Tiberius when he saw all the strongholds opening their gates to the advancing legions. Tiberius spared his life and allowed him to live out his days under guard in Ravenna. The Romans took the capture of Bato as the end of the war in Illyricum and all the commanders received

the honours due to their rank (63). How far the pacification of the mountainous interior was complete is difficult to say. The most important achievement of the war had been to secure Roman control of at least two and possibly three routes between the Adriatic littoral and the Save valley. The evidence for the great road-building activity in the years following A.D.9 is discussed in another place (cf. ~~part~~ ch. VII pp. 184ff). Once these routes had been secured the possibility of a repetition of the events of A.D. 6 was very remote; areas away from these main routes were probably untouched by the war and more likely than not were never actually 'conquered' by the physical presence of a Roman army. The conquest of Illyricum was the crowning achievement of the Augustan Principate in the military sphere; important as the German front was, it was speedily closed down when Illyricum rose in A.D. 6 and the finest military strategist of the age was swiftly transferred to deal with the threat from <u>within</u> the empire. The legions of the Danube had to look both ways; they encircled a vast tract of country inhabited by a fierce population which could still explode into rebellion and upset the careful balance of the Augustan army. The next occasion on which the Illyrian warriors came out from their mountains was in the third century, to save the Roman world from destruction.

Chapter V: notes.

1. A full bibliography of all the works published until 1934 about the Illyrian Wars of Augustus is provided by the tenth volume of the Cambridge Ancient History; for the Illyrian campaigns of Octavian in 35-33 B.C. cf. CAH x 903 supplemented by Schmitthener, op. cit. (see below), 189-90 and for the later wars, CAH x 938ff. supplemented by Koestermann, op. cit. (see below), 345 note 1. The basic studies are the contributions by R. Syme to CAH x (1934), 355ff and 369ff. Three more recent items can be added:

E. Koestermann 'der Pannonische-dalmatini\sche Krieg 6-9 n. Chr.', Hermes 81 (1953) Heft 3, 345-378. This study is concerned mostly with topographical questions and draws on the author's experience as an officer of the German army which was faced with the problem of the guerrilla tactics of the Yugoslav partisans in the latter part of the Second World War.

E. Pašalić 'Quaestiones de bello Delmatico Pannonicoque (A.D. 6-9)' in Godišnjak Istorikog društva Bosna i Hercegovina, ann. viii (1956) 245-300 in Serbocro-ation with latin summary. The author, who works in the University at Sarajevo, has an excellent knowledge of the geography of the South-western Balkans; he stresses that the pacification

of A.D. 9 was probably the first occasion on which the legions penetrated into Central Bosnia.

R. Syme 'Augustus and the S. Slav lands', Rev. Int. des Etudes Balkaniques, Beograd (1937), ann. iii tome i (5), 33-46. A lucid exposition of the author's views on the relative importance of the three wars Augustus undertook or directed in Illyricum. He places great emphasis on the bellum Pannonicum of 13-9 B.C. following on the views he expressed concerning the restricted character of the war of 35-33 B.C. when reviewing Swoboda, Octavian und Illyricum (Wien 1932), in JRS xxiii (1933) 63ff.

W.Schmitthenner 'Octavians militarische Unternehmungen in den Jahren 35-33 v. Chr.', Historia vii (1958) Heft 2, 189ff.

2. The two principal sources for the Illyrian campaigns of 35-33 B.C. are Appian Ill. 16-28 (based on the memoirs of Augustus) and Cassius Dio xlix 34-38. In addition, the following passages record the campaign but do not furnish any details; Strabo iv 6,10; vii 5,2,4 (adding some topographical information); Liv. epit. cxxxi-ii; Vell. Pat. ii 78,2; Florus ii 23,7; 24, 8-9; 12; Suet. Aug. 20; Oros vi 19,3.

3. Appian Ill. 15, οὐ γάρ ἀλλοτρίας πράξεις ὁ Σεβάστος, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ συνέγραφεν.

4. Appian Ill. 16: Ὀξυαίους μὲν δὴ καὶ Περθεναίας καὶ Βαθιάτας καὶ Ταυλαντίους καὶ Καρβαίους καὶ Κινάρβρους καὶ Μεδόνεννους καὶ Πυριδραίους . . . .

(i) Oxyaei; probably the Ozuaei of Plin. NH iii 143 in the conventus of Narona.

(ii) Pertheenatae; not the Parthini (as Swoboda, Octavian und Illyricum, 82f.) but probably a minor people in S. Illyria.

(iii) Bathiatae; an Illyrian name cf. Krahe, Sprache, 110 but otherwise unknown.

(iv) Taulantii; once a powerful people in the hinterland of Apollonia (cf. Fluss, RE iv A 2526ff) but those mentioned here may be an offshoot, since in one place Appian speaks of Taulantii as bordering on Delmatae (Ill. 24) and the same location may be inferred from Plin. NH iii 144, eo namque tractu (of river Drilo) fuere Labeatae, Enderudini, Sasaei, Grabaei proprieque dicti Illyrii et Taulantii et Pyraei, cf. Schmitthenner, op. cit., 202.

(v) Cambaei; otherwise unknown; possibly the Grabaei of Plin NH iii 144.

(vi) Cinambroi; connected by Fluss (RE supp. v 453) with Cinna of It. Ant. 339,3, Peutinger (Sinna) and Ptol ii 16,7 (Κίννα), a place on the inland route from Scodra to Narona in the area of the Scutari Lake (cf. ch. XIII p. 405f).

(vii) Meromennoi; unknown, as also are the (viii) Pyrissaeioi but note the Pyraei of Plin. NH iii 144.

5. M. Varro lxxxviiii civitatis eo ventitasse auctor est, nunc soli prope noscuntur .... (eighteen names follow), Plin. NH iii 143.

6. Appian Ill. 16, ἔργῳ δὲ μείζονι ἐλήφθησαν, καὶ φόρους ὅσους ἐξέλιπον ἠναγκάσθησαν ἀποδοῦναι, Δοκλεᾶταί τε καὶ Κάρνοι καὶ Ἰντερφρουρῖνοι καὶ Ναρήσιοι καὶ Γλιντισίωνες καὶ Ταυρίσκοι.

(i) Docleatae; later the city of Doclea (Duklija in Montenegro, cf. ch. XIII p. 385 (below), they were in the conventus of Narona and numbered 33 decuriae, Plin. NH ii 143.

(ii) Carni; an alpine people in the northeast of Italy with two main centres, Iulium Carnicum (Zuglio) and Carnium (Kranj NW of Ljubljana), cf. Degrassi, confine nord-orientale dell' Italia Romana (1954), 20, 81ff, 111. (iii) Interphrourini; a most suspicious name, possibly ~~false~~ manufactured from 'inter' and 'phrourios', the latter word meaning stronghold. The people are not otherwise known but may be identical with the Endirudini of Plin. NH iii 144, a people in the conventus of Narona; note also the Ἐνδήρον of Ptolemy ii 16,7 probably connected with this people (RE v 2553). (iv) Naresioi; in the conventus of Narona, Plin. NH iii 143cf. Ptol. iii 16,5, numbering 102 decuriae. Presumably they belong somewhere in the region of the River Naro.

(v) Glintidiones; in the conventus of Narona, Plin., loc. cit., numbering 44 decuriae. They are not necessarily related to the Ditiones of Central Bosnia (on whom see below ch. XIV p. 413), an inference of Swoboda corrected by Syme, JRS xxiii (1933), 69.

(vi) Tauriscoi; (also recorded in this context by Dio xlix 34) a Celtic people dwelling in the Upper Save valley which later formed the southern part of the province of Noricum, cf. Miltner, Festschrift fur Egger (1942), 49. They may have spread eastwards to the region of Ljubljana, cf. Fluss RE v A 1ff.

7. Appian Ill. 16.

(i) Hippasinoi; otherwise unknown.

(ii) Bessoi; a large Thracian people dwelling the the Upper Hebrus valley (mod. Marica). Thracian names do appear in the western Balkans, cf. Patsch Ojh. x (1907), 169-174.

8. Appian Ill. 16. We cannot be certain whether these were Greeks or Illyrians since both were established on the island, cf. ch.1 pp. 11 ff.

9. Appian Ill. 17.

10. App. Ill. 16. On the location of Avendo, Monetium and Arupium, cf. Patsch, Lika, 29-30 and map fig. 1. The later cities are discussed below (ch. XI p. 307ff).

11. Veith, Die Feldzüge von C. Caesar Octavianus in Illyricum, 35-33 B.C. (Schriften der Balkankommission, Antiq. Abteil. viii), Wien, 1914, 27 ff.

12. Appian Ill. 19-22; the controversy over the site of Metulum is summarised by Rice Holmes, The Architect of the Roman Empire (44-27 B.C.), 226-7 in an appendix entitled 'the site of Metulum', cf. also Veith, op. cit., 47ff.

13. Arrian, vi 9ff.

14. Appian, Ill. 22; on the campaigns of Cotta in 119 B.C. cf. ch. III p. 80f.

15. Appian Ill. loc. cit.; Dio xlix 38.

16. Appian Ill. 24; the name of the garrison commander, Fulfius Geminus, is given by Dio, loc. cit.

17. M. Agrippa against the Delmatae, Dio xlix 38; against the Iapudes at

Metulum, Appian Ill. 20.

18. Capture of Promona from Liburni by Delmatae, Appian Ill. 12; for earthworks of the pre-Roman period on the Promina mountain see W. Büttler, 'Ringwalle in Nordddalmatien', Ber. RGK 21 (1931) 196ff. in particular nos. 33-36. On the status of Promona under the Empire cf. below ch. X p. 280f.

19. Appian Ill. 25-6.

20. Appian Ill. 27; Strabo vii 5,5 p. 316; no definite site for Synodion has been agreed upon although Mayer, op. cit., 306, suggests that it lies in the region of Balijina Glavica. Strabo, loc. cit., refers to 'old' and 'new' Sinotion, both of which were set on fire by Octavian, cf. Veith, op. cit., 94ff.

21. On the location of Setovia, cf. below ch. XIII p. 391 note 7 . citing an inscription from Rider which appears to record a decurion of Set(ovia?) (Glasnik NS vi (1951) 57 n.10).

22. Strabo vii 5,5 p. 315; on Ninia cf. Fluss RE xvii 629.

23. Appian Ill. 28.

24. Appian Ill. 28; the Derbani are not known of elsewhere. Tomaschek has attempted to connect them with Anderva which may lie in the region of Gačko, cf. Patsch, RE v 237; Mayer op. cit., 44, s.v. Anderva, follows Evans and locates Anderva at Nikšić and doubts the connection with the Derbani.

25. Veith, op. cit; J. Kromayer, 'Kleine Forschungen zur Geschichte des zweiten Triumvirates v, Die Illyrische Feldzüge Octavians', Hermes xxxiii (1898), 1ff.

26. E. Swoboda, Octavian und Illyricum, Wien 1932. The views of Vulić are set out in JRS xxiv (1934), 163ff., 'The Illyrian War of Octavian'.

27. Appian Ill. 28.

28. Dio xlix 36,4, cf. Jagenteufel, fasti, 92ff.

29. Syme JRS xxiii (1933), loc. cit., in particular 69-70 section 6 indefinite ancient evidence and 'Augustus and S. Slav. lands etc.,' 36f. also note 30 below.

30. Strabo vii 5,3; ἔθνη δ' ἐστὶ τῶν Παννονίων Βρεῦκοι καὶ Ἀνδιζήτιοι καὶ Διτίωνες καὶ Πειροῦσται καὶ Μαζαῖοι καὶ Δαισιτιᾶται, ὧν βάτων ἡγεμών, καὶ ἄλλα δοκιμότερα μικρά, ἃ διατείνει μέχρι Δαλματίας, σχεδόν δέ τι καὶ Ἀρδιαίων, ἰόντι πρὸς νότον.

~~The 'wooded' country here is clearly a reference to the river valleys of Bosnia while~~ In another place Strabo states that the Pannonians dwelt in 'mountain plains' (vii 5,10 ὀροπέδια)-almost certainly the polja ofDalmatia. The MS of Appian gives among those peoples who gave him most trouble, Δαλμάται καὶ Δαισιοί τε καὶ Πλαίονες (Ill. 17). The Δαίσιοι are not known of elsewhere and Schweighaüser's emendations to Daesitiatae was made on the grounds that they occur amongst the Illyrian peoples involved in the war of A.D. 6-9. As is shown ~~above~~ below (ch. XIV p. 414) the Daesitiatae dwelt in Central Bosnia in the region of Sarajevo. It is most unsafe to include this powerful Bosnian people in the nations subdued by Octavian in 35-33; Appian's Illyrike is suffieiently detailed to exclude any possibility of Octavian having campaigned against them and they are not mentioned

elsewhere. See the discussion of Schmitthenner, op. cit., 213.

31. Plin. NH iii 147, Saus per Colapianos Breucosque (defluit).

32. During, and after, the war of A.D. 6-9 Iapydia and the Liburni were under some form of direct military administration, cf. V 3346 (=ILS 2673) Verona mentioning an equestrian officer who bello] Batoniano praefuit Iapudiai et Liburn.

33. The standards of Gabinius recovered from the Delmatae were displayed in the porticus Octaviae at Rome, cf. CAH x 88 and 574

34. Dio xlix 36,1; Vell. Pat. ii 78,2.

35. Dio xlix 38,4; Appian Ill. 26. Before he set out on his Illyrian campaign Octavian had at least one serious mutiny in his army, Dio xlix 35, 3-5.

36. Dio liii 12,4.

37. Dio liv. 20, 1-3.

38. The sources for the bellum Pannonicum are: Res gestae 30; Vell. Pat. ii 96,2; Suet. Tib. 9; Florus ii 24, 8ff; Dio liv 28,1; 31,2f; 34,3f; 36,3f; lv 2,4; Liv. epit. cxli. The importance of this war in the Augustan conquest of Illyricum is emphasised frequently by Syme, opp. cit.

39. Dio liv 28,1.

40. Dio liv 24,3.

41. Vell. Pat. ii 96,2, the MS reads as follows; subinde bellum Pannonicum, quod inchoatum [ab] Agrippa, Marco Vinicio, avo tuo cos, magnum atroxque et perquam vicinum imminebat Italiae, per Neronem gestum est. The ab was added by Lipsius. The MS says that

the war was commenced in the consulship of M. Vinicius by M. Agrippa; this is impossible since in the year of Vinicius' consulship (19 B.C.) Agrippa was in Spain, cf. Dio liv 11,2. Kritz, followed by Halm in the Teubner, emends cos to consulari. It is possible that cos was originally a scribe's glass to explain the position of Vinicius, while Syme, 'Augustus and S. Slav lands, 40 note 1, suggests that Vinicius may have been operating in Illyricum as early as 14 B.C.

42. Dio liv 31,2ff; Suet. Tib.9.

43. Syme, op. cit., 40ff.

44. In A.D. 6 there were five legions in Illyricum although there is no indication when this formation was put together; the problem is treated in detail by Syme, JRS xxiii (1933) 21ff., 'Some notes on the legions under Augustus'.

45. Illyricum was transferred to imperial administration in 11 B.C. according to Dio, liv 34,4. The question is discussed by Syme JRS xxiv (1934), 113ff., 'Lentulus and the origin of Moesia'.

46. The main sources for the war of A.D. 6-9 are the accounts of Dio lv 28, 9-33,4; 34, 4-7; lvi 11, 1-17,3 and Velleius Paterculus ii 110-116. The latter is a contemporary source who served on the staff and was with Tiberius at Siscia in the critical winter of 6-7. His brother Magius Celer Velleianus was also a legate of Tiberius in A.D. 9 (Vell. Pat. ii 115,1).

47. Dio lv 29,2. The actual cause of the outbreak was, according to Dio, the demand from Tiberius for contigents of soldiers to serve in the

war against Maroboduus.

48. Vell. Pat. ii 110,6.

49. Dio lv 29,3.

50/51. Dio. loc. cit.

52. The Alma of Dio is presumably the same as Almam montem apud Sirmium of Eutropius ix 17.

53. Vell Pat. ii 111,1-3; Germanicus, Dio lv 31,1.

54. Vell. Pat. ii 112,4.

55. Vell. Pat. ii 113,1.

56. Mayer, op. cit., 80, suggests the Bednja in Croatia while Koestermann prefers the Bošut near Vinkovci, op. cit., 365 note 4.

57. Vell. Pat. ii 114,4.

58. Dio lvi 12,2.

59. Vell. Pat. ii 115, 2-3.

60. Koestermann, op. cit., 369, believes that since the Una valley was the field of operations of Germanicus against the Maezaei (Dio lv 32,4), then the route of Lepidus must have been farther to the East. He may have passed along the Sana valley and then through Glamočkopolje, Livjanskopolje and over the Dinara Ridge near Halapić, a route later taken by one of the main roads across the interior of the province (cf. below p. 379f.). The early date of the base at Burnum is suggested by the very early legionary tombstone of a has(tatus) pri(or) of leg. XX (III 2836).

61. On Splonum and Raetinium see below ch. XIV p. 417f, 429f, ~~305~~, XI p. 305.

62. Dio lvi 12,3.

63. Dio lvi 17,1-3; Tiberius triumphed in Rome on the 16 Jan. A.D. 11 de Pannonis et Delmateis, cf. Vell. Pat. ii 121,3 and CIL I(2) p. 181.

Chapter VI: The province of Dalmatia.

The Roman province of Dalmatia included not only the Adriatic littoral which still bears that name today but also all of the modern republics of Bosnia-Hercegovina, Montenegro, most of Southern Croatia together with a large slice of Western Serbia. On the Adriatic it began in the north at the River Arsia (mod. Rašа) on the western side of Istria and extended southward as far as Lissus (mod. Lješ) at the mouth of the Albanian Drin (Roman Drilo); also included were the islands of the Gulf of Rijeka (Roman sinus Flanaticus) as well as those along the Dalmatian coast proper. Inland there is considerable doubt as to the precise line of the boundary with Pannonia and Moesia superior, but there is little question which major areas fell within the province.

In the north the line probably followed the River Colapis (mod. Kulpa) for a stretch, then travelled to cross the River Vrbas near Laktaši (the ad fines of Peutinger, see below ch. XIV p. 419). It is the north-eastern boundary of Dalmatia that has provided the most difficulty; as Domaszewski first pointed out, Ptolemy seems to imply that at one point the boundary of Dalmatia ran along the River Save and he fixes this point as the marshy basin of the river between Sirmium and Singidunum (mod. Belgrade), where the tributary river Kolubara flows in from the south. From the Save it travelled southwards through Western Serbia, enclosing the mining district of Rudnik on Mt. Šturac, and thence to the plain of Metohija in Old Serbia. On this section it included most of the old Sandjak of Novipazar including that place and Peč further south;

Kosovska Metohija can be confidently excluded, as not only members of the officium of the legate of Moesia superior are attested, but we also find honestiores of Ulpiana and Scupi, both cities of the latter province. In Metohija it probably followed the White Drin (Albanian Drin i Barve) to the point on Mons Scardus (mod. Šar planina west of Skopje) where the three provinces of Moesia superior, Dalmatia and Macedonia met, whence it is but a short distance to the city of Lissus at the mouth of the Drin. Obviously there cannot be any certainty over the boundary described above (basically that of Kiepert in CIL III supp. ii, except for the exclusion of Kos. Mitrovica) (see note 1).

The province of Dalmatia was created after the war of A.D. 6-9 by the division of the great military command of Illyricum into inferius (later known as Pannonia) and superius (later Dalmatia). From this period we can speak of the Roman province of Dalmatia as a separate entity with its own army controlled by successive senatorial governors of consular rank.

The succession of consular legates was broken temporarily by Domitian, who is known to have sent at least one and possibly two praetorian legates; consulars soon returned, however, and continued to administer the province until they were replaced by non-senatorial praesides about the middle of the third century. In recent years the fasti of the legates of Dalmatia have been diligently compiled by the Austrian A. Jagenteufel and furnish us with a fairly reliable list. Useful annotation and some additional information has been supplied by R. Syme in his recent review of Jagenteufel's work (2).

Most of the legates tell us little about the province and its development. The earlier governors, however, clearly had an enormous task before them in organising this unwieldly area, and considerable evidence has come down to us of their administration at work. In this group the two most important are P. Cornelius Dolabella (c. 14-20 A.D.) and L. Volusius Saturninus (c. 29-40); Dolabella was responsible for initiating the massive programme of road building in the interior, an essential procedure if the gains of the recent war were to be consolidated (3). The garrison of the province, legions VII and XI, was an essential instrument in this progressive settlement. As well as being actively concerned in constructing these strategic routes from Salonae into the interior, many officers were detached to act as arbitrators in boundary disputes between cities and other communities of the province (4). Even though the fighting was over and the legate had not a frontier to concern him, he needed all the military resources he possessed to control peoples who had given Roman arms one of their severest tests ever. Even so, they were quite content to leave a large measure of control in the hands of native principes, and we can detect such rulers taking over from the military praefecti control of the civitates in the interior. In addition to the two legions, a force of auxilia was retained as a complement to the activities of the former (5).

The closeness of this powerful military force to Italy and the centre of the Empire produced an episode which nearly anticipated the events of A.D. 69 by almost thirty years. In the first year of Claudius' reign the legate L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus was won over to the

senatorial factio which had nearly succeeded in doing away with the rule of the Caesars altogether after the murder of Gaius. When the revolt was proclaimed they legions remained loyal to the Caesars for which they were awarded the honorific titles Claudia pia fidelis. The diligence of his successor, L. Salvius Otho, father of the emperor, in rooting out supporters of Camillus in the province earned him promotion to the patriciate (6).

The two legates known to us for the reign of Tiberius clearly laid down the administrative structure of the province; the work of Cornelius Dolabella and Volusius Saturninus covered all fields of the government of the province. In addition both men acquired ties with some of the coastal cities as well as patronage of the provinces as a whole; Dolabella had a cult of his own established in the provincial capital Salonae (7). The compliments paid to these and other legates of the province were something more than flattery of authority. Within a few years of the final pacification of the interior of Illyria numerous settlements along the coast, swelled by many immigrants from Italy, became municipia and enjoyed great prosperity. It was obviously in the interest of the government to encourage this process by helping the cities with loans of money and technical help in the construction of civic amenities; Liburnia seems to have received special help in this direction. The choice of Dolabella and Saturninus illustrates that Tiberius attached great importance to this province so near Italy which, after all, was conquered and later pacified by him personally. Both legates were consulars of some seniority, especially Volusius Saturninus

who, when he died in A.D. 56 at the age of ninety-three holding the office of praefectus urbi, could claim to have been the trusted confidant of every one of the five Julio-Claudian emperors (8).

Quite soon after the abortive revolt of Camillus the strength of the provincial army was drastically reduced by the transfer of legion VII C.p.f. to Moesia, where it took up a permanent station at Viminacium (Kostolac on the Danube east of Belgrade). The work of settlement and administration was carried on by legion XI C.p.f., road building supervised by the engineers and boundary disputes settled by senior centurions. During the chaos that followed the end of Nero's reign the legion left Dalmatia and was replaced, probably almost immediately, by the newly-raised legion IIII Flavia firma. As time went on the need for a legion disappeared and it was finally transferred to Moesia in or about A.D. 86. The military force at the legate's disposal now consisted of only three auxiliary cohorts who were employed on policing duties and in the officium at Salonae (9).

By the Flavian period the important work had been completed and the results of the recruitment of auxilia as well as the road building were gradually changing the character of the non-Italian communities. At the end of the first century some areas of the interior had even acquired a partly-urbanised aspect. In the second century the pace of the advance quickened with widespread grants of the civitas by Hadrian and his successors to the extent that virtually all the major settlements of the interior had become Roman cities by the end of the third century. In the third century the development of mining, especially of

the silver-bearing lead in the Drina valley and Western Serbia, brought an even higher level of prosperity.

By the second century Dalmatia had become a governorship normally held within a year or so of the consulate; the character of the province still demanded a vir militaris and a number of the legates who are attested went on to hold the senior commands on the Rhine and Danube Frontiers (10). The relegation of Dalmatia to a virtual provincia inermis meant that the governor was forced to borrow legionaries from other provinces for his officium; virtually all the beneficiarii consulares in charge of the stationes were drawn from the legions of Pannonia and Moesia (11).

The evidence for the consular legates of Dalmatia comes almost entirely from inscriptions, many of them on careers from elsewhere in the empire. Some, on the other hand, occur on records of public works within the province and, naturally, milestones. At Gardun a structure for draining water (turris ad aquam tollendam) was constructed for the station of cohors VIII voluntariorum c.R. ~~for~~ by that unit under Antoninus Pius, while at Scardona in Liburnia the name of the legate (Scapula Tertullus) appears on the inscription recording the building of the administrative headquarters of the Scardona conventus, or judicial circuit, by some of its constituent communities. At Trilj (pons Tiluri) the bridge over the River Hippius (mod. Cetina) was reconstructed by three cities of the Delmatae, Novenses, Delminenses and Riditae, under the legate L. Iunius Rufinus Proculianus in A.D. 184. In the third century were constructed baths at Narona and Senia probably with assistance from the governors mentioned in both cases (12).

Chapter VI: Notes.

1. The boundaries of Dalmatia: for the coastline, cf. Plin. NH iii 139, Arsiae gens Liburnorum iungitur usque ad flumen Tityum and iii 145, A Lisso Macedonia provincia. cf. Ptolemy ii 16,1. On ad fines at Laktaši, Peutinger, It. Ant., 274,6 and ch. XIV p. 419. The contact of Dalmatia with the River Save is implied in the following passage of Ptolemy (ii 16,1), dealing with the western boundary of Moesia; ἀπὸ δὲ ἀνατολῶν Μυσία τῇ ἄνω κατὰ γραμμὴν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰρημένης ἐκτροπῆς τοῦ Σαούου ποταμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ κατὰ τὸ Σκάρδον ὄρος πέρατος

The ~~ἐκτρο~~ τὸ Σκάρδον ὄρος is clearly the Scardus mons of Liv. xliii 20 and xliv 31 cf. Pol xxviii 8,3, Strabo vii fragment 10 (Loeb ed. p.328), and the Šar planina west of Skopje; this point gives us a reasonably precise line for the southeast. Ptolemy says above that the western boundary of Moesia superior began at the ἐκτρόπη of the River Save in the direction of the Scardus mons. This word means 'turning aside from a normal course' in the case of a river (Liddell & Scott, ad loc.), and must surely refer to the marshy area between Sirmium and Singidunum where the river meanders considerably; the Kolubara seems the most likely line for a north-south boundary line in the area. How much of the land southwest of Belgrade was actually included within Dalmatia is by no means clear and presents the most difficult problem; on the whole, however, the line drawn by Kiepert, CIL III supp. ii plate VI, seems acceptable, although it is worth noting the

occurence of a number of lead pigs bearing the letter M(etalli?) D(elmatiae?) from Babe, west of Guberevci (Ojh xiii (1910) Bb. 225 n.43), which lies well outside Kiepert's boundary. If they were produced from the nearby mining centre of Rudnik near Mt. Šturac then the latter should almost certainly be included within Dalmatia.

2. A. Jagenteufel, Die Statthalter der römischen Provinz Dalmatia von Augustus bis Diocletian, Schriften der Balkankommission xii (Antiquarische Abteilung), Wien 1958; reviewed in detail by R. Syme in Gnomon 31 (1959), 510-8. The only definitely attested praetorian legate is Q. Pomponius Rufus, cos. suff. late 95 and legate of Dalmatia in 94(dipl. XVI II). A possible praetorian legate is the Macer addressed by Martial when he was about to take up the governorship (x 78); he is not mentioned by Jagenteufel op. cit., while Syme, op. cit., 515 suggests he may be consular.

3. On P. Cornelius Dolabella and L. Volusius Saturninus, see Jagenteufel, 11-21. The evidence of the road building is set out below ch. VII p. 184ff. note 17.

4. See below ch. VII p. 182ff., for the boundary settlements.

5. On the auxilia in Dalmatia, see below ch. VIII p. 195ff.

6. For the rebellion of Camillus, cf. Dio lx 15,4; Suet. Claud. 13. The persecution of his supporters by M. Salvius Otho is recorded by Suet. Otho 1, 2, 3. A member of Camillus' household is recorded at Salonae, BD 28 (1905) 20.

7. III 14712, L. Anicius Paetinas, a IIIIvir quinquennalis of Salonae, was also pontifex quinquennalis of P. Dolabella.

8. The loyalty of Volusius to successive emperors drew a notice from Tacitus, ann. xiii 30; cf. also Crook, Consilium Principis, 190 n. 360. He accepted the patronage of Aenona(probably of Iader, see below p. 266.) after he had left the province and become praefectus urbis under Gaius, III 2975, 2976.

9. On the movements of legg. VII C.p.f. and IIII F.f., see below ch. VII p. 178f. .

10. In this connection the following careers may be noted (the figures in brackets refer to their number in the list of Jagenteufel, op. cit., where full references are given):

(13) L. Funisulanus Vettonianus (80-83) - Pannonia - Moesia superior.

(15) C. Cilnius Proculus (96/99) - Moesia superior.

(20) L. Vitrasius Flamininus (171-3, see ch. VIII appendix ii below) - Transpadana - Dalmatia + Moesia superior.

(22) M. Didius Iulianus (176-7) - Germania inferior.

(23) C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes (178-9) - iii Daciae - Pannonia superior.

(28) Fulvius Maximus (end 2nd- 3rd century) - Pannonia superior - Germania inferior.

(30) Cassius Dio Cocceianus (224-6) - Pannonia superior.

(31) L. Domitius Gallicanus Papinianus (239ff.) Hispania citerior - Germania inferior (?).

11. Members of the legate's officium at Salonae drawn from the legions of other provinces:

I Adiutrix; speculator, BD xxxviii (1914) 94 4692A also the christian

vet. ex cornic., III 8752.

XIV Gemina Martia victrix; comm. cos., III 2015 cf. p. 2165, speculator, III 9401.

The evidence for beneficiarii consulares in the province is considerable: I Adiutrix (from Hadrian at Brigetio, Pann. sup.); III 13847 (A.D. 194) Plevlja/Mun. S....; III 1907, 1909, 1910 Novae, III 15066 Raetinium (Golubić), III 14218 Lješće near Skelani, Vjesnik I (1929-30) 67 (A.D. 187) Doclea, III 3161 findspot unknown. I Italica (Novae in Moesia inferior); III 2023, Betz 192 (otherwise unpublished) Salonae, III 1781 (A.D. 225) Narona, III 1906 Novae, III 14361 Stolac.

V Macedonica (Hadrian-Marcus, Troesmis in Moesia inferior then Dacia);

Strena Buliciana 216 n.6 Burnum, Glasnik xxvi (1914) 175 fig.49, Lješće, as Betz, op. cit., 49-50, suggests these probably are more likely to belong to the period when the legion formed part of the army of Moesia inferior.

X Gemina (Vindobona, Pann. sup.); III 8656, 8745, AE 1906 135, veterans of the legion in the officium at Salonae?, BD xxix (1906) 12, BD xxx (1907) 29 Salonae, III 2677 Tragurium, III 14219 Lješće, III 14637 Novae, III 9847 cf. p.2165 Lipa in Livjanskopolje also a decurion of a municipium, III 3158a findspot unknown.

XI Claudia (Durostorum in Moesia inferior by early second century); III 8727, III 14703 Salonae, III 9790, III 14959 Magnum, III 9862 = 13231 Glamoč, III 14638 Novae, III 14219/4 Skelani.

XIV Gemina Martia victrix (from early second century Carnuntum in Pann. sup.); Glasnik xxxix (1927) 262, 267 Halapić near Glamoč (A.D. 261), III 12789 (two ex.) Stolac, III 10050 Avendo (Crkvina near Brlog), III 1780 (A.D. 209) Narona, III 1911 (A.D. 239) Novae. Unspecified legions; III 8743, BD xxx (1907) 40 3778A, III 2001, III 12895, III 8754, III 8749, Salonae, III 10057 Munjava, III 12723 Domavia, III 14219/6, III 14219/5 Skelani, Strena Buligiana 216 n.5 Burnum, III 1783 Narona, III 14221 Banjaluka, III 14956, 14957, 14960, 14961, 14962 Mun. Magnum, III 12802 cf. p. 2328/122, III 14636.

12. Legates of Dalmatia involved in public works etc.;
Water tower at Gardun, Vjesnik li (1930-4) 225 cf. Sex. Aemilius Equester (19); Praetorium at Scardona, III 2809 Scapulla Terullus (25); bridge at Trilj, III 3203 L. Iunius Rufinus Proculianus (26); baths at Senia, III 10054 L. Domitius Gallicanus Papinianus (31), and Narona III 1805 M. Aurelius Tiberianus (37). Numbers in brackets refer to Jagenteufel's list.

Chapter VII: The legionary garrison of Dalmatia and veteran settlement in the province.

(i) The legionary garrison

Tacitus states that in A.D. 14 the army of Dalmatia consisted of two legions (VII and XI) while that of Pannonia consisted of three (VIII Aug., IX Hisp. and XV Apollinaris) (1). The movements of the legions before A.D. 9 (the end of the emergency in the Balkans and the beginning of fairly stable conditions) are a most complex problem and do not bear directly upon the subject of this section except perhaps in one or two details. During the Augustan period the army of Illyricum was regularly composed of five legions, and these were, according to Ritterling, VIII Aug., IX Hisp., XI and XV Apollinaris, while Syme suggests that XI was in Moesia until it was transferred to Illyricum as a reinforcement during the winter of A.D. 6/7; and before this he would have XIV in place of XI. He suggests that XIII may have been in Illyricum for a time in this period, citing the soldier of that legion at Narona who was transferred to a centurionate in the citizen cohort I Campana, a unit attested in Dalmatia in the early first century (2). Leg. XX was stationed in Dalmatia until it was moved to Germany after the disaster of Varus; its place at Burnum was taken by XI, probably newly-arrived from Moesia (3).

There is comparatively little evidence for the movements of legions VII and XI before they took up their stations in the permanent garrison of Dalmatia.

Legion VII. The date of the arrival of this unit in Dalmatia is unknown

but there is little doubt that it once formed part of the proconsular army of Macedonia where it is attested with the title Macedonica (4). Cuntz sought to connect the large proportion of eastern recruits to the legion by their nomina with some of the legates of M. Antonius in the years before Actium, and suggested that they may have been recruited as peregrini in the East, taking the nomen of their commander when they were granted the civitas on enlistment. On the basis of this he postulates an arrival for this unit in Dalmatia at least as early as 15 B.C., but this has been doubted as far too early by some scholars, including Syme. Cuntz has clearly been able to establish some connection with the eastern veterans of leg. VII and some of the legates of M. Antonius, but there are some difficulties in accepting this as evidence for the legion being in Dalmatia as early as 15 B.C. (5).

Legion XI. There is practically no evidence for the history of this formation before it took up station at Burnum probably about A.D. 9. An elderly veteranus missicius at Poetovio suggests that it was stationed in the general area of Illyricum but obviously not necessarily at Poetovio (6). As has been already noted, Syme suggests it may have been in Moesia and brought to Illyricum in the winter of A.D. 6/7.

Apart from fighting the men of the legions were called on to perform many tasks in the administration of the province. Legionaries staffed the senior grades of the legate's officium (~~see above ch. VI p.~~) at Salonae while, on the strategic side, legionary surveyors and engineers took charge of the construction of a number of roads through the interior of the province designed to consolidate the victories of A.D. 9; for while

the main forces had been crushed and their leaders imprisoned complete pacification was impossible without good communication between the Adriatic and the Save valley.

Of the legionary garrison serving in the officium of the legate at Salonae we find the senior post of cornicularius filled by a legionary of leg. XI (died before A.D. 42), while the only other attested officer for the period before A.D. 42 is the veteranus speculator whose tombstone near Imotski reveals that he was co-opted on to the Salonae decurionate (7). A number of men from leg. XI are found serving in Dalmatia as beneficiarii consulares but all of them clearly belong to the period after the legion had left the province. Most are patently of the late second or third century while the earlier examples give the legionary titles as Cl.p.f. or the later and more common Cl. or Clau. (8). No men of leg. VII are known to have served in the officium while the legion was in the province, and the only man in this category from the formation, an exactus consularis at Andetrium, is hardly earlier than the end of the first century (9).

One field of provincial administration which kept the legate and his staff particularly occupied during the first half of the first century was the demarcation of boundaries between cities and ~~the~~ other communities of the province. Time and time again the provincial authorities were called upon to arbitrate over disputed territory. The officers appointed to do the actual arbitration in the case of cities would be termed commissioners (iudices dati) drawn from the upper grades of the centurionate of both legions. Copies of the settlements were presumably displayed on bronze

tablets in the cities concerned (the bronze tablet concerning the vicus of Promona ~~and~~ dealing with some question over access to running water, although in this particular matter there is no trace of government activity), while the actual points on the boundaries were indicated by inscriptions recording the name of the governor and the iudices who drew up the settlement on his behalf (10). Some of the iudices acted in a number of cases and probably became known to the legate as good conciliators of opposing claims (11). Some of the recorded settlements are revisions of earlier settlements but, judging from the fact that almost all the known records of these belong to the period before A.D. 70, most of the settlements by these commissioners produced boundary lines which remained permanent. The topographical significance of the settlements is discussed in the sections dealing with the communities involved (12).

Legionary activity in the cities was almost certainly not confined to the settlement of boundary disputes. At Iader a dedication to Tiberius in A.D. 18/19 was set up by the two legions; what it records, assuming that it is recording public works of some kind, is not stated, but bearing in mind the evidence for the colony's walls and towers being 'granted' by Augustus we can reasonably infer the presence of legionary technicians assisting in some public building (13).

In the vast interior of the province many of the tribes can barely have been pacified. Here the policy of the government was to install reliable members of the local aristocracies as administrators with Roman advice and protection. Even during the war of A.D. 6-9, the government was willing to allow Bato the Breucian, one of the leaders of the

Pannonian rebellion, to retain after capture his traditional authority among his people (14). Further south the Maezaei and Daesitiates had proved implacable enemies and had fought on desparately under their leaders to the end. When eventually they were made to capitulate they were placed under the direct administration of military praefecti. At Bovianum Vetus there is the tombstone of a centurion of leg. XI Claudia who was seconded to the prefecture of the two peoples mentioned above; the stone was set up as a dedication to Vespasian but, allowing for an interlude between retirement and death, his post in Dalmatia probably belongs to the reign of Nero. His last post was the prefecture of the auxiliary cohort III Alpinorum, also in Dalmatia (15).

It was realised by the Roman government that the successes of the campaigns of A.D. 8-9 in the interior of the province could only be followed up and consolidated properly by the construction of strategic roads to link the military bases of the Adriatic hinterland with the major centres of Siscia and Sirmium in the Save valley. The construction of these routes must have commenced soon after the end of the war, since the two large tablets set up at Salonae to record their completion are dated to A.D. 16/17 and 19/20. We do not know when P. Cornelius Dolabella arrived in Dalmatia but even if he was not responsible for initiating the programme it was largely under his administration that the work was carried through to completion, a work that was to have such enormous importance for the development of the interior during the following centuries and which, as Mediaeval trade routes to the East, ~~were~~ was to breathe life into the Adriatic cities of Spalato and Ragusa (Dubrovnik) (16). The main

responsibility for carrying through this formidable task of civil engineering must have fallen upon the surveyors and technicians of the two legions; theirs was the duty of exploring the mountain passes and designing bridges and marshland causeways to cross the poljes, no doubt assisted by large forces of local labour and prisoners from the recent wars. All the five routes commenced at Salonae, and their completion was commemorated on two fine inscriptions; the first is dated to A.D. 16/17 and records two routes, while the second, set up three years later, records three routes (17).

The evidence for the line of most of the five routes is discussed in the sections dealing with the topography of the different localities of cities and other centres, although the recent summary of the evidence for roads in Bosnia and Hercegovina by E. Pašalić provides a picture that is useful and most instructive, particularly in the manner in which it shows how all the subsidiary roads were based on these military highways (18). The creation of this network of routes during the first decade of peace in Dalmatia was an immense achievement, and its success from the strategic point of view is well demonstrated by the apparent absence of any major disturbance in the interior afterwards. Although obviously it was military needs that made the government expend such effort on their construction, these roads were the most positive contribution by the government to the Romanisation of the interior, since otherwise contact with the outside world would have hardly been possible.

(ii) Veteran settlement from the legionary garrison.

Two veterans of leg. XX are found settled with their families in cities of the province, one at Salonae and another at Iader; clearly retired legionaries were happy to settle in the coastal cities even during the period of the A.D. 6-9 emergency (19).

Leg. VII was stationed at Gardun-Vojnić, a flat-topped hill near Trilj at the important crossing of the river Cetina in the southeastern extremity of Sinjskopolje. This is established beyond doubt by the large number of tombstones of serving legionaries which have been found at Gardun and its vicinity. Leg. XI was stationed at Burnum (Šuplija Crkva, Kistanje), previously occupied by leg. XX. Here the situation is a level plain near to the fifty-foot deep gorge at the river Krka, a site chosen obviously with the intention of commanding the Strmica pass north of Knin, through which passed the route to Western Bosnia and Southern Croatia (20).

In A.D. 42 both legions were awarded the titles Claudia pia fidelis for their refusal to support the rebellion of L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus; the titles are invariably given on all records of the legions after A.D. 42, and we are thus provided with a valuable means of subdividing legionary tombstones into those set up before and after this date. It is possible that many of the legionaries who have C.p.f. on their tombstones had left the legion some years before A.D. 42, since any legionary would be sure to see that his regiment was recorded with its correct titles even if some of them had been acquired since he left it (21).

Two categories of veteran settlement can be distinguished among those

men whose tombstones were set up before A.D. 42, those who were settled collectively, possibly with some government assistance, in the region of their station, and those who went to the cities on the coast, preferring the life of the city to that of farming in the interior (22).

One veteran of leg. VII is known to have remained at the camp at Gardun while none of leg. XI is attested at Burnum. There was a settlement of veterans on a collective basis near Burnum, at the waterfall of Roski-Slap near Visovac on the Krka; two veterans of leg. XI are known together with a centurio veteranorum of IIII Macedonica. The nearest city to this place was Scardona (mod. Skradin) which did not become a municipium until the Flavian period- possibly after A.D. 86 when there was no legion at Burnum- until which time the territory may have belonged to the legion. Another veteran is found at Mratovo near Promona and he may belong to this group; his tombstone records that he was killed in the territory of the Varvarini, a community of Liburnia, at a point where a large rocky headland juts into the river Krka (23).

Perhaps the most interesting group of veterans who settled in Dalmatia are those of leg. VII at Humac near Ljubuški, where the river Trebižat flows in a wide fertile basin a few miles northwest of Narona. Ljubuški, or Bigeste as it was known in the Roman period, was a station for auxiliary units, where many units are attested for the Augustan period, but which was the permanent station of only the cohors I Belgarum. The nine attested legionary veterans are clearly part of a single settlement, and the following inscription from Ljubuški probably refers to them; divo Augusto et Ti. Caesari Aug. f. Aug. sacrum veterani pagi Scunast.

quibus colon. Naronit. agros dedit. (24)

Before this dedication was known O. Cuntz put forward the theory that these veterans and other soldiers of leg. VII at Ljubuški, all of whom have origines from the Eastern part of the Roman World, were peregrini recruited in the East by Antonius and his legates during the years before Actium. His chief arguments are, the similarity of some of their nomina with some of Antonius' legates, the absence of a different patronymic praenomen, suggesting first generation of citizenship and, of course, all their origines being in the part of the world once under the control of M. Antonius. The first and second points of Cuntz's theory are valid; the third is perhaps less so since the legion continued to draw recruits from the cities of the East, and many of them can hardly have been recruited until much later in the Augustan period. Most of the eastern recruits were probably enlisted over the years, and one of the eastern veterans of leg. VII was alive after A.D. 42. Even if the date suggested by Cuntz is doubtful, the veterans are certainly very early and need not be later than the Augustan period. Five out of the nine lack cognomina while some of the stipendia are exceptionally high, for instance 30 years out of a life of sixty, 29 out of 50, 27 out of 50, and 26 out of 50. Even reckoning the earliest possible recruitment as seventeen years of age many of them did not live to enjoy a long retirement. Another rather powerful argument against Cuntz is the strong likelihood that the nine veterans are in fact the veterani pagi Scunast(ici?) on the dedication given above; certainly there is no evidence whatsoever for other legionary veterans in the neighbourhood (25).

We have no evidence for how this settlement was effected although it seems that the discharged legionaries may have been settling at Ljubuški in the later years of Augustus, with or without government support, and that at some period under Tiberius their land was incorporated, and perhaps at the same time centurionated, within the territorium of the colony of Narona, no doubt a welcome augmentation of the wealthier class of citizens in the city. There is certainly no evidence to connect the pagus Scunast(icus?) settlement with the foundation of the colony which, on the contrary, may well have taken place as early as the time of Caesar (26).

We do not know how these groups of veterans fared in later years; those at Ljubuški probably soon became integrated into the citizen body of Narona, while the descendants of the leg. XI veterans near Scardona may have drifted to the coastal cities seeking higher standards of living. Certainly no Romanised communities developed on the places where they were settled. Far from spreading any new ideas of living among the surrounding Illyrians, any descendants of the veterans who remained were probably soon submerged beneath the intensely conservative Illyrian peoples who dwelt within the immediate hinterland of the provincial capital. Tombstones reveal the differences in condition between those veterans settled in the cities and those who preferred the collective settlements on or near legionary territory; the former can invariably record a large family and their household servants, but for the latter no comparable domestic background is apparent and, more often than not, it is a fellow veteran who acts as heir.

Eight veterans are known from Salonae and its environs, five from leg. VII and three from leg. XI. Some of these may have served on the officium of the provincial governor at Salonae, although only one mentions such on his tombstone, and his case is particularly interesting for the evidence it provides of the high social status of the legionary veteran. C. Appuleius Etruscus, veteran of leg. XI, was speculator at Salonae, and on his retirement was invited to join the decurionate of that city. His gravestone was set up some distance from Salonae, in the north end of Imotski polje. This is certainly too far to have been on the territorium of the colony and so close to the legion at Gardun. Perhaps his large gratuity enabled him to purchase an estate outside Salonae, while the erasure of his name on the stone, in Antiquity, Patsch believed, suggests that the new landlord may not have been very popular in the locality. Another point about Appuleius is the omission of his origo, very rare for a veteran of this period (only four of the veterans who died befor A.D. 42 fail to give an origo), suggesting that he may have been from an Italian family settled in the province - the Appuleii were a leading family in Liburnia, especially Iader (27). In addition to the other veterans of leg. XI at Salonae there is Quartus Iuventius T.f., missicius of leg. XI, discharged prematurely because of illness or injury (28). Five veterans of leg. VII are found at Salonae, four in the city itself and one at nearby Biač, where an official settlement of veterans was made under Claudius (29).

It might have been expected that the flourishing cities of Dalmatia would have attracted veterans from the legions stationed in the other

Danubian provinces. Surprisingly this is not the case, although many men from those legions settled in Dalmatia in later years after service on the officium, mostly as beneficiarii consulares in the province at large. Apart from this we may note the case of the polyonymous M. Uttedius Sallubianus C. Petilius Amandus from Iguvium, who after completing service in XIV Gemina Martia victrix, probably during the period after Trajan when it was stationed permanently at Carnuntum, settled in Salonae and became a decurion of the colony (30). The dedication by veterans of V Macedonica to L. Praecilius L.f. Clemens Iulianus, who was their primuspilus in the later years of Tiberius and under Caligula, does not indicate definitely that veterans of this legion had settled in Salonae where the dedication was set up. Clemens was an important man at Salonae, pontifex, quinquennalis designate, flamen, patron, etc., and possibly a native, and it would not be surprising for veterans living elsewhere to pay tribute to their old senior centurion in his home city (31).

The provincial capital Salonae held most attraction to legionary veterans as a place to settle; other cities such as Iader and Narona drew their quota of veterans but not in comparable numbers. At the latter place L. Riccius L.f. from Pessinus in Asia Minor is attested with his wife and children on his tombstone set up by his nephew L. Atilius L.f. Vel(ina), also a veteran and, as his tribe indicates, a native of Pessinus. Riccius must have been recruited quite early under Augustus and was probably one of the veterans originally settled at Ljubuški who had moved down to Narona, as may also be the case with M. Heredius M.f. Pal(atina) (32).

At Iader two veterans of the period before A.D. 42 are known, one of leg. VII and one of leg. XI. The latter C. Trebius C.f. Firmus was probably the founder of the Trebii in Liburnia who rose to Equestrian status and were related to the senatorial Raecii (33). The other veteran in Liburnia settled at Asseria (34).

We do not know for how long leg. VII remained in Dalmatia after AD. 42. Most of the serving legionaries known after this date appear to be on detached duty away from their legionary base, especially at Salonae where we have a centurion, an imaginifer and two signifers. Only two examples of serving legionaries of leg. VII after A.D. 42 are known at Gardun (35). The date of its departure for Moesia is not precisely known, but Ritterling suggests the winter of 57/58 as most likely, a time when other legionary movements are known to have taken place. It must have been away by A.D. 62 since under that year Josephus only refers to one legion in Dalmatia, which must be leg. XI (36).

Apart from Salonae the principal centre of veteran settlement after A.D. 42 was the Claudian colony of Aequum (Čitluk near Sinj, at the opposite end of Sinjsko polje from Gardun). The raising of Aequum to colonial status may not be unconnected with the removal of leg. VII C.p.f. to Moesia, since this would have made available some land which up till then had been required for the legionary station at G ardun; if Sinjsko polje was attributed to the legion then it would obviously have been given to the new colony at Aequum. Veterans of leg. VII C.p.f. are mentioned collectively on an inscription datable to the earliest years of the colony, while the tombstones of two individual veterans, both with families, are also found (37). The pre-eminence of Salonae as the choice of veterans is

even more pronounced after A.D. 42 and settlement in the neighbourhood had some official support. Pliny states that Claudius dispatched veterans to Siculi (Biač), a small place on the shore of the bay of Salonae towards Tragurium and well within the ager centurionatus of the colony (38). How this provision of what was clearly very valuable land was made is not clear, but more than likely it may have come from the confiscated estates of supporters of Camillus sought out by his successor M. Salvius Otho (39). Two veterans at Siculi, both of leg. XI C.p.f., are probably some of those settled by Claudius (40). Eleven veterans are known after A.D. 42 at Salonae, and one of them, C. Curiatius T.f. Serg. Secundus, from Augusta Troas, became scriba of Salonae after having changed his tribe from Aniensis to Sergia before dying at the age of sixty-five. None of the other known veterans had any administrative appointment either in the officium or the city (41). Two veterans of leg. XI C.p.f. remained at Burnum while an eques veteranus of leg. VII C.p.f. settled at Narona (42). Two veterans appear to have settled away from the cities, one, a veteran signifer of leg. XI C.p.f., at Vitina near Ljubuški and another, also of leg. XI C.p.f., at Novae (43).

Only one veteran of leg. IIII Flavia felix, stationed at Burnum from early in the reign of Vespasian to about A.D. 86, is found settled in Dalmatia. M. Antonius M.f. Surus is recorded with his wife and household at Salonae; his tribe is Sergia and he may well be a native of Salonae who returned home after service (44).

Veteran settlement did not contribute significantly to the foundation of any community in Dalmatia; even at Aequum, where veterans are known to

have settled, a civil conventus of Roman citizens was already in existence from which the colony's leading magistrates were drawn. At Burnum no community appears to have survived the departure of the legion, while the collective settlement of leg. VII veterans at Ljubuški appears to have been rapidly incorporated into Narona. It is not surprising that these veterans preferred the coastal cities to the vicinity of their stations. Salona, Narona and Iader were Mediterranean cities with a Mediterranean pattern of life, while the interior, even that part close to the coast, with its barren hills and harsh climate has never at any period been able to support anything more than the most primitive peasant society.

Chapter VII: Notes.

1. Tac. ann. iv 5.

2. Ritterling, article in RE xii legio, 1362; Syme, 'Some notes on the legions under Augustus', JRS xxiii (1933) 14-33. Inscription from Narona, III 8438; for text see below p. 199.

3. Leg. XX at Burnum, III 2836, cf. V 4365 Verona for a soldier of this formation decorated by Tiberius, presumably in the war of A.D. 6-9.

4. Leg. VII Macedonica, III 7386 Thracian Chersonese, cf. X 4723, 8241.

5. O. Cuntz, 'Die legionare des Antonius und Octavian etc.' Ojh xxv (1929) 70-81. The veterans which he discusses are referred to below p. 189 note 25. Ritterling keeps it in Macedonia until A.D. 6, cf. legio, 1616.

6. Veteranus missicius at Poetovio, AE 1920 63. cf. Ritterling, legio, 1691 and Syme, op. cit., 30, note 115

7. Speculator of leg. XI near Imotski, III p. 2328/121 add. III 1914, for text see below ~~ch.~~ note 27 p. 190. cornicularius, III 8738.

8. Bf. cos. leg. XI Cl.p.f; III 14703 near Salonae (Klis), III 14638 Novae, III 14219/4 Skelani, III 14959 Mun. Magnum; with Cl. or Clau; III 8287, 9790 Salonae, III 13231 Gradina near Glamoč.

9. Exactus cos; at Andetrium AE 1940 177.

10. The bronze fragment referring to Promona, III 14969/2, was first known in Vienna but was presumably found in that part of Dalmatia.

11. For instance the two senior centurions of leg. XI, A. Resius Maximus and Q. Aebutius Liberalis; see note 12 below.

12. P. Cornelius Dolabella (A.D. 14-20)

(i) III 9973 - OJh xii (1909) Bb. 32 with improved reading from Corinium, between the Corinienses and Nedites by S. Titius Geminus princeps posterior leg. VII. This is recorded on a settlement by the Neronian legate A. Ducenius Geminus. cf. no. (viii) below. Two other fragmentary settlements are known for the same legate but neither the names of the communities nor the Commissioners are preserved; OJh xii (1909) Bb. 32, Popović near Corinium; Betz 34 no.11 (otherwise unpublished) findspot not stated. L. Volusius Saturninus (A.D. 29-40, cf. Syme, Gnomon, 31 511 on the date)

(ii) III 2882 Corinium, between Neditae [et Corinienses] A.D. 37-40, by [....]nus Laco (centurio) leg. VII iudex datus.

(iii) III 8472 Neraste (Jesenice), Onastini et Nerastini, A.D. 37-40, L. Trebius Secundus praefectus castrorum terminos posit. This formula implies that those communities which did not possess city status had their boundaries fixed summarily, whereas cities such as those in Liburnia were entitled to a iudex who would act in the capacity of a mediator only.

(iv) III 12794 Pituntium (Podstrana), Ner[asti]ni et Pituntini, a restoration or revision of an early settlement by the Claudian legate L. Calpurnius Piso, cf. Jagenteufel, fasti, 28ff., A.D. 43ff.

(v) III 9832 Razvadje between Promona and Burnum, communities unknown but iudices; ... Vib]ullius t[rib? le]g. VII, L. Sa[lvius?], M. Sueto ce[nt]uriones leg. X[I].

L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus, A.D. 40-42.

(vi) III 9864a Vaganj southwest of Jajce in the Vrbas valley between the Sapuates et [La?]matini with one iudex, M' Coelius centurion leg. VII. L. Calpurnius Piso, A.D. 43ff., cf. Jagenteufel, fasti, 28ff.

(vii) III 12974 Pituntium (Podstrana) ..i]nter Ne[rasti]ni et Pituntini, by C. Marius Maternus (centurio) leg. VII C.p.f.

A. Ducenius Geminus, A.D. 63-7.

(viii) III 9973 Corinium, between Nedites and Corinienses, A. Resius Maximus princeps posterior leg. XI C.p.f. Q. Aebutius Liberalis hastatus posterior coh. I leg. XI C.p.f.

(ix) III 15045/2 - III 2883 Corinium, as (viii) above.

(x) OJh. xii (1909) Bb. 30, Cvijina gradina near Asseria, inter Ans[ienses? et Co]riniens.

(xi) OJh viii (1905) Bb. 53 between Medvidje and Asseria, inter Sidrinos et Asseriates by Q. Aebutius Liberalis (centurio) leg. XI.

M. Pompeius Silvanus, 67-70.

(xii) III 9938 between Medvidje and Asseria, inter rem p. Asseriatium et rem p. Alveritarum, iudices; Ti. [Cl]audius L[....], C. Avillius Clemen[s], L. Coelius Capella, P. Raecius Libo and P. Vallerius Secundus. No military status is given for these men and it is quite possible that they were not from the legions but notables from the cities of the province; the Raecii were one of the leading families of Liburnia, see below p.464.

[.....]s. Bassus cf. Syme, Gnomon, 31 (1959), 516.

(xiii) Vjesnik lv (1953), 104 fig. 1, Šušnjar between Vrlika and

Koljane in the upper Cetina valley, inter Barizani(ates) et Lizaviates, in neg(otio) finali C. Plotius Maximus iudicare iussus [.....]a p[ra]ecepuit ut [diceret se]ntentiam [de ponendis? ter]minis.

13. Dedication by legions VII and XI at Iader, III 2908; for construction of walls by Augustus in Iader, cf. III 13624 and III 2907.

14. Dio lv 34,4.

15. IX 2564; for the text cf. below p. 438 ch. XIV, note 3.

16. Cornelius Dolabella is not attested until A.D. 14 (III 1741, Epidaurum, where he is legate of divus Augustus and Tiberius Augustus), and it is open to question whether there was another man between C. Vibius Postumus, A.D. 9ff., and Dolabella; Jagenteufel, fasti, 9ff. has L. Aelius Lamia (cos. A.D. 3) from Vell. Pat. ii 116,3 which mentions a command in Illyricum, cf. the remarks of Syme, Gnomon, 31, 511 who appears to accept Jagenteufel's suggestion.

17. The readings given below are those of Abramić, whose rearrangement of the four existing fragments supersedes all previous publications, Vjesnik, xlix (1926-7) 147ff:

(i) III 3198a (10156a) & 3200 (10158)

[Ti. Ca]esar divi Augusti f. [Aug]ustus imp. pont. max. [trib. p]otest. xiix cos II,

(a) [viam] a colonia Salonitan. [ad f]in[e]s provinciae Illyrici [.....] cuius viai millia passus sunt cl*vii munit. per vexillarios leg. VII et XI. This route is probably to be identified with that of the Antonine Itinerary route from Salonae to Servitium, via Aequum, Salvium and Leusaba. The distance of this route from Salonae to ad

fines is 154 Roman miles, and with the additional mileage to Servitium gives a total of 168 miles, that is within a mile of the distance of the above inscription. On the ground the route is probably to be identified with that via Aequum, Risanovci, Bos. Petrovac, Pecka and then down the Vrbas valley to Servitium (Bos. Gradiška). Claudian milestones (dated A.D. 47) have been discovered along this route, but with their mileage reckoned not from Salonae as might be expected but apparently from somewhere in the vicinity of Burnum (see below ch. XIII p. 380).

(b) item viam Gabinianam ab Salonis Andetrium aperuit et munit per leg. VII. The road from Salonae to Andetrium (Gornje Muč) via Dicmopolje (the ad Decimin of Ravennas iv 16). The title Gabiniana refers to the Caesarian legate A. Gabinius (cos. 58 B.C.) whose career ended in disastrous campaigns against the Delmatae around Salonae in the winter 48/47 B.C. while the Adriatic was closed to him by the Pompeian admiral M. Octavius. The absence of leg. XI may be due to the comparative shortness of the route, and thus the need for the service of only one legion, in which case leg. VII at Gardun was the obvious choice.

(ii) III 3201 (10159) & III 3198b (10156b).

[Ti. C]aesar divi Augusti f. [Au]gustus imp. pontif. max. trib. potest. XXI cos. III,

(a) viam a Salonis ad He[.....c]astel Daesitiatium per mi[llia pass]uum clvi munit.

The Daesitiatesdwelt in Central Bosnia around Sarajevo, and the route

described is almost certainly that by Trilj, Duvjanskopolje and the Lašva valley (see below ch. XIV p. 421ff).

(b) et idem viam ad Ba[.....flu]men quod dividit Hbis[.....]ibus a Salonis munit per [millia pas]suum clviii.

A route almost impossible to identify; Saria, Klio xxiii (1929) 92f, would restore Ba[thinus flu]men, the river where the Pannonians surrendered in the winter of A.D. 6/7, cf. Vell. Pat. ii 114,4, and identifies this with the river Bosna.

(c) [et idem viam .....]munit ad imum montem Ditionum Ulcirum per millia passuum a Salonis lxxviiD.

Probably the mons Ulcirus is the Rastello di Grab, the pass over the Dinara north of Knin in the Krka valley, where the Ditiones are located (cf. ch. XIV p. 413); the route on the ground is not certain but may be Salonae, Aequum, Vrlika and Knin.

18. Esad Pašalić, 'Römische Strassen in Bosnien und der Hercegowina', Archaeologia Iugoslavica iii (1959), 61-74.

19. Leg. XX (later Valeria victrix) in Dalmatia; at Burnum, III 2863, Sal. Frebranus T.f.Quir. Baculus, hastatus prior, is the main evidence for the legion at Burnum. Veterans; III 2911 Iader, C. Allius C.f. Fab. Luc. and III 2030 Salonae, T. Fuficius C.f. Pol.

20. No archaeological work has been carried out at Gardun. In June 1960, in company with Dr. B. Gabričević of the Split Museum, I examined the site and observed traces of what were undoubtedly ancient fortifications built into the outbuildings of a farm in the northwest corner of the site. The actual camp site is a flat area of good arable land behind

the modern village. From this area considerable quantities of pottery and tile are found in the course of ploughing; two intaglio gems were shown to me by a peasant who had discovered them only a few days previously. Without doubt this is one of the most rewarding sites for excavation in all Dalmatia. At Burnum, on the other hand where the front of the principia basilica is still standing, extensive though somewhat crude archaeological exploration was carried out by the Austrian authorities in the years preceding the First World War. The work was concentrated on the headquarters building where two constructional phases were identified, period I being identified with leg. XI and period II with leg. IIII Flavia felix. Tiles of both legions are common on the site; within half an hour I picked up no less than four stamped examples of leg. XI C.p.f. and two of IIII F.f. from the 'gromilje' or stones collected together over the years from the fields and piled in heaps around the edges. For the excavations at Burnum, cf. Reisch, OJh xvi (1913) Bb. 112ff. Two building inscriptions dated 51/52 have been found in the principia, cf. Strena Buliciana, 22.

21. While the legions were stationed in Dalmatia, the form of the abbreviation was C.p.f. but soon after the move to Moesia Cl. becomes almost the rule, cf. Ritterling, legio, 1628 (VII C.p.f) and 1705 (XI Cp.f.). The value of the title C.p.f. for dating before or after ~~or before~~ A.D. 42 has been called into question on the grounds that two boundary stones which are unquestionably Neronian mention a centurion of leg. XI without the proper titles, III 15045/2 cf. Ojh

viii(1905) Bb. 53 (fragmentary but mentioning Q. Aebutius Liberalis, a contemporary of A. Resius Maximus), mentions A. Resius Maximus as (centurio) leg. XI; yet the same officer is described as centurion with the appropriate legionary titles on another boundary settlement, III 9973. The inconsistency of these boundary stones, probably set up by the cities concerned, can hardly affect the validity of the evidence from the tombstones of legionaries, who would surely have been most punctilious in seeing that their funeral monuments gave the proper titles of the formation in which they served. Others have taken the contrary view, cf. Betz 32f. and Pavan, 208 note 1 with reference to III 9712, a veteran of leg. VII from Biač.

22. The evidence for veteran settlement is set out in diagrammatic form in the chart at the end of this chapter, see p. 194 below.

23. Veteran of leg. VII who remained at Gardun, III 9726 (2710), Cn. Domitius Cn.f. Vel. Pessinunte, an. xliv, stip. xxv. Collective settlement of veterans at Roski-Slap near Burnum; III 2817 [..] Appinius Pol. Faven[ti]a Quadratus, 7 veteranorum IIII Mac. ano. na xl bis (i.e. 80 yr.); III 9885 M. Fraxsanius Sex. f. Pol. domo Regio Lepido veteranus leg. XI eques annorum xliii stip. xxv.; III 2818 cf. p. 1626 T. Cillius T.f. Fab. vet. leg. XI ann. lxx stip. [x]xxiix; Veteran at Mratovo near Promona, III 6418 A. Sentius A.f. Pom. Arreti vet. leg. XI, hic est occisus in finibus Varvarinorum in agello secus Titium flumen ad petram Xlongam. The Latin name for the rocky crest which overhangs the Krka near the village of Puljane is perpetuated still today by the name 'Dugi stina', Serbo-Croatian for long rock,

cf. Evans Archaeologia, xlviii 35.

24. Veterans of leg. VII at Ljubuški: III 8487, L. Domitius L.f. A[n]n. Aquila domo Myliada, stip. xxxiii; III 8488, L. Herennius L.f. Pap. Myliade an. lx stip. xxx; Jb. A. ii (1968) 110 fig. 30, T. Varius T.f. Vel. domo Pessinunte an. l, stip. xxix; III 8493, M. Sosius M.f. Fab. Sebasto[poli]; Betz 58 (otherwise unpublished), C. Licinus C.f. domo Fab. Sinope an. l stip. xxvii; WMBH xii (1912) 132 fig. 60, M. Livius M.f. Pal. dom. Aloro an l stip. xxvi; Betz 63 (otherwise unpublished), L. Oppius L.[f.]Ser. Segninus domo Conana an. lxx; Betz 66 (otherwise unpublished), C. Valerius C.f. Dento. The dedication to Tiberius from Ljubuški by the veterans is published with a photograph by M. Abramić, Bull. Inst. Arch. Bulg. xvi (1950), Zbornik Kazarov, 235f. fig. 2 cf. AE 1950 44, now in the Split Museum.

25. O. Cuntz, 'Legionare des Antonius und Augustus aus dem Orient', Ojh xxv (1929), 70-81; in particular he points out the similarity between the following legates of Antony and the Eastern milites and veterans in leg. VII (the numbers in brackets are the numbers of the individuals in the RE articles): C. Domitius Ahenobarbus (23), cos. 32 and present on the Parthian campaign of 36 B.C.-III 2710 and III 8488 (an L. Domitius); C. Sosius (2), legate of Antony in Cilicia and Syria and in Jewish War in 38 B.C., cos. 32-III 8493; M. Titius (18), quaestor of Antony in 36, commanded troops in Asia - BD xxxvi (1913) 14; M. Herennius Picens (13), cos at the end of 34 B.C., possible procos. of Asia - III 8488 (L. Herennius); L. Arruntius (7), proscribed in 43 B.C., joined Octavian before Actium - BD xxxvii (1916) 66;

L. Varius Cotyla (5), aedile in 44 B.C. and friend of Antonius - Jb. A ii (1908) 110 (T. Varius); L. Iulius Caesar, cos. 64 and made praef. urbis by Antony in 44 B.C. - III 9736, BD xxxi (1908) 79 (but both C. Iulii). Cuntz has brilliantly shown that some connection exists between these eastern recruits and some of Antonius' legates in the years before Actium, but it is doubtful whether these men are necessarily the first generation of families enfranchised for legionary service; the occasional variation of praenomina between senator and legionary suggests that these men come from families in these Eastern cities enfranchised, possible for military service, by Antonius' legates and proconsuls. The evidence of these men does not constitute sufficient grounds for placing leg. VII in Dalmatia as early as 15 B.C.

26. On the problems connected with the dating of the colony at Narona, cf. p. 336 ch. XII).

27. Veterans at Salonae before A.D. 42: leg. VII; BD xxxvii (1914) 66, L. Arruntius domo Pasimoae ann. lv; III 2033, Q. Hortensius Q.f; BD xxvii (1904) 157, C. Pinarius Scarpus; III 2048, T. Sabinus T.f. Fab. domo Sebaste ann. lvi stip. xxxii; leg. XI; III p. 2328/121 Vrlika near Imotski, C. Appuleius Etruscus speculator vet, decurio allectus Salona; III 2017 L. Cornelius L. [f.] Mae. Pelagonia, an. xlv, stip. xxv; III 2056 C. Valerius; On the Appuleii of Liburnia see below p. XVI ch. 538ff.

28. III 8579; presumably he received the missio causaria described by Macer in Digest, xlix 16 13,3.

29. Veteran of leg. VII at Biač; L. Vegnonius L.f., [d]om. Florent[ia].

30. III 2066.

31. III 8753 (2028), L. Praec[i]l[i]o L.f. Clementi Iuliano ponti. quinquennal. desig. flamini patrono coloniae primipilari leg. Macedicae praefecto castrorum leg. eiusdem veterani qui militaver. sub P. Me[mmi]o Regulo legato August. et missi sunt Q. [L] ut[a]tio Lusio Saturnino M. Seio Verano cos. curam gerentib. Ti. Claudio Celso T[.....]; no veterans of this formation known at Salonae are obviously as early as this, III 2577 and BD xxix (1906) 12. On Praecilius Clemens see below ch. XV p. 489.

32. Veterans at Narona before A.D. 42; III 1818 L. Riccius L.f. Vel. Pessinunte, with his nephew L. Atilius L.f. Vel., presumably from Pessinus also; III 1813 M. Heredius M.f. Pal.

33. Veterans at Iader before A.D. 42; III 2913 Sex. Atilius Sex.f. Pap. domo Ticino; III 2918 C. Trebius C.[f.] Firmus stip. xxv annor. lxxx, of leg. XI. The Trebii, in later years of Equestrian status, are discussed below p. XVI ch. 537f.

34. Veteran of Asseria before A.D. 42: Q. Magius C.f. Publ. domo Verona vet. leg. VII ann. l, stip. xxv. III 9939.

35. Serving legionaries of leg. VII C.p.f. at Gardun; III 13976 (cf. Betz, 7 note 13), III 2715; before or after A.D. 42, III 2713 also possibly leg. VII III 14933. Serving legionaries of VII C.p.f. at Salonae; Vjesnik 1 (1928-9) 13, centurio; III 8735 imaginifer; III 2040 signifer; BD xxxvii (1914) 77 signifer with freedman who was IIIIIIvir Aug; BD xxvi (1903) 193; III 8760.

36. The departure of IIII Scythica from Moesia for the East in the winter

56/7 was considered by Ritterling the most likely occasion for the transfer of VII C.p.f. from Dalmatia, cf. legio, 1619; one legion in Dalmatia in A.D. 62, Jos. bell. Iud. ii 16,4.

37. Veterans of leg. VII C.p.f. acting collectively at Aequum, III 2733. The text is given and discussed below in connection with the colony of Aequum, ch. XII p. 348ff. Individual veterans of VII C.p.f. at Aequum; III 9761 M. Varenus M.f. Vol. Valens; III 14946 C. Octavius C.f. Fabia Vita[i]s domo Brixia.

38. Plin. NH iii 141, Siculi, in quem locum divus Claudius veteranos misit; Ptol. ii 16,3, Σικοῦν , here Λ| has been corrupted in the MSS to Ν ; cf. Rav. v 14 and Guido 115 (ed. Pinder and Parthey), Siclis; Plin. NH iii 143, Siculotae, cf. Ptol. ii 16,5; Peutinger, Tragurium v.m.p. Siclis viii m.p. Salona. For the ager centurionatus of Salonae, cf. below ch. XII p. 326ff.

39. Suet., Otho i 2,3.

40. Veterans at Siculi (Biač); III 9709 T. Octavius T.f. Vel. Hister vet. leg. XI Cp.f; III 9710 L. Pescennius L.f. Fal. Saturninus vet. leg. XI C.p.f.

41. Veterans at Salonae after A.D. 42: leg. VII C.p.f; III 8732, ... stip. xxx; III 2014, L. Caesius L.f. Cam.Bassus domo Pisuari, an. liii stip. xxxiii; III 2019, C. Curiatius T.f. Serg. Secundus dom. Augusta Troade vet. leg. VII C.p.f. scriba Salonis; III 14244/1, T. Curtiacus T.f. Lem. Bon; III 2022, L. Fabius L.f. Saturninus; III 2041, C. Lucr.tius domo Verona; Rech. Salon. i (1928) 158, ...; III 8764, C. Vatinius Sex. f. Capito dom. Arreti; III 9711, Tragurium, [.....?]: leg. XI C.p.f.

Vjesnik xlvii-xlviii (1924-5) 40, L. Barbius [L.]f; III 8758 L. Tettenius L.f. S[t]e. Pansa; BD xxxvii (1914) 34 Iulius Luc[i]lius veter[a]nus leg. XI [C.p.f... 42.

42. Two veterans of XI C.p.f. at Burnum: III 2839 Q. Valerius Q.f. Ani. Niger domo Foro Iu[l]i an. xlv stip. xxiiii; III 15004/1 L. Val. Maximus Proclus ann. lxxx: Eques veteranus at Narona; III 1814 P. Lastus A.f. Scaeva domo Florentia ann. lx stip. xxx.

43. Veterans after A.D. 42 settled away from cities: Glasnik xxxv (1923) 83, Vitina near Ljubuški, M. Antonius Maximus signif. veter. XI C.p.f. an l Florentia.

44. Leg. IIII Flavia felix in Dalmatia: probably a new creation of Vespasian, as Dio lv 24,3 states, but see E. Birley, JRS xviii (1928) 56ff., 'A note on the title Gemina', suggesting a link with the cashiered IIII Macedonica. The formation began its career as the replacement of XI C.p.f. at Burnum, cf. Ritterling, legio, 1540-1. Its station was Burnum, III 14995, P. Carsidius P.f. Gal. Calvus, the aquilifer from Lugdunum; the veteran at Salonae, III 2004, M. Antonius M.f. Ser. Surus.

Legion	Remained at camp.	collective settlement (deductio)	Salonae	Narona	Iader inc. Liburnia	elsewhere in D.
Leg.XX to A.D.9			III 2030		III 2911	
Leg. VII to A.D. 42	III 9726 (Gardun)	Ljubuški. III 8487 (2) III 8488 Jb A ii (1908) 110 III 8493 Betz 58 WMBH xii 132 Betz 63 Betz 66	BD 37 66 III 2033 BD 27 157 III 2048 III 9712 (Biač)	III 1813 III 1818	III 2913 III 9939 (Asseria)	
Leg. XI to 42.		Roski-Slap III 2818 III 9885 III 2817 (7 IV Mac) III 6418 (Promona)	III 2328/121 (Imotski) III 2017 III 2056 III 8597 (Missicius)	III 2918		

Legion	Remained at camp.	collective settlement (deductio)	Salonae	Narona	Iader inc. Liburnia.	elsewhere in D.
Leg. VII C.p.f. to app. 57/58			III 8732 III 2014 III 2019 III 14244/1 III 2022 III 2041 RS i 158 III 8764 III 9711 (Tragurium)	III 1814		Aequum (cf.III 2733) III 9761 III 14946
Leg. XI C.p.f. to 69	III 2839 III 15004/1 (Burnum)		(Biač) III 9709 III 9710 (Salonae) BD 47-48 40 III 8758 BD 37 34.			Gl. 35 83 (Vitina) III 8597 (Imotski)
Leg. IIII F.f. 70-86			III 2004			

Chapter VIII: The Auxilia in Dalmatia

I Units of the auxilia forming part of the army of Dalmatia, probably withdrawn by the middle of the first century.

(i) Ala Claudia Nova Miscellanea.

(a) III 2065 Salonae; Virdomarus Thartontis f. domo Biturix missicius alae Claudiae Novae t.f.i. et Pamae sorori. The Bituriges dwelt in the Loire Valley. He had clearly settled in Salonae and was joined by his sister.

(b) III 2712, cf. p. 2328/154, 2350, Gardun, M ELVADNS MACRINI F. eq. alae Claudiae novae dom. Cugernus ann. xxx stipen. xii t.f.l. Ti. Claudius Aurelius her. pos. There is some doubt concerning the form of the name Melvadius Macrini f., i.e. a peregrinus is surely preferable to M. Elvadius as is read in CIL ad. loc, Far ~~Melvadius~~ Melvas in Britain cf. Holder ii, 542. This was pointed out to me by E. Birley.

(c) III 9816 Kadina Glavica; Surus Sparuci f. dom. Tribocus eques alae Claudiae novae ann. xxx stip. xiii h.s.e. t.f.i. arbitratu Celati sesquiplicari heredis. The Triboci were a German people, probably in the area of Strasburg.

(d) III 9796 Balijina Glavica; Vercaius Me[n?]di f. eques ala nova Claudia [t. L]ici[n]i (?) domo Varcianus anno[r...] stupendior. xx h.s.e. posuit Maximus Regini f. The Varciani were a Pannonian people dwelling on the Save in the region east of Siscia. (cf. H. v. Petrikovits, Die Varciani, Vjesnik lvi-lix/2 (1954-7).

(e) III 9797 Balijina Glavica; de]c. ala[e Claudiae no]vae ...

(f) BD xxxviii (1915) 154 Sinj; Ti. Claudius Priscus vet. Alae Claud. nov.

arbitratu Sexti Viniusi.

(g) Vjesnik lvi-lii/2 83 fig. 1 Balijina Glavica; ...eque]s alae [novae Cl]a. dupli[car. a]nnor. xl [stip.] xxii h.s.est [Ti. C]laud. Sabi[nin]us decurio [her]es posit t.f.i.

(h) III 10033 Golubić near Bihać; I.O.M. T. Flavius Sabinus decur. ter.(?) ala. Claud. v.s.l.m.

The unit was a Claudian formation, as its title demonstrates. It appears on a diploma of 74 (XVI 20) in the army of Upper Germany whence it had moved to Upper Moesia by 82 (XVI 28). The unit was raised in Gaul and three of the men here attested (a,b and c) may well belong to the original levy. The recruitment of Varciani (attested in another auxiliary unit of the province-see coh. III Alpinorum) is interesting and suggests that it may have been government policy to avoid local recruitment in the province so soon after the pacification of the Delmatae. On the other hand we find at Mainz (A.D. 74-82) a civis Raetinius (Golubić), suggesting that the Iapudes, at any rate, were regarded as suitable material for what was obviously a first-class unit. The decurio at Raetinium (h) may have been a successful recruit who returned home after service. (Kraft, Rekrutierung, 144-5.)

(ii) Ala () Pannoniorum.

(a) III 2016 Salonae; Cloutius Clutami f. duplicarius alae Pannonior. Sussaru.(?) domo Curunniace an. xxxv stipend. xi [h.] s. est posit Ca[....heres].

Inscriptions attest a unit of this title in garrison in Pannonia, probably by the middle of the first century (III 4228, 4227, cf. p. 2280,

4732, 4376, 4377). Both of the names are clearly Spanish (Holder, i 1047, 1050) while the origo may be Curunda, a city somewhere in North-western Spain (Holder 1205-6). Whilst in Pannonia (it may have left for Moesia about the end of the first century), it drew ona a variety of area for its recruits; Germans, Spaniards and Illyrians are found. Some of the Illyrians may have been recruited while it was in Dalmatia, for instance the two Colapiani (west of Siscia), a Breucus and a Lirus Plassari f., probably from the borders of Pannonia and Dalmatia. (Kraft, Rekrutierung, 155-6)

(iii) Ala (Tungrorum) Frontoniana.

(a) III 9735 Gardun; [Eu?]genio Eucisi f. eq. ala. Frontoni. an. xl stip. xx Nemis Sige h.s.e. frateres frater (sic) fecerunt.

The unit was on the Lower Rhine until about A.D. 70 and recruited from peoples of that region (Ber. RGK xxvii 242; Asciburgium; XIII 8558 Novaesium) as was also the man at Gardun. The unit's stay in Dalmatia must have been quite brief since it appears on Pannonian diplomas from 80 onwards (XVI 26 etc.). (Kraft, Rekrutierung, 162-4).

(iv) Cohors () Aquitanorum.

(a) III 9760 Ervace near Aequum; Burrius Betuloni f. Trebocus miles cho. Aquitanorum annorum lv stip. xxix h.s.e. heres posuit.

(b) III 2053; Tarcho Tarbunis f. mil. coh. Aqu. ann. xlv stip. xxv dom. Camul. Tarpolje [..... (Spalato).

Four cohorts of Aquitani are attested in the army of Upper Germany at various times during the first century. As Cichorius concluded, it seems that one of them spent a period in Dalmatia, probably during the first

part of the first century. (Cichorius RE iv 244, and on the cohorts in Germany, Kraft, Rekrutierung, 166-7)

(v) Cohors () Asturum.

(a) III 14705 Salonae: ....]AUGITIE LAN[.....]ASTUR[..... doubtful but see section on recruitment, below p.236 ch. IX.

(vi) Cohors I Bracaraugustanorum.

(a) AE 1907 249 Bigeste (Humac); Meduttus Caturonis f. miles coh. I Bracaraugustanor. ann. xxx s[tip ....

(b) Patsch, Narona, 75 fig. 38. Bigeste (Humac); ....]SCA[...] miles c[oh. I] Bracau[gustano]rum an[.....] h.s.[e.] Cambi[....]h.p.[....

(c) cf. also III 1773 Narona; Dianae Nemores sacrum Ti. Claudius Claudianus praef. coh. I Bracar August. ex voto suscep. de suo.

The unit appears on a Moesian diploma of A.D. 99 (XVI 44), while it probably began in the army of Dalmatia under Augustus. (a) is a Spaniard (Holder i 861; ii 529). (Kraft, Rekrutierung, 170).

(Later the unit, or another of the same name and number may have been stationed in Britain at Ebchester, Jarrett, AA4 xxxviii 197-9.)

(vii) Cohors I Flavia Brittonum.

(a) III 2024 Salonae; d.m. Fideli Saturonis mil. coh. I fl. Brittonum stip. xviii.

This is the earliest reference to this unit and with the formula d(is) m(anibus) can hardly be earlier than the end of the first century. Early in the second century it had moved to Noricum (III 5668 Melk). (Kraft, Rekrutierung, 172).

(vii) Cohors I Campana.

(a) III 8693 Salonae; P. Cloelius miles cho. Campanae custos Traguri v.s.l.m.

(b) III 14246/1 Salonae; Q. Vettiu[s] Hospes mil. cohortis Camp.domo Suessa annorum xlv stipendioum (sic) xxii testamen[t.] iussit fieri.

(c) III 14623/3 Narona; ..] C. Iulius C[.f.] Cerialis [...coh.] Campan[ae] Castori et [Polluci] v.s. [l.m.]

(d) III 8438 Narona; ....]o Arimin. mil. Leg. XIII donat. torq. armil. phal. et 7 coh. I Camp. an. lx t.f.i. Posidonius et Prunicus lib. posuer. et ali ne. h.s.e.

This is an example of a regular citizen volunteer unit actually enrolled in Campania, as the man (b) from Suessa shows. The unit was probably in Dalmatia immediately after its creation, perhaps in the Augustan period, and was at some time moved on to Pannonia, probably not long after the middle of the first century (VI 3520 coh. primae voluntariae Campanorum in Pannonia inferior). Its duties were clearly not confined to the usual military tasks; the custos Traguri (a) was probably harbourmaster or market superintendent.

(ix) Cohors II Cyrrhestarum.

(a) AE 1925 132 Burnum; Dacnas Apsaci f. mil [c]oh. Cyrrhestaru. domo Berea ann. 1 stip. xxiv h.s.e. (Strena Buliciana 217 n.12.)

(b) III 14934 Gardun; M. Pytha Segni f. mil. chor. II Chyrres. dom. Berea an.lx stip. xxxv t.f.i. sibi Felici l.

(c) Betz, Vjesnik lvi-lix/2 (1954-7) 84-5 and plate IX 1, Iader; Stiev Barnainu f. domo Berea annor. xxx miles coh. II Crestar. stipen[di]o[rum .. h.se

Cyrrhestica was an area of Northern Syria named after the city of Cyrrhus; in this region was situated Berea, the home of the three milites. The unit is nowhere else recorded and as all the above inscriptions are probably dateable to the first half of the first century, the unit can be accounted as one of the Dalmatian army under Augustus and Tiberius which may have been disbanded when the emergency was past. I disagree with Cheesman's suggestion that this unit is to be connected with Cyrrhus in Macedonia (Auxilia 179 note 4), on the grounds that that place is much nearer to its station than Syria.

(x) Cohors XI Gallorum.

(a) III 8439 near Narona; M. VL d. cho. XI Gall. domo Patavi. ann. xlvi stip. xv.

A unit not known of elsewhere. ~~His late date of joining and~~ His Italian origo possibly points to the Augustan emergency, suggested also by his joining at the age of 31. As in the case of the previous unit it may have been disbanded soon afterwards.

(xi) Cohors I Lucensium equitata.

(a) III 8486 Bigeste (Humac); Andamionius Andami f. eq. coh. I Lucens. ann. xxxv st. xv h.s.e. Bav[i]lius f[rat]er [eiu]s posit.

(b) III 8492 Bigeste (Humac); Rufus Angeti f. mil. coh. I Luce. annorum xxx stipen. xi h.s.e. h.p.

(c) III 8494 cf. p.2322 near Bigeste; ..]i Eq. coh. I [.....]ur. Valeri[.. ..]Delm. an[n...stip]xxv.. The attribution to I Lucensium is doubtful.

(d) III 9834 Promona; Flavos Bouti f. mil. coh. I Luce. ann. xxxi stip. x. dom. Luco Aug. h.f.c. h.s.e.

(e) III 8736 Salonae; [...]Calp[urnio ..f.] Tro. Ma[...pr]aef[e]cto [coh.] [I] L[u]cen[sium etc.

A unit raised from the area of Lucus Augusti in Northern Spain, and the three Spaniards attested (a,b and d) may have been in the original levy. A cohort of Lucenses appears on the Pannonian diploma of A.D. 80 (XVI 26), but on the intus the numeral of the unit is II while on the extrinsecus the numeral is I. Since a coh. II Lucensium is attested in Moesia for about this period, we can perhaps connect this unit with the one attested earlier in Dalmatia. On the inscription from Bullis in Macedonia recording units of a vexillatio, probably drawn from the Eastern provinces, there appears a coh. I Lucensium equitata (the inscription probably dates to about the end of Trajan, III 600 cf. Cheesman, Auxilia, 160 note 5.) The eques from Bigeste (a) shows that the unit in Dalmatia was equitata but there is no mention of such a title on the Pannonian diploma; this latter point may be of little significance since it was not unusual for descriptive and honorific titles to be omitted from diplomas when there was no possibility of confusion. (For a Spaniard, probably Augustan, at Burnum cf. Kubitschek, Strena Buliciana, 216 n 7; Imerix Bdi f. equ. Hisp.)

(xii) Cohors I Montanorum.

(a) III 15003 Burnum; Remmo Saeconis f. mil. coh. [.] Mont. ann[.....

The above individual is almost certainly a Montanus, and probably dates to the first century. By A.D. 80 it was in Pannonia and we have two diplomas (XVI 26, 30) issued to individuals in the unit. One, discharged in 80, is a Bessus from Thrace while the other, discharged in 84, is Dasius Dasentis f. Dalmata. The Thracian presumably joined around A.D. 55

while the Dalmatian probably about 59. Perhaps the unit spent a period in the first century on the Lower Danube and was then transferred to Dalmatia for a short spell until its movement to Pannonia shortly before A.D. 80. However the miles from Burnum is surely evidence for the unit having been in Dalmatia in its earliest years - perhaps under Augustus. (Kraft, Rekrutierung, 44 & 181, who appears to assume that they were both recruited while the ~~legion~~ unit was in Moesia).

(xiii) Ala Partharum.

III 8746 Salonae; C. Jul. Thiridates f. dec. ala Partho. an. xxvi dom. Roma h.s.e. Sex. Coelius [...]; presumably a Parthian refugee.

II. Units of the auxilia who are attested in the province in the first century and who remained to form the permanent garrison of Dalmatia.

A. Soldiers originating from where the unit was raised and outside Dalmatia generally:

(i) Cohors III Alpinae or Alpinorum equitata.

(a) III 8495 cf. p.2322 and 2328/121 Bigeste (Humac); Vanaius Venic[..]t. fi. domo Bodion[t.] eq. coh. III Alp. an. liiii stip. xxv h.s.e. Valeria et Marcella p.

(b) III 14321/5 (9907) Burnum; Verus Ve[r]caei[.] do[mo] Bodiontius mil. coh. II[I] Alp. A(?) an[nor..] stip[end..

The Bodiontici were an alpine people and appear on the triumphal inscription set up to record the victory of Drusus the Elder over the Alpine tribes in 17 B.C. at La Turbie. (The text is given by Pliny NH iii 136-7, Brodionti. For the remains of the arch and fragments of the

inscription cf. V 7816.)

(c) III 8491 (6366) Bigeste (Kutac near Humac); Primus Titi f. tubicen. do. Caturix mil. coh. III Alp. an xliix stip. xxiii h.s.e. t.f.i. L. optio et Tullius veter. h.p.

The Caturiges are another Alpine people who appear on the La Turbié monument (Plin. NH iii 137, and for a full discussion Holder, i 859-60).

(d) Ojh xxxvi (1946) Bb. 67 no.1 (AE 1950 109) Bigeste (Humac); Betulo Carnis f. domo Eguius mil. coh. III Alp. an. xl stip. xxi h.s.e. t.f.i. Valerius sig. h.p.

The Egui are also on the La Turbié monument. see (a) above.

(e) Ojh xxxvi (1946) Bb. 68 no.2 (AE 1950 110) Bigeste (Humac); ..... equ. cho. III Alpine domo Vercianus an. xxxviii stip. xiii t.f.i. h.p. h.s.e.

Although not an alpine people the Varciani may be included in the group of early recruits. Another eques Varcianus is found in the ala Claudia nova (q.v.)

(f) JhbA ii (1908) 113 n. 5 fig. 33 Bigeste (Hardomilje); ..Caenio Q.f. [e]q. coh. [II]I Alpinoru[m d]omo [V]e[l]au[no] ann.[...] st[ip ...]xx[...

Velauni appear on the La Turbíe monument (cf. (a) above). Compare the domo Velaun[us] at Lugio in Pannonia inferior, probably a miles of coh. I or II Alpinorum both of which were in Pannonia in the first century (cf. Kraft, Rekrutierung, 165-6).

(g) III 14632 (Patsch, Narona, 72 n. 5 fig. 36) Bigeste (Hardomilje); Ti. Claudius Ligomarus Carstimari f. Claudia Salinis eq. coh. III Alpinae ann. lvii stipend. xxx [t.f.i.] her. p.

Salinae was the chief town of the Suetri who dwelt in Narbonese Gaul east of the Rhone (Ptol. iii 1,42). The title Claudia must date the inscription to the Claudius-Nero period, and Ligomarus can hardly have joined the unit before A.D.23.

(h & i) JhbA ii (1908) n.6 fig. 34; [domo El]ococi [.....

" " " 114 n. 7 fig. 35; Brigantilone. Both from Bigeste. Two fragments of military tombstones, probably of men of III Alpinorum. The restorations are those of Patsch, citing Elukokoi of Narbonensis (Ptol. ii 10 8) and Brigantio in the Cottian Alps (Holder i 537-8). Betz (Ojh xxxvi (1946) Bb. 71 note 11.) regards them as doubtful.

The pacifications of the Alps ~~undertaken~~ clearly opened up a valuable source of recruits for the Roman government. The three cohortes Alpinorum were all employed in Illyricum, and on the division of the province in A.D.9 two (I & II) remained in Pannonia, while the third became one of the units in permanent garrison of Dalmatia. As (g) shows, men continued to be recruited from the homeland of the unit well into the reign of Tiberius, although once the interior of Dalmatia was pacified this must have become the exception rather than the rule. Some recruits were drawn from areas nearer to Dalmatia; at Gardun we have a possible recruit from Noricum:

(j) III 14935 Gardun; ..]lio[....]bucin[atori c]oh. III Alp[inor. p]rovinciae [dom]o [N]oricus (?) [an. xxx]v stip. xv [.....s]ig. (centurio) Iuliani h[er.f.c.] As Hirschfeld noted, however, the restoration is doubtful There is no doubt about the following, ~~which is~~ probably to be dated not later than the end of the first century:

(k) III 2746 Andetrium (Muč); M. Valerio Donico natus domo Celeiae 7 chor.

III Alpinorum fecit Herennia Pudentilla coniugi bene merenti. The small amount of abbreviation suggests an early date. The cognomen is Celtic (Holder i 1304).

(ii) Cohors I Belgarum equitata.

In complete contrast with III Alpinorum, there are virtually no traces of original recruits to this unit from the peoples of Gaul, a strange situation in view of the fact that there is no evidence for the unit having been stationed anywhere else but in Dalmatia. The only peregrini known in the unit are all from Dalmatia. One individual attested in the unit may be a recruit from elsewhere;

(a) III 14980 Burnum; Herculi Sa[..] Claudius Peregrin[s] dec. coh. I Belgarum v.s.l.m.

(iii) Cohors VIII Voluntariorum civium Romanorum.

During the emergency of the Pannonian War and the period after the disaster of Varus, levies were held of free-born Roman citizens to serve as in units of the auxilia. The provision of a donative equal to that of the legionaries in the will of Augustus for these cohortes civium Romanorum (Tac. Ann. i 8) indicates that they enjoyed a status practically equal to the legions. In the same manner their commanders were styled tribuni in the manner of the legions rather than praefecti as was normal with auxilia. As the history of the cohort VIII in Dalmatia shows, onee the emergency had passed they accepted peregrini as recruits in the normal manner and were distinguished from other auxilia only by their titles. (XVI 38 A.D. 93 from Salona) (On the raising of these units: Dio lv 31; lvi 23; Velleius ii 111; Suet. Aug. 25.)

In the first century three recruits from outside Dalmatia are attested for this unit:

(a) III 9782 Andetrium (Muč); Ser. Ennius Ser. f. Claudia Fuscus domo Cemeneli miles coh. VIII Vol. stip. xviiii ann. xxxiix Fulvia Vitalis v.f. sibi et coniugi b.m.f. h.m.h.n.s. From Cemenelum in Liguria. Possible enrolled at the time of the emergency. The other two in this category are from Noricum and are both Claudian or later;

(b) III 2745 Andetrium (Muč); L. Teren[t]io L.f. Claud. Severo Cel. mil. coh. VIII vexil[l]iar. ann. xxx stipend. xiv L. Ae[b]utius Felix posui[t]. The tribe Claudia at Celeia (mod. Celje) was due to Claudius.

(c) III 13975 Gardun; P. Attecius P.f. Venimarus mil. coh. VIII 7 Atili domo Clau. Viruno ano. xxi stip. ii M. Ressius Brigomarus h. ex t. p.c. Obviously a pair of first generation Norican citizens; probably Claudian.

At this point it might be as well to summarize briefly the strength, composition and recruitment of the auxiliary units stationed in Dalmatia during the first century A.D., at the end of which a garrison of three units became permanent. Units are referred to by the numbers which they hold in the above list and individuals by the alphabetical list of their particular unit.

On the evidence as discussed above, no less than twelve auxiliary units are known to have been stationed in that part of Illyricum which later became the province of Dalmatia at the end of the War of A.D. 6-9: one cavalry unit (ii) and seven infantry units (iv, vi, viii, ix, x, xi, xii) + the three units which later formed the permanent garrison. Two of these (ix and x) are not heard of afterwards and were in all probability

disbanded when the emergency was passed. As for the rest, it is extremely difficult on the present evidence to determine the exact movements of individual units away from Dalmatia, but it is clear that, for a time, while some were withdrawn other fresh units were still being introduced (i, iii, vii). During the last quarter of the first century the gradual running-down process becomes more pronounced, particularly with the increasing need for troops on the Danubian Frontier; to Pannonia (ii [about middle of first century], iii [in Germany until 70, then Dalmatia and Pannonia by 80], vii, xi(?), xii); to Moesia (vi), Noricum (vii) and Germany (i, iv). Recruitment for the period in Dalmatia is dealt with under the heading of individual units, but it is noteworthy that whereas some units display a wealth of evidence for their original recruiting sources (i, vi, ix and III Alpinorum), other units, for instance I Belgarum, provide no certain evidence whatsoever of recruitment from their original sources. Recruitment from within Dalmatia by the permanent units is dealt with in the following section. Some of the other units also provide evidence for the tendency to rely on local areas or at least areas in neighbouring provinces (i, ii, xii and III Alpinorum (e, j)).

III The permanent auxiliary garrison of Dalmatia.

The three units which formed the permanent auxiliary garrison of Dalmatia (Cohortes III Alpinorum, I Belgarum and VII Voluntariorum C.R.) were all stationed in Dalmatia from the creation of the province in A.D.9. The majority of the inscriptions referring to these units come from Salonae and its environs, although a sufficient quantity of evidence has been discovered to prove that detachments were stationed at the two old legionary depots at Burnum and Gardun as well as the major auxiliary sites of Bigeste and Andetrium.

With the withdrawal of the legions from Dalmatia before the end of the first century it would be natural for the legate of the province to recruit the more intelligent auxiliaries for some of the posts in his officium, although for some appointments (beneficiarii consulares in the province) legionaries were considered essential and had to be recruited from the armies of Pannonia and Moesia. Four individuals are known in the officium from auxiliary units, and of these three are from VIII Voluntariorum. This suggests that as an original citizen cohort recruited in Italy the unit held a status above that of the other two and attracted a far higher standard of recruit. At Salonae two men of the unit served as assistants (adiutores) to the (AE 1904 10) cornicularius consularis (invariably legionaries of high quality). One member of the unit held a very unusual post for an auxiliary and his inscription is worth recording in full: III 12679 Doclea; I.O.M. Epone Regin. genio loci P. Bennius Egregius mil. coh. vol. adiu[t]. princ. bf. cos. v.s. As Mommsen noted (CIL ad. loc.) this is probably the only known case of an auxiliary holding such an

important appointment as clerical assistant to a senior centurion (princeps). It is not surprising to find that the Bennii were honestiores at Salonae with other members of the family holding equestrian commands (see below). From the other two units the only individual found serving the governor is a miles of I Belgarum in charge of the stables at Salonae (III 2067 ex strat(ore) cos.). Auxiliaries undertook other duties outside the normal field of a military unit; the miles of I Campana in charge of the market or habour at Tragurium has already been noted (III 8693 Salonae, cf. above I viii (a)). An interesting inscription from Brattia (Brač) records a centurion of I Belgarum as administrator of the theatre (probably that of Salonae), a most interesting appointment, especially in view of the fact that he was not a native of the province. In A.D. 173 the same unit, acting collectively under a centurion of I. Adiutrix, reconstructed the temple of Liber Pater and Libera at Narona. The date and the centurion of a Pannonian legion suggests that the unit may have been involved in something a little more important than the restoration of an old temple. Walls were being rebuilt at Salonae at this time, and one may suspect that the same thing was going on at Narona and other cities on the coast. The temple at Bigeste may have been a by-product of this activity (III 1790). The unit may have been under the command of legionary centurions for some period during the late second century. From Novae we find a centurion of I Minerva as praepositus of I Belgarum (III 1908). It seems probably that the Marcomannic crisis forced the government to improve the military efficiency of the auxiliary units in Dalmatia by replacing the fairly competent but perhaps inexperienced equestrian commanders,

mostly drawn from the upper classes of the Dalmatian cities, by more effective commanders in the form of experienced centurions from the frontier legions.

It is to be expected that when the units had become settled in the province new recruits would be drawn from convenient sources in Dalmatia. Recruitment of peregrini from the interior of Dalmatia was well under way by the middle of the first century and was continued into the second by the units that remained. In the second century and later virtually all the recruits were Roman citizens and can be connected with families living in the province. The most significant fact which seems to emerge is the close ties of these units with the coastal cities. This may have been the result of soldiers from the interior settling in the cities and concealing their origins under purely latin nomina and cognomina. The centurionate was probably composed of people from the province, although there are at least two cases where a Dalmatian origin is doubtful. Equestrian commanders of these units are dealt with in the section on honestiores generally.

(i) Recruits with Illyrian names i.e. peregrini or individuals recruited as peregrini:

(a) XVI 38 diploma of 13 July 93 from Salonae granted to Venetus Diti f. Davers(us) his wife Madena Plarentis filia Deramista and his son Gaius. Venetus was a miles of III Alpinorum. On the Daversi and Deramistae cf. Ch. XIV , p. 414f.

(b) AE 1913 138 - WMBH xii (1912) 133 Bigeste (Humac); [Das]sius

Bastarni [f. do]mo Maezaeus [Mile]s coh. I Belgarum [c. Resti]tuti sig. ann. [...]stip. xv t.f.i. cura[vit] Valerius Maxi[min]us heres. Late first century?

(b) III 14950 between Andetrium and Magnum (Postinje); I.O.M. Cassius Dasantis (f.) coh. III Alpin. tessera. ce. Nunisiani (??) v.s.l.m. Dasa or Daza is extremely common in Dalmatia, cf. Mayer, 109.

(c) III 8347 Narona; d.m. Victori Scenobarbi (f.) mil. coh. I Bel. stip. x tubic. testamento fieri iussit Munnius et Gentius heredes posuerunt. Second century. Three Dalmatian peregrini. For Munii in Dalmatia cf. III 2955 Iader, III 1779 Narona.

(d) III 9739 Gardun; [ ]emans Platoris (f). [Da]esitias vexill. [e]quit. coh. I Belgar. turma Valeri Proculi ann. xlv stipendior. xxiv h.s.e. fieri curavit Iulia Ves. coniunx. The Daesitiates dwelt in Central Bosnia (c.f. p. 414 .).

(e) III 8762 Salonae; C. Val. [C.] f. Azinas Procl[us] eques coh. I [A]lp. ve[x] equit[....coh] I Belg. dec. Equit. coh. eiusdem hunc sepulchrum vivos paravi mihi et Apuleie Sabine uxori meae lib. libertabusque h.m.h.n.s. Azina(s) was a city in Dalmatia. It is recorded on two other inscriptions ([de] vic. Azin[..] VI 2388,9; also of the second century III 8783 Sučurać near Salonae: q(uaestor) municipp. Azina. Splonistarum Ar(upinorum).) as a municipium and vicus and is probably the same place as the Assino of Ravennas (iv 19), but has not been located.

(f) AE 1913 139 Bigeste (Hardomlje); d.[m.]s. Iuliae B[...] coniugi ben[e] merent[i] que (sic) mecum annos xxii et tulit aetatis suae

annos xl Fl. Aurelianus dec. cho. I Belgarum posuit natione Pannonia. Third century.

(g) Vjesnik Liii (1952) 226 n 35 Salonae; ...]Sep[timius? Epic]adus Pir(ami. f.?) Mil. coh. III Alp. .... h.s.e.t.f.i. Plares Annaei Eq. ix Sin[.

(ii) Recruitment to the auxilia in Dalmatia during the second and third centuries.

Recruits of this category fall into two groups; those who bear imperial nomina and are obviously peregrini from the interior who received the civitas as a reward of service of through the Constitutio Antoniniana; those who bear Italian nomina common in the province and, as is shown below, almost certainly come from the chief cities.

The evidence for imperial nomina may be summarised briefly:

Aelii: Coh. VIII Vol; III 2002 Salonae.

Aurelii: Coh. III Alp; III 2748 Matkovine near Vrlika.

Coh. VIII Vol; III 8728,8729, 8777, 12902 Salonae; III 9732 13187 Gardun.

Flavii: Coh. VIII Vol; III 14930 Gardun.

Ulpii: Coh. VIII Vol; III 8522 Gardun.

Many of those with Italian names bear nomina which are so common in Dalmatia and the rest of the empire that any attempt to suggest an origo is impossible. Nevertheless if a certain more unusual nomen is found in quantity in the province then a man with that nomen serving in a local unit is almost certainly to be a local recruit.

An investigation of the half a dozen or so nomina, whose quantity does not destroy the value of any distribution pattern, attested in the auxilia of Dalmatia yields interesting results. Some can be demonstrated to be local men while others are shown in all probability to hail from elsewhere in the empire.

Of those from outside the province the most interesting is M. Ippius L.f. Stell. Benevento Vitalis, a centurion of coh. VIII Vol. attested on a dedication of A.D. 245. The nomina of others suggest that they also may be from elsewhere:

(a) Avillius: III 1810 Narona, M. Avilius Nummius 7 coh. III Alp. Virtually unknown in the province: III 12817 Pituntium is doubtful, while an Avil(ia) is the wife of a veteran of Coh. I Belgarum at Doboj, III 8376b.

(b) Silvius: III 3096 Brattia, Q. Silvius Spe(ratus) cent. coh. I Belg. curagens theat(ri). A nomen unknown in Dalmatia. III 8376 from Blažuj appears to be part of a religious dedication rather than a nomen. Silvii appears in Noricum, III 4767 Teurnia, 5407 between Solva and Bruck, and in Raetia as honestiores, III 5827 Augusta Vindelicorum.

The occurence of other nomina points to a local origin:

(c) Alasinius: BD XXX (1907) 117 3740 A Salonae, C. Alasinius Secundus miles coh. VII Vol. dupl with father also. Alasinii at Salonae, III 12930.

(d) Attius: III 13906 (8725+8735) Attius Restitutus e[q]. ex sing. c[o]h. III Alp[in.] at Salonae, cf. Attii, III 8523, Epetium,

M. Attius Cinna [....] ob honorem aug. also, III 2197, 8, 9.

(e) Baebidius: G. Baebidius Marcellus mil. coh. III Alp. III 2012 Salonae. cf. III 2244 Salonae and III 3163 (Salonae?).

(f) Bennius: III 12679 Doclea, P. Bennius Egregius mil. coh. adiut. princ. bf. cos. Almost certainly one of the Bennii of Salona, honestiores and, probably later, equestrians (III 8733). He may, on the other hand, have been an Italian settler and first of the Bennii- the inscription is probably early.

(g) Domitius: III 2003 Salonae, P. Domitius Potens veter. chor. III Alpinor. A Domitius was IIvir of Salonae in A.D. 137 (III 1933); fairly common around Salonae.

(h) Iunius: III 2759 Kadina Glavica, M. Iunius Fadenus dec. eq. coh. III Alpinor. Iunii are of freedman grade at Salonae (III 12903, 14243) and Narona (IIIIIIvir, Patsch, Narona, 92 n.7 fig.51).

(i) Pompeius: III 14968 Salonae, [.] Pompeius [Fro]ntinianus [mil. co]h. III Alp. Pompeii are found in freedman class at Salonae; III 2147, 2409, 2472, 2625, 2695 (Tragurium), 9281.

(j) Vivius (for Vibius): AE 1913 41, Salona, Vivius Silvester miles coh. VIII Vol. Freedman class at Salonae III 2610-1, 9420-1 and also 9780 Aequum.

Additional Notes (i): Legio VIII Augusta in Dalmatia.

Widely differing dates and interpretations have been placed on the undoubted evidence that all or at least part of legio VIII Augusta was at some period based in Dalmatia:

milites; Betz 228 (otherwise unpublished) Burnum, [S]ex. Valeri[u]s Sex. filius Ultinia [L]uci[n]us ? [V]iana (sic) miles le[g]. VIII Aug. 7 Terent. Iuliani vixit anis (sic) xxix miles leg. [V]III?

III 3051 Albona, Maxi[mus] miles le[g]. VIII Au[g]. mil. a[n..... duplicarius; III 14692 Salonae (Aurelius).

veterani; III 12749 Gradac near Sarajevo (Aurelius), III 2865 Nedinum, III 3127 Curicta.

It is the evidence of tiles that is conclusive: Asseria, III 10181/2, 13399/1, BD xxvi (1903) 150 (seven ex.); Bigeste, III 13339/2; Burnum (including the tile kilns nearby at Smrdelj), III p 2328/178 and 10181/2 (one has only leg. V[III]).

Before Betz produced his inscription from Burnum there were three theories about this legion in Dalmatia; Mommsen, followed by Hirschfeld (CIL p. 280, 1474), put them in the Augustan period when leg VIII was in the army of Illyricum (later Pannonia). This is really most unlikely, since legionary tiles do not appear generally until the Claudian period, while none of the inscriptions can be said to belong to the Augustan period. Ritterling (legio, 1646, 1659.) connected this evidence with the Marcomannic period; a possibility, but no confirmation from the evidence. Patsch (WMBH v (1897) 209, 339ff.) argued for a date under Pius, and speaks of a disturbance in the

interior of the province late in that reign. What his evidence for this was we do not know since he never published his promised study of this 'revolt'. The troubles under Marcus were probably connected with ruthless recruitment in the interior and with the fact that the overland route from Salonae became of vital strategic significance (see section ii below).

The new evidence from Burnum suggests an altogether different date for this legion's sojourn in Dalmatia (cf. Betz 51-2). The inscription is clearly first century but not necessarily very early in that century. The most likely date is sometime before A.D. 70 when the legion, which had left its Moesian station at Oescus to fight for Vespasian at Cremona, was transferred to help with the crisis in Germany. It is possible that the departure of leg. VII Claudia pia fidelis sometime under Claudius had weakened the army of the province to a dangerous degree, and that a detachment was sent from the Lower Danube to help leg. XI Claudia pia fidelis in its road-building and other duties. On the other hand it is possible that the man at Burnum is just a stray who ended up ~~at Burnum~~ there while the legion was moving towards Italy in A.D. 69. The veterans add nothing one way or the other. The one from Sarajevo is third century, while the man at Curicta is not obviously early and belongs to one of the leading families of Liburnia (see below p.537f). The veteran at Nedinum has proved something of a red herring (III 2865), <u>... vet]er.[...]le VIII L. Octavio [.] f. Cla Frontin. fratri</u>. Mommsen's theory of an Augustan <u>deductio</u> at Nedinum is most

unconvincing; the stone is not that early while in Dalmatia the tribe Claudia seems to go along with the emperor Claudius. Additionally, the Octavii were the great family of Nedinum and were somehow connected with the jurist Iavolenus Priscus (see below). Other points go against Mommsen's thesis such as the cognomen and the abbreviation le. VIII.

Additional Notes (ii): Dalmatia during the Marcomannic Wars.

An immediate effect of the Marcomannic emergency was the reconstruction of the city walls of Salonae. Three inscriptions record this, all dated to the year 170, and their interest is such that it is worth setting them out fully.

All are preceded by a similar dedication: Imp. Caes. M. Aurel. Antonino Aug. pont. max. tr. pot. xxiiii cos. iii p.p., and the three building records are (i) vexillationes leg. II Piae et III Concordiae ped. CC sub cura P. Ael. Amyntiani 7 frumentari leg II Traian. (III 1980) The two legions were the new units raised by Marcus in Italy a year or so before the outbreak of the war. Here they bear their original titles, but later they became known as II and III Italicae (Ritterling, legio, 1300f). The frumentarius of II Traiana, the Egyptian legion, was probably stationed permanently at Salonae. The absence of the legate's name is perhaps a little puzzling, and it may be that he was busy elsewhere, perhaps outside the province.

(ii) Coh. I (milliaria) Del. sub cur. Grani Fortunati trib. coh.

eiusd. muri p. DCCC in his turr. una. (III 1979)

(iii) Coh. II (milliaria) Del. ped. DCCC in his turris 1 sub cura L. Annaei Serviliani trib. vice tertia. III 6374 cf. III 8655 for number of cohort. Both these units are new creations and must not be confused with the seven cohortes Delmatarum raised during the first century and stationed in Britain (I and II), Germania superior (III, IV and V), and Mauretania (VI and VII, both equitata). On this latter occasion four cohorts were raised of which two are attested in Dacia (III 8010, ad Mediam (Mehadia) in W. Dacia, a dedication to Gallienus by coh. III Delmatarum Valerian. Gallienae (milliaria) eqq. c. R. p.f. and III 1474 Sarmizegethusa, tribune of IIII Delmatarum).

Of the two units at Salonae the only other record is a dedication to I.O.M. Partinus from Mačkat near Užice by C. Iul. Rufus a tribune of coh. I mil. Del., coupled with the good health of an emperor whose name has been erased (III 8353 = Spomenik xcviii 485). The three inscriptions from Salonae are our only evidence for the effect of the Marcomannic emergency on the coastal cities of Dalmatia; it is more than probable that similar defensive measures were undertaken in other cities (the rebuilding of a temple of Liber pater at Bigeste by coh. I Belgarum may be associated with such activity [III 8484]). Salonae as the provincial capital claimed priority, and the direct government assistance which she received may not have been extended to other centres. The remainder of the evidence for Dalmatia in this period comes from the other extreme of the

province, in the region southwest of Belgrade on the borders of Moesia superior. Two units are attested from the valleys of the Morava and the Moravica; near Užice there is the tribune of I milliaria Delmatarum (see above) while from Čačak comes a dedication to I.O.M. et genio loci dated to A.D. 197 by a tribune of coh. VIII voluntariorum c.R., one of the permanent auxiliary garrison of Dalmatia (see above p. 208ff. ch. VIII). (III 8336 [equals 6321] from Jezdinae southwest of Čačak).

The most remarkable evidence for military activity at this period is a concentration of newly-recruited auxiliary units around Guberevci, probably just within the borders of Moesia superior. Here five cohorts are attested, of which four are new creations.

(i) Cohors II Aurelia nova milliaria equitata c.R.

III 14537 (cf. Ojh iii (1900) Bb. 165 n.65) Stojnik: Valetudinarium coh. II Aur. nov. (milliaria) equit. c.R, T. Bebenius Iustus praef. imp C[ommodo] II et Vero II cons. (A.D. 179) cf. also III 14541 Guberevci and Ojh xii (1909) Bb. 189 n. 59 Stojnik: Marc[i]an[u]s [trib? c]oh. II Aur. n. (Milliaria) e. [Anto]ninianae, possibly Caracalla? cf. Ojh vii (1904) Bb. 7 for a dedication to Severus Alexander. Clearly the unit started life at Stojnik and was still there c. 230.

(ii) Coh. I (?) Aurelia Dardanorum.

III 14700 Salonae; d.m. Surus Victoris mil. coh. I mil. Aurel. Dard. The number of the cohort is not certain; it could be I (at Naissus (Niš), cf. III 8251) or possibly II (at Timacum minus

(Ravna), cf. III 14576). The man is a peregrinus and is probably one of the original 'latrones Dardaniae' (see below p. 221).

(iii) Coh. I Aurelia n. Pasinatum (?) c.R.

Only one item of evidence for this problematical unit. III 14545 (cf. Ojh iii (1900) Bb. 163 n. 63 Stojnik; [I].O.M. [..S]cribonius Faustus v e (vet?) I Aure. n.[..] PASINATV c.R. .....Clearly this refers to a new Aurelian cohort; but what appears to be an ethnic title is difficult to interpret. The original editors (v. Premerstein and Vulić in Ojh loc. cit.) restore Pasinatu[m] and connect it with the civitas Pasini of Pliny NH iii 140, a city on or near the Liburnian coast near Aenona and Argyruntum which has not been precisely located. It is, of course, perfectly possible to comprehend and auxiliary unit being enrolled from the territorium of Liburnian and Dalmatian cities during the Marcomannic crisis, and the nomen Scribonius suggests such an origin as opposed to the backwoods of Dalmatia or Dardania, but one must not ~~base~~ put too much trust in the reading of a stone obviously in such bad condition.

(iv) Coh. II Aurelia nova Sacorum.

III 14217/6 Guberevci; Aur(e)l. Victor mil. c. II Aur. n. Sacor. The sole reference to such a unit; the Sacii may be the Scythian people of that name or, as Wagner suggests (op. cit., 182), the unit may have some connection with Sacida in Dacia south of Apulum.

(v) Coh. V Lucensium.

III 14542 Suvodol near Guberevci; I.O.M. G. Gellius Exoratius praef. coh. V Lucens v.s.l.l.m.

A unit entitled V Callaecorum et Lucensium is attested on numerous diplomas of Pannonia superior, the latest dating to A.D. 154 (XVI 104). This may be the same unit on duty in Moesia during the Marcomannic Wars. The tribute of an unnamed cohort of this formation is at Stojnik, Ojh xiii (1910) Bb. 226 n.138.

The epigraphic evidence cited above provides us with a sizable concentration of auxiliary forces on or near the borders of Dalmatia during the Macommannic period; newly-recruited cohorts of Delmatae, rebuilding the walls at Salonae with help from detachments of the two new legions of Marcus, while four new cohorts and another probably transferred from Pannonia are at Guberevci. The complex history of the Marcomannic campaigns lies outside the immediate scope of this section, and it would be pointless to examine that subject without detailed consideration of all the evidence from other provinces. From the narrower field of the history of the province of Dalmatia, however, these units do have some importance, and may be considered along with a scatter of literary evidence for happenings in the province itself.

In the life of Marcus we read that he made soldiers out of the bandits of Dalmatia and Dardania (xxxi 7, latrones etiam Delmatiae atque Dardaniae milites fecit.). It was in this connection that M. Valerius Maximianus may have undertaken his operations against latrones in confinio Macedon(iae), cf. his cursus from Diana Veteranorum (AE 1956 124). This would seem to explain quite adequately the origin of the new units at Guberevci; their purpose in being there is however another matter. If they were required as a strategic reserve for the army of Moesia, then their dispersal in the

back country not too distant from the camps of Singidunum and Viminacium is an understanderable measure. On the other hand, is it possible that they were stationed there for a particular operation in that region or, even more interesting, in the interior of Dalmatia further to the West and South?

In the life of Didius Iulianus, governor of Dalmatia in 176 or 177 (cf. Jagenteufel, Fasti, 72ff.), we find a reference to his dealing with hostile peoples near the borders of his province (vita 1.9, inde Dalmatiam regendam accepit eamque a confinibus hostibus vindicavit.). There is no justification for rendering confines hostes as 'barbarian frontier peoples' as Jagenteufel (op. cit., 73 barbarische Grenzvölker, following Zwikker, op. cit. 221). Trouble may well have broken out within the province as a result of the recruitment of latrones, an operation which almost certainly took the form of a pacification. The time when the Empire had to bargain with such men as these for their services was still a very long way off. As well as the value of its recruits other factors ~~determined~~ may have determined2the obvious importance that Dalmatia held at this crucial period.

L. Vitrasius Flamininus is described on his cursus from Capua (X 3870) as Leg. pr. pr. Italiae Transpadanae et provinciae Moesiae superioris et exercitus provinciae Dalmatiae. It is quite possible that Vitrasius belongs to the period of the Marcomannic Wars, and is not the man of that name designated as suffect consul on a diploma of 122 (XVI 69), as Stein once suggested (cf. Syme, Gnomon, loc. cit., 513-4.) We must record that another instance of the unusual post of legate of Transpadana is of the Trajanic period, C. Julius M. f. Proculus, probably also a legate of Dalmatia, cf. ILS 1040 and Jagenteufel, fasti, 54ff n. 16, dating him 112-114.

As Syme argues, a simultaneous command extending from N. Italy to Serbia is most improbable, if only on geographical grounds. While we should follow Syme and regard Transpadana as a separate command, I am attracted by the possibility of an '<u>exercitus Dalmatiae</u>' being controlled by a legate based in Moesia. If the army had been concentrated in the valley of Western Serbia ~~for~~ as a result of, operations against the <u>latrones</u> (there certainly is a suggestion of the transfer of troops from Salonae to this region, cf. above with <u>I milliaria Delmatarum</u> and <u>I Aurelia Dardanorum</u>), then geography demands that this force <u>had</u> to be controlled from the Moesian side, perhaps by the legate of that province. Whether the littoral was under another man acting as <u>iuridicus</u> is not really important. As Syme has shown time and time again, operations in this region can only be conducted from the North and East along the river valleys.

To sum up. The trouble with the <u>latrones</u> may have been the result of ruthless press-gang activities in the interior of Dalmatia. With the uncertainty in Noricum and Pannonia the overland route to Moesia through Dalmatia had to be maintained at all costs, and the activity at Salonae and around Užice and Čačak may have been part of an operation to keep this route open as a strategic link between Italy and the Danube. For example, if the Marcomanni had managed to advance beyond Aquileia and even threatened Rome itself, what quicker way was there of getting troops to Italy from Moesia and Dacia to central Italy than through the interior of Dalmatia?

In the early third century a detachment of leg. I Italica, stationed at Novae in Moesia inferior, was based at Salonae. Twelve <u>milites</u> are

known, and of those whose names are preserved all are Aurelii; the cognomen of one of them, Mucatra, points to a Thracian origin, another sure sign of the third century. One of the tombstones records the legion with the title Severiana (III 12899), datable to the reign of Severus Alexander. (III 2008, -9 (2 ex.), 2010, 2132, 8719, 12898, 12899, 13909, Vjesnik 1 (1929-30) 14, nos 15, Sev[eriana], 16; BD xxvii (1904) 52 3207, Salonae; no legion mentioned, but Aurelii with cognomen Mucatra suggests Thracians in Italica.

Chapter IX: The pattern of military recruitment from Dalmatia.

(i) The Praetorian Guard.

The Praetorian Guard were the élite of the Roman army and served as the emperor's bodyguard, accompanying him when he undertook any major campaign. In times of peace they were stationed in Rome where their closeness to the centre of the empire led them to take a hand in imperial politics on more than one occasion. Recruits to the Guard were expected to be of a higher intelligence and physical fitness than the ordinary legionary, and as a consequence were granted higher rates of pay, shorter terms of service and far better prospects of advancement than the legionary. In contrast with the legions the Italian character of the Guard was retained throughout the first two centuries A.D., although this is probably due as much to geographical considerations as any inferiority in the provincial. As well as Italians dwelling in Italy, descendants of Italian families in the provinces joined the Guard, and in this the cities of Liburnia and the coast of Dalmatia are no exception; twelve recruits are known from the cities of the province. Four of them, three from Iader and one from Flanona, occur in the praetorian lists during the middle decades of the second century (1), while two others attested at Rome, one from Senia and one from Varvaria, occur in undated contexts (2). The praetorian miles at Tarsatica may be a native of that city (3), while the veteran at Corinium (4) is a Caninius, a family noted amongst the honestiores of nearby Asseria in the first century (5). Two are

known from Salonae; although the reading of one is more doubtful it clearly belongs to the later second century (6). The second is very interesting, and illustrates how the praetorian could advance in the legionary centurionate after having been selected as an evocatus for such promotion. On his tombstone at Cibalae (7) M. Herennius Valens from Salonae was promoted from evocatus to centurion in leg. XI Cl., and then went on to hold five further centurionates, two of which were served in the same legion- I Adiutrix, to reach the rank of hastatus posterior in the fifth cohort of leg. IIII Fl., not a very high rank considering that he served in all fifty-five years out of a life of eighty-five. Of an earlier generation was C. Statius Celsus from Risinium, whose family were well established in that city (8). He was a distinguished praetorian warrior decorated for gallantry by Trajan during the Dacian War, and he was later promoted to a centurionate in VII Gemina. Other aspirants ~~for~~ to the centurionate are found in the Flavian municipium of Scardona; one of them, C. Turranius Severus, belonged to the leading family of that city in the second century and sets up a dedication to the Liburnian deity Latra (9). The praetorian at Corinium, A. Saufeius P.f. Cam [.]max Ansio, may come from the unknown Dalmatian city of Ansium (10), but the tribe Camilia, not attested in any Dalmatian city, points to an Italian origin.

The reforms introduced by Septimius Severus at the end of the second century changed completely the character of the Praetorian Guard; as a result of his measures in the third century they were

almost exclusively drawn from the frontier provinces, especially Pannonia, Moesia and Thrace (numbers 169, 98 and 174 respectively, according to Passerini (11)). Surprisingly, Dalmatians are hardly at all represented in this transformation of the praetorians; two men from Salonae, presumably from the Delmatae, are attested at Rome (12), while a third gives his origo as vicus Azinas, a place which later became a municipium, somewhere in Liburnia (13). Two praetorians at Carales in Sardinia give their nationality as Delmata (14).

A scatter of men from Dalmatia appear in the ranks of the Equites singulares, the cavalry equivalent but on a smaller scale, of the praetorians (15).

(ii) The Legions.

The two legions which formed the garrison of the province of Dalmatia during the first half of the first century drew most of their recruits from the cities of Northern Italy or from veteran colonies in the Eastern Mediterranean. The latter group are more common in leg. VIIf, which spent many of its early years in Macedonia and continued drawing its recruits from Eastern sources even when it had been established at Gardun, from where the Italian cities were obviously the most convenient recruiting ground. Closest of all were the cities of the province itself where for most of the first century Italian families were dominant.

The earliest recruit to the legions from the province appears to have come from Liburnia, or more exactly Albona on the Western

side of Istria. L. Veratius L.f. Cla. Otho died at the age of twenty, presumably during the first year of service (16). He is the only definite instance of a native of the province recruited before A.D. 42. Of the legionaries who died (from Dalmatia) after this date four were taken by leg. VII C.p.f. and one by leg. XI C.p.f; three of the former group came from Salonae while the fourth, C. Iulius C.f. [Ser]r. [Agri]ppa, probably a romanised Liburnian, came from Corinium. One of those from Salonae is found settled at Scupi where he became one of the local magistrates; presumably he had gone on with the legion to Viminacium, and when discharged preferred to move to the principal city of his province rather than return to his home Salonae (17). The recruit to leg. XI who is attested at Burnum comes from the Claudian colony of Aequum (18). Of the few legionaries known of leg. IIII Flavia felix, stationed in the province c. 70-86, one is attested at Salonae with his family and household and may be presumed to be a native of that city (19).

There is virtually no evidence of legionaries recruited from the cities of Dalmatia to the armies of the Danubian provinces before the early second century. One man from Aequum appears on the list of casualties at Adamklissi, which probably records those who fell with the ill-fated Cornelius Fuscus; here the legion is probably V Alaudae (20). The other example, a man from Iader serving in XV Apollinaris at Carnuntum, must have been recruited at least as early as A.D. 100, since he had completed sixteen years of service before the legion left for Cappadocia in the later years of Trajan (21).

Another man serving in the same legion may come from Aequum, but his origo, given as Aeq., could be Aequiculi in Italy (22).

Half a dozen or so legionaries are known to have been recruited from the cities of Dalmatia during the second century, five of whom joined in A.D. 169 leg. VII Claudia at Viminacium (23). Four of them are from Salonae and one is from Iader. As these men occur on the only major recruitment list preserved for this legion it would not be too tendentious to suggest that during the earlier part of the second century this and perhaps other Danubian legions recruited regularly from the cities of Dalmatia. The sixth man comes from Iader and is found serving in leg. XIII Gemina at Apulum in Dacia (24). One of the more distinguished ex-legionaries from Dalmatia must unfortunately remain an ignotus due to the fragmentary condition of his tombstone, although most of the details of his career are clear to be seen. A legionary in [leg. XXX Ul]p. vict., he rose to become aquilifer and then held centurionates in three legions (XIIII Gemina, XIII Gemina and XXII Primigenia) before dying at the age of seventy after forty-five years service (25). His home is recorded as Aeq]uo Dal[matiae] and cannot by any means be regarded as certain although no other restoration comes readily to mind.

By the end of the second century recruitment to the legions from the cities of Dalmatia appears to have ceased, and in the third century most of the evidence for the origin of legionaries comes from their names, many of which point to origins in the more

backward parts of the empire, mostly in the Balkan provinces. In this category a number of legionaries may be detected as originating from the interior of the province of Dalmatia. A group of men serving in II Parthica at Alba, one of the legions raised by Septimius Severus, have names which suggest an origin in the Dalmatian interior (Dasimius, Dasius and Varzo), while a ~~collective~~ dedication to Severus and the matres Delmatae by soldiers of I Minervia at Lyon points to milites from that part of the Roman world (26). Within the province the decurion of Rider at Podstrana, who was also a miles of XI Claudia, is more likely to be a member of the legate's officium than a native of the area; his twenty-five years' service suggest that he was ~~infact~~ a veteranus although this title is not in fact given on his tombstone (27). Five members of leg. II Adiutrix, stationed at Aquincum in Pannonia inferior, are attested in the interior of the province; all of them were serving when they died, but it is quite probably that, even though they may have died elsewhere, their tombstones were set up in their place of origin. This is in fact clearly stated on one of them, from Glavatičevo near Konjic in the Neretva valley, of Pinnius a miles of a leg. II (probably Adiutrix) who died at Bassiana in Pannonia inferior (28).

(iii) The Ravenna and Misene Fleets.

The two imperial fleets based on Misenum and Ravenna rarely undertook any serious military activity. Their function appears mainly to have been concerned with providing an escort for the emperor

whenever he wished to travel, and to act as a transport for any expedition which involved major troop movements. Their conditions of service were not very dissimilar to those of legionaries. Peregrini were sometimes recruited and on completion of service were awarded the civitas in the manner of an auxiliary.

The presence of a disciplined body of men at two separate places in Italy was of considerable importance during the civil turmoil of A.D. 69; with troops in Italy of such vital importance, the marines of the fleets were formed into infantry units on at least two occasions at this time and the two formations became in later years legions I and II Adiutrix. Thus it is with considerable interest that we read the remark of Tacitus that the Ravenna Fleet was mostly composed of men from Pannonia and Dalmatia; what is even more interesting is that these men from the two provinces did not originate from the coastal cities where a seafaring tradition had long been established, but from the inland peoples such as the Maezaei and Daesitiates (29).

A diploma was issued in the year 70 to Nerva Laidi f. Desidias on the completion of his military service in the legion II Adiutrix, a unit formed either by Vespasian, or on his behalf, during the winter of 69/70 from marines of the Ravenna Fleet (30). Clearly Nerva Laidi f. had been nearing the end of his service when he was taken from the Ravenna Fleet and made into a legionary. His case is most interesting as an indication of the speedy progress of Romanisation in the interior of Dalmatia. His tribe, the Daesit-

iates, had been the leaders of the great revolt against Roman authority, while Nerva, even if he had only completed the minimum term of twenty years, cannot have been recruited later than A.D.50. The presence of a member of a people dwelling far from the sea in Central Bosnia suggests that many recruits were chosen for qualities other than their seamanship.

A number of men from Dalmatia are found serving in legions I and II Adiutrix who without question commenced their military service in either the Ravenna or Misenum Fleets. At Moguntiacum, where leg. I Adiutrix was stationed from about 70 to 85/86, five milites are attested with a Dalmatian origo; in four cases this is Aequum and these all have the tribe Tromentina (31). None of them had completed more than sixteen years of service. At Moguntiacum we have a miles whose home was probably Risinium, while at Argentorate a miles of an unknown legion give his origo as Aequum and is also in the tribe Tromentina (32).

It is from Aequum also that Dalmatians attested in II Adiutrix appear to have come; at Ravenna a veteran gives this place as his home, while his heir is a Plaetorius, an Illyrian nomen attested at Aequum (33). The legion spent the year 70 operating against the Batavians in Germany, but by the following year it had accompanied the new Flavian legate of Britain, C. Petilius Cerealis, to that province where it eventually took up station at Chester (34). At this place two legionaries have the tribe Tromentina, although only of one of them is the origo Aequum preserved; in this case, however,

we can be reasonably sure that the tribe Tromentina is indicative of a Dalmatian origin - more likely than not Aequum (35). The preponderance of Aequum among the origins of the marines who ended up in I and II Adiutrix leads to the conclusion that either they were Delmatae and *peregrini* who acquired with the *civitas* Aequum as their *origo*, or that they had in fact never seen service in the fleet but were recruited from Aequum and its vicinity when the legions were actually being raised. They may anyway have been *peregrini* when enlisted and only have received the *civitas* when their formations became *iustae legiones*, which had not occured in the case of the Desitias cited above. Another *peregrinus* who remained in the Ravenna Fleet was *Plator Veneti f.*, a centurion from the Maezaei in Northwestern Bosnia, attested on a diploma at Salonae of A.D. 71 (36).

Dalmatians continued to be recruited into the fleets during later centuries; at Ravenna fifteen sailors give their origin as *Dalmata* while seven are also found serving at Misenum (37). This *origo* must refer to the province as a whole and not merely the Delmatae in the hinterland of Salonae. Two of the Dalmatian marines given more specific *origines*, Varvaria in Liburnia and Castrum Planae, an unknown place of the Delmatae (38).

The presence of a group of serving sailors at Salonae suggests that there was a naval depot manned by men of both fleets at this city. Four examples from the Ravenna fleet are known and two veterans and two *milites* of the Misenum Fleet, none of whom ~~are~~ is necessarily

at home in the province while two of them (an Egyptian and a Pannonian) are certainly not at home (39). A single instance of a sailor of the Misenum Fleet in the early third century is probably a member of this detachment (40).

(iv) The Auxilia.

The value of the peoples in the interior of Illyricum as a source of recruits for the Roman army was recognised as early as the reign of Augustus. Indeed the occasions for the outbreak ~~for~~ of the War of A.D. 6-9 was the assembling together of contingents of soldiers from Illyricum to serve under Tiberius in the forthcoming campaigns against Maroboduus (41).

The more regular recruiting of auxiliary cohorts got under way during the first century and we know of at least eight cohortes Delmatarum, all of whom were almost certainly in service well before the end of that century serving in three areas of the empire, Germany, Britain and Mauretania. Five of the cohorts started their service in Germany, although in the case of two of them (I and II) this has been inferred from the known movements of later units in the series. III, IIII and V are attested in Germania superior during the later part of the first century, IIII at Bingium (mod. Bingen), and the other two probably at nearby Aquae Mattiacorum (Wiesbaden) although traces of them are known from other places in the province. III and V remained in Germany, but the others, I, II and IIII, had been transferred to Britain during the later years of the first century where they appear regularly on diplomas of the province. I and II

first appear on the diploma of A.D. 122 (although II may appear on that of A.D. 105), while IIII had definitely reached the province by A.D. 103 (42).

Evidence from Caesarea in Mauretania suggests that more than one series of cohortes Delmatarum were raised during the course of the first century. Coh. V Delmatarum C.R. is attested regularly on Mauretanian diplomas during the years A.D. 88-156/7 and is clearly a different unit from the V Delmatarum of Germania superior attested there during the corresponding period (43). Also of this series are the cohorts VI and VII recorded on tombstones of Caesarea (44).

The only evidence for the recruitment of auxiliary cohorts from Liburnia is a centurion of I Liburnorum at Nedinum where, as an Octavius, he was presumably at home (45). No other evidence is known for either this or any other cohortes Liburnorum, and they may well have been only temporary formations raised during the Augustan emergency and disbanded soon afterwards.

There are some records of Dalmatian recruits to these units in Germany and Mauretania. Three peoples are represented on tombstones of soldiers of coh. IIII at Bingium, Daversi, Ditiones and the Delmatae, while in coh. V we have a Docleas (i.e. of the Docleatae) at Moguntiacum and a Maeseius at Aquae Mattiacorum (46). The last named people occur twice and perhaps three times in Mauretania, an eques of VI Delmatarum and an eques of VII Delmatarum both give their nationality as Maezeius, while a third man in the latter unit has the same name as the Maezeius in coh. VII and can thus be

regarded as almost certainly of the same people (47). The evidence of Dalmatians in these cohorts, most of whom probably belong to the units' original recruitment, show that men were drawn not only from the Delmatae but from the Docleatae, Daversi and the Ditiones also. The Maezeii appear to have been chosen for their ability as horsemen and, judging from the small quantity of evidence, formed the cavalry portion of the two cohorts in Mauretania which were equitatae (VI and VII).

In the course of the second century a number of peregrini serving in auxiliary units in Pannonia and Moesia bear names which point to an origin in Dalmatia; thus we have a Dasatus [S]cenobarbi f. serving in a Ala I Batavorum milliaria in Dacia, a Derinus (~~probably of the Derrioi~~) in ala II Pannoniorum at Sirmium and a Dalmata in coh. II Alpinorum at Mursa (48). These are the natural result of the permanent stationing of auxiliary units in a particular province which would make continued recruitment from the units' native people very impracticable when good supplies of men were easily come by from near at hand; this clearly was the case with Batavian or Alpine units in Pannonia recruiting from the interior of Dalmatia.

A most unusual and quite isolated case of recruitment from Dalmatia occurs at Mainhardt near Moguntiacum in Germania superior; in the coh [I] Asturum we ~~re found~~ first two peregrini, Maximus Dasantis (f.) from municipium Magnum and Bato Beusantis (f.) from municipium Salvium serving in the same century. The inscription dates to the

second century and gives the title of Municipium to two cities of the Delmatae, both of which, Salvium and Magnum, do not appear to have achieved this status before the middle of the second century. How the two men, who appear to be some of the latest attested instances of peregrini in an auxiliary unit, came to be recruited in a cohort that is not known ever to have been anywhere near the Danubian provinces is quite inexplicable, but merely serves to remind us how dangerous it is to generalise on such complex processes as the recruitment of such ~~as~~ a varied formation as the auxiliary cohorts of the Roman army (49).

Chapter IX: Notes.

1. VI 32515 e I 24, [....]ius Restitutus Iader (A.D. 120-136); VI 32519 a II 8, evocatus C. Valerius C.f. Ser. Vitalis Iader (A.D. 141-158); VI 32520 b 20, T. Ennius Sedatus Iader (A.D. 143-160); VI 209, Q. Sextilius Rufus Flanona (133-150).
2. VI 2451 M. Valerius M.f. Sergia Quintianus Seni(a) mil. coh. I pr; VI 32515 a II 27, fis. cur. Sex. Gavius Vindex Varvaria.
3. III 3027 C. Livius C.f. Serg. Clemens mil. coh.VIII pr.
4. III 2884 T. Caninius T.f. Ser. Maxim. vet. coh. VI pr.; according to the CIL text the tombstone was set up by M. Maesius Paulus vet. but the vet has been doubted, cf. OJh viii(1905) Bb. 46.
5. Caninii at Asseria, cf. OJh xi (1980) Bb. 70 12 equals AE 1908 192, flamen divi Claudii IIvir quinquennalis.
6. III 8765 Salonae, L. Vetu[rio .....]o eq. c. o[ctavae? pr.]aet. ann. xviii Aelia Maximina mater.
7. III 13360 Cibalae (Vinkovci), d.m. M. Herennio Tromentina Valenti Salona evocato leg. XI Cl. 7 leg. eiusd. 7 leg. I Adi. 7 leg. II Adi. 7 leg. XV Apol. 7 leg. iteru(m) I Adi. 7 leg. IIII Fl. coh. V hast. post. stip. lv. vixit annis lxxxv M. Herennius Helius libertus et heres patrono b.m.f.c. h.m.h.n.s.; on evocati cf. Passerini, le coorti praetorie, 76-9.
8. III 6359 Risinium, C. Statius C.f. Serg Celsus evoc. aug. donis donatus bis corona aurea torquibus phaleris armillis ob triumphos

belli Dacici ab imp. Caesare Nerva Traiano Aug. Ger. Parthico optimo 7 leg. VII Geminae in Hispania t.p.i. et epulo dedicavit. Statii are common at Risinium, III 1732, 1733, 6360.

9. III 14321/2, Scardona, C. Terentius Celsus evoc. Aug; III 2816, Scardona, C. Turranius C.f. Severus evoc. Aug. [L]atrae aram p. On the Turranii of Scardona, cf. ch. XV p.547 below.

10. III 2887 Corinium; on the problem of Ansium see below ch. X p.269.

11. le coorti praetorie, 175ff.

12. VI 32536 c I 42, L. Septim. Nepos; VI 32914 11.

13. VI 32563 14, 5, on the identity of Azina, cf. below ch. XI p.309.

14. VI 2633; X 7589.

15. VI 3261; III 12879; III 2011; 2047 and a miles of coh. VII Urb. (sic.) presumably an error for XII, III 2886, son of a Calpurnia Volaesa.

16. III 3052 Albona.

17. Recruits from Salonae: III 8735, 8760, both at Salonae; Spomenik lxxi (1931) 243 n. 650, Skopje, [.....]undus d[om]o Salonis ve[t.] leg. VII C.p.f. mil. annis [x]xii b(eneficiarius) MV E leg. consula[ris] qu(a)es II vir col. Fl. f. D(omitiana) vixit annis lx t.f.i. h.s.e. L. Marcianus Probatus L. Marcianus Successus libe. f.c. From the liberti we can conclude that his nomen was [L. Marcianus Sec]undus; the original reading, and for that the matter publications, is a hopeless jumble, but the general sense is clear; recruits from Corinium, III 2885.

18. III 10054 Burnum.

19. III 2021 cf. p. 2135, Salonae.

20. III 14214; the identity of this casualty list is discussed by Ritterling, legio, 1569-70.

21. RLO xviii (1937) col. 60 n.21.

22. III 14358/14 Carnuntum; his name is L. Cassius Cla. Albanus and the tribe Claudia makes Forni, Reclutamento, 169 note 2, prefer Aequiculus, as the tribe of Aequum a pears to be Tromentina (see below ch. XII p. 349); yet Claudia is common in Dalmatia and it is quite possible that Cassius is from Dalmatia; Colonia Aequum is a home of veterans; Aequiculi in Samnium is not, cf. Forni, op. cit., ad locc.

23. legionaries in VII Claudia at Viminacium; III 14507 is a list of men recruited in A.D. 169 and discharged in 195; II a 16 [....]us Ia[der?] and four from Salonae, I b, 34; II a, 48; II b, 14; III a, 48. A doubtful Dalmatian recruit is Q. Petronius Valens who militav. (?i.e. veteran) leg. VII [C] p.f. at Rider III 2772; if anything his nomen suggests an origin at Salonae where Petronii are common, see below ch.XVI p.636.

24. III 1200 Apulum, an eques of leg. XIII.

25. XIII 6952 Moguntiacum.

26. Dalmatians in II Parthica; XIV 2255 (Basimius), VI 3403 (Dasius), Rend. Acad. Lincei v.s. xxv (1916) 403,2 (Varzo); dedications by Dalmatians in I Minervia, XIII 1766, The permanent station of this legion was Bonna, Germania inferior.

27. III 12815a Podstrana. ~~the text is given below under Rider, ch. p. .~~

28. Dalmatians in II Adiutrix; III 12799 Glavatičevo in Neretva valley near Konjic, Pinnius miles legionis secundes (sic) defunctus Bassianis annorum xxxii. II 10036 Golubić; III 12764 Zenica, both only leg. II but Adiutrix can be inferred; Spomenik lxxvii (1934) 19 fig. 26, Bos. Grahovo; Patsch, Narona, 68 fig. 31, Bigeste. Dalmatian origin may be inferred in the case of some names attested at the legionary base at Aquincum, III 3558 (Bato Neritani), III 3349 (Dazanus), III 3540 (Dasianus), III 10572 (Oplonus), III 3553 (Tatulo). Forni, op. cit., 183, includes AE 1939 8, a man in II Adiutrix do. D[al]m[ata], as of the Flavian-Hadrian period; as E. Birley has suggested to me, this is surely too early and a third century date is preferable.

29. For the raising of I and II Adiutrix from the fleets in Italy cf. Ritterling, legio, 1265ff.; Magna pars Delmatae Pannoniique erant, Tac. hist., iii 12.

30. XVI 11 Herculaneum.

31. Dalmatians in leg. I Adiutrix: XIII 6828 Q. Attius Q.f. Tro. Rufus Aequ; XIII 6831 M. Marius M.f. Tro. Vegetus Aeq; XIII 6833 C. Vibius C.f. Trom. Severus Aequo; XIII 6830 [....]idius [...f.]Trom. [?Cle]mens [Ae]q[u]o and one from Iader, XIII 6827, L. Appuleius L.f. Sergia Iadestinus; the Appuleii were a leading family at ~~Aequum~~ Iader (see below ch. XVI p. 538) but his

cognomen suggests that he was once a peregrinus and became a citizen, perhaps taking Appuleius as his nomen when one of the family was a magistrate at Iader.

32. XIII 5982 Argentorate, L. Licinius L.f. Claud. Maximus Aequo [..... probably of I Adiutrix and perhaps identical with a man of the same names who was trierarch in the Ravenna Fleet, cf. XI 71.

33. XI 23 Ravenna, T. Plotius Tromentina Rufinus Aequo, vet, leg. II Adiut. p.f. and M. Plaetorius Valens; Plaetorii are attested at Aequum, III 2728, and they are honestiores at Varvaria, Vjesnik liii (1951) 244 n.35.

34. Ritterling, legio. 1440-1.

35. EE IX 1087 Chester; Sebdius L.f. Tr[o. Pu]dens Aequ[o ...], a most unusual nomen, unknown in Dalmatia; EE VII 885 Chester, L. Annius L.f. Tro. Marcel[lus ...

36. XVI 14, A.D. 71 Salonae.

37. Men at Ravenna with natio Dalmata; XI 44, 53, 54, 68, 69, 71, 85, 89, 90, 98, 100, 104, 108, 118; note also the na. Ditio at Tergeste, V 541; on the Ditiones, see below ch. XIV p. 413. Dalmatians in the Misenum Fleet; natio Dalmata, X 3475, 3486, 3545, 3570, 3618, 3642, 3666.

38. XI 104, M. Valerius Colonus from Varvaria, and XI 76, a veteranus ex adoptione nat. Delm (?) Castri Planae both from Ravenna.

39. Ravenna Fleet at Salonae; III 2034, 3165 (cf. AEM xviii (1895) 98, 7 natio. Paraetonius from Egypt), III 14691 natio. Panno.

and III 2020, a veteran: Misene Fleet at Salonae; two milites III 2036, AE 1904 171 and two veteransIII 8580, III 14695 (IGR I 552).

40. BD xxvi (1903) 192 3149.

41. Contigents assembled for the war against Maroboduus, Dio lv 29,2.

42. I Delmatarum first appears on a British diploma of A.D. 122, XVI 69, and the unit is attested on dedications from Maryport, VII 387, 400; an earlier dedication, probably Antonine, suggests that it may for a period in the second century have been stationed at Cilurnum (Chesters), cf. JRS xlvii (1957) 229 no.14. In the first century it may have been in Germany.
II Delmatarum appears on British diplomas of A.D. 122, XVI 69, and A.D. 135, XVI 82, as well as perhaps on that of A.D. 105, XVI 51; here the numeral of the cohort could either be II or IIII Delmatarum. There is no evidence of its earliest station, probably somewhere in Germany, but in Britain it appears at Carvoran on Hadrian's Wall (Magna) where an imaginifer is attested, VII 760, and is given for that place by the Notitia dignitatum, occ. xl. 43.
III Delmatarum appears on diplomas of Germania superior in A.D.90, XVI 36; A.D. 116; XVI 62; and A.D. 134, XVI 80. On the diploma of A.D. 116 it carries the titles p(ia) f(idelis) showing that it was in Germany at least as early as the revolt of Saturninus in 88/89. Tiles of the unit have been found at Rückingen and Wiesbaden, cf. Cichorius, RE iv 282.

IIII Delmatarum is attested in Britain on diplomas of A.D. 103, XVI 48, and A.D. 122, XVI 69; earlier in the first century it was stationed at Bingen in Germania superior: XIII 7507, Annaius Pravai f. Daversus; XIII 7508, Bato Dasantis fil. natione Ditio; XIII 11962 (7509), Beusas Sutti f. Delmat., all milites of the cohort at Bingen.

V. Delmatarum appears on diplomas of Germania superior from 70-134, cf. XVI 20, 36, 62, 80; a miles at Moguntiacum, XIII 7039, [.....] anio Plassi f. Docleas. This man is to be dated almost certainly before the Flavian period when the civitas Docleatium became municipium Doclea, since the Docleas here is an ethnic rather than a locative origo; another miles appears at Wiesbaden, XIII 7581, which is most likely to have been its station in the province, Dassius Daetoris fil. Maeseius; on the Maezeii cf. below ch. XIV p. 412 .

43. V. Delmatarum c. R. is attested in Mauretanian diplomas from A.D. 88-156/7, cf. XVI 73, 159, 161, 169, 181, 182.

44. VI Delmatarum, VIII 9377 Dazas Sceni f. Ma[eze]ius eques, turma Licconis. VII Delmatarum, VIII 9834 Kiccaius Carvi f. Maezeius eques, VIII 21040, Liccaius Iauletis f. turma Anni.

45. AE 1950 111, ~~text given below~~ cf. ch. XVX p. 496, note 19

46. see n. 42 above.

47. see n. 43 above.

48. Ala I Batavorum milliaria, III 7800 Apulum, Dasatus [S]cenobarbi f., almost certainly a Dalmatian, cf. III 8437 Narona, III

2775 Rider and Spomenik xciii (1948) 140, Breza, north of Sarajevo. The unit was in Pannonia until Hadrian and then in Dacia, cf. Wagner, op. cit., 16.

Ala II Pannoniorum, III 10223 Sirmium, [....]uli f. Derini, possibly from the Derrioi of Ptolemy, ii 16,5 or the Deuri of Pliny, NH iii 142 or even Derini, NH ii 143 in the conventus of Narona with 17 decuriae. The unit was in Moesia until Trajan and then Dacia, cf. Wagner, op. cit., 60.

II Alpinorum, III 3261, Mursa, [.....] Dalmata.

49. XIII 6538 cf. add. p. 100, Mainhardt, Germania Superior, d.m. Maximo Dasantis (f.) mensori coh.[I] Asturum 7 Co[br]uni Quin[t]ini s[ti]pendiorum xviii annorum xxxviii c(ivis) Dalmata ex municipio Magn(o) e[t] Ba[t]oni Beusantis (f.) optioni coh. s.s. (centurionis) [ea]dem s[t]ip. xviii ann[o]rum xl ex muni[c]ipio Salv[..... The unit is attested on diplomas in Germania Superior in 74 (XVI 20) and 134 (XVI 80) and appears to have been transferred to Britain at some period before the middle of the third century, when it is assigned to that province on the cursus of Q. Gargilius Martialis from Africa (VIII 9047 ILS 2767). It presumably took up station at Mainhardt when the Outer Limes was established under Antoninus Pius. There is no evidence to suggest how the two Dalmatians came to be recruited into the unit, but it is intelligible that if the unit had seen some service on the Danube in the time of the Marcomannic Wars and sustained some casualities, it should have made up its losses by recruits

from the more backward parts of Dalmatia. No other men from the area are found serving in the Rhine *auxilia* at this time, and the fact that the two men have identical *stipendia*, certainly points to their recruitment being the result of a need for battle replacements, while the unit was in the Balkans. For a doubtful record of a cohort of Asturians at Salonae, cf. III 14705 and p. 198 above.

Chapters VII-IX: Bibliographical note.

The following standard works are cited only when the contain discussion on some relevant point but they have been used frequently both as works of reference and on points of interpretation:

A. Betz. Untersuchungen zur militärgeschichte der römischen provinz Dalmatien (Abhandlung des Archaeologisch-epigraphischen seminaires der Universitäts Wien, neue folge iii Heft), Vienna, 1938.

A. Betz. 'Neues zu den Auxilien in der römischen provinz Dalmatien' ÖJh xxxvi (1946) Bb. 67ff.

G.L. Cheesman. The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army. Oxford 1914.

G. Forni. Il Reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano. Milan-Rome 1953.

K. Kraft. Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau. Berne 1951.

E. Ritterling. Article legio in RE, xii 1211-1829. 1924.

W. Wagner. Die Dislokation der römischen Auxiliarformationen in den Provinzen Noricum, Pannonien, Moesien und Dakien von Augustus bis Gallienus. Berlin 1938.