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Abstract: The Romans specified the Iapodes as one of the most bellicose indigenous communities. Nevertheless, the preserved works of Roman authors show that even the Romans were aware that the Iapodes were, in fact, an alliance of smaller communities. The Romans gave a generic name to this alliance based on their experience in warfare and their knowledge of their territory. In terms of topic, this paper is divided into three units. The first part addresses the question of a fragmentary identity of the Iapodian communities based on literary and epigraphic sources and literature analysis. Using the same methodology, the second part analyses the problem of the position and number of the Iapodes in Conventus Scardonitanus. In the last part, using the example of the Iapodian communities whose assumed territory was in the valley of the Una River, shows the existence of a separate local identity especially manifested through the role of the elites.
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The archaeological research has shown that the middle course of the Una River, especially the area around Bihać was one of the most culturally developed territories of present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Roman period. By analysing written sources, archaeological material, and epigraphic inscriptions, scholars have come to the conclusion that this part of Bosnia and Herzegovina represented the easternmost part of the Iapodian territory during the Early Empire. This is a relatively confined region surrounded by mountains dominated by the Una River. This specific geostrategic position influenced the development of a separate identity of the Iapodian communities.

We should emphasize that the Iapodian territory encompassed a large region from Vinica in Bela Krajina (White Carniola) in Slovenia via Gacka, Lika, Krbava, the Ogulin region, partially encompassed Gorski Kotar and Kordun in Croatia and the region of northwest Bosnia along the middle course of the Una River. These Iapodian territory borders were constructed on the basis of testimonies of Graeco-Roman authors such as Strabo, Pliny the Elder, Claudius Ptolemy, Appian, and Cassius Dio. Material traces left by the Iapodes as a kind of identity marks are especially important for establishing borders. By observing the layout of hillfort settlements, the communication between them, burial mounds, and necropolises, we come to the conclusion that the Iapodian settlements developed regional identities. Namely, their recognisable cultural identity was fragmented into specific regional variants, which is especially prominent in the Iapodian communities in the Una.

1 This paper relates to the research results obtained within the scientific research project of the Croatian Science Foundation, Among Gods and Men – The Cults and the Population of Roman Dalmatia According to the Votive Inscriptions (IP-2020-02-7214), lead by Ljubica Perinić, PhD.
4 Strabo, 4. 6. 10; Strabo, 7. 5. 2; Plin. HN 3. 139. 127; Ptol. Geog. 2. 16; App. Ill.14. 40–42; App. Ill. 16. 46–48; App. Ill. 18. 52–53; App. Ill. 21. 61; App. Ill. 22. 62–66; Cass. Dio 49. 34–5; Cass. Dio 56. 11–12.
River valley in northwest Bosnia. For example, the cult of Bindus appears only in this territory. Moreover, this is the location of the Iapodian settlement Raetinium.

The Iapodian alliance and the question of identity

The data preserved in the works of Graeco-Roman authors and archaeological finds imply that the term the Iapodes represents a generic name of a community that inhabited the border area between southern Pannonia and northern Dalmatia. Many pieces of evidence testify about the diversity within the envisioned Iapodian ethnical corpus. Although Lika and Ogulin-Plaški plateau are not generally considered the "Iapodian cultural epicentre", the most recent research indicates strong regional identities in other micro-regions, especially in the Una River valley and northwest part of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Namely, archaeological explorations have corroborated differences in burial methods during the pre-Roman period. Thus, inhumation is predominant in Lika as a sign of a strong indigenous component, while incineration is dominant in the Bihać basin. A specific type of grave, or specific stone urns, appears in the Bihać basin. In some parts of Lika, graves were discovered in which the deceased were buried one on top of another, something which is associated with families. Large regional differences are also observed among grave goods, as well as materials found outside of sepulchral context. No matter if these were indigenous products or imports, different grave goods are indicators of a different cultural development within micro-regions which the Romans later observed as one Iapodian territory.

An important segment of the understanding of the differentiation of communal identity in the preRoman period is the layout and position of settlements. Along with economic reasons and fortification, natural circumstances had a key role in the origin of settlements. Apart from the common hillfort settlements dominating the entire supposed Iapodian territory, archaeology confirmed certain particularities. Some examples are the use of caves as settlements in Lika, Croatia or the construction of stilt houses in the Una River valley in northwest Bosnia. The Amber Road also significantly influenced the cultural development of the Iapodian communities that lived in the southwest during the Iron Age. We can observe the acceptance of cultural trends and influences that manifested through local production of objects. For example, bow fibulae with an amber decoration (pearl) on the bow appear in this part of the Iapodian territory and they can be associated with Italy and Liburnia. This part of the Iapodian region belonged to the so-called Adriatic koiné region during the Iron Age. Other Iapodian communities, such as the ones from the Una River valley, did not belong to the Adriatic cultural koiné. The aforementioned differences observed by archaeologists, in fact, represent a group of characteristics that define the individual communities within the envisaged Iapodian ethnical corpus. These communities seemed to be what the Romans in Dalmatia called civitates during the Early Principate.

The first specific data about the existence of regional identities among the Iapodes are found in the description of Octavian's campaign in Illyricum. Namely, two literary sources, Cassius Dio and Appian, suggest the existence of these identities. Both of them noted that Octavian considered the Iapodes to be a serious threat so he personally led his army against them and left his generals in charge of smaller communities. Moreover, both authors recognized different warfare phases against the Iapodes that can be associated with the fragmentation of the Iapodian territory and identity. Dio noted that Octavian conquered relatively easily those Iapodes who lived not far from the sea on the nearer side of the mountain, but more resistance was shown...
by those on the heights and the other side of the mountain.\textsuperscript{14} The mountain refers to the Dinaric Alps (Dinarides) which Dio discusses from the Roman perspective, i.e., he observes the region from the sea towards the inland.\textsuperscript{15} The possible existence of three political alliances can be observed here. One group or alliance was made of the Iapodes who lived to the south and southwest of the Velika and Mala Kapela mountains, whereas the other group was comprised of the Iapodian communities who possibly lived in these mountains. The third group includes the communities who lived to the east of these mountains in the inland. Classical authors compared the Velika and Mala Kapela to be an extension of the Alps as well as all of the Dinaric Alps.\textsuperscript{16} We can assume that the Iapodian communities were grouped into alliances primarily based on geography. The communities that lived in the mountain probably had a different identity than the communities closer to the sea or in the Una River valley. Clearly, economic and geographic circumstances represented an important habitus in the construction of an identity of communities.

Appian also suggests the existence of different political alliances along the Iapodes in the same period. While describing the conflicts between the Iapodes and Octavian’s troops, he mentioned two Iapodian alliances which he also defined with respect to the position of the Alps, i.e., the Velika and Mala Kapela.\textsuperscript{17} Contemporary literature uses the terms Cisalpine Iapodes and Transalpine Iapodes for these two alliances.\textsuperscript{18} Unlike Dio, Appian offered us a better insight in the structure of these alliances since he mentioned certain communities which probably were the most numerous and bellicose ones. The Cisalpine Iapodes alliance was comprised of communities that inhabited the southwest foothill of the Velika and Mala Kapela, i.e., present-day Lika.\textsuperscript{19} Appian mentions three communities by name – Moentini, Avendeatae, and Aurupini.\textsuperscript{20} According to Appian, the Aurupini were the most numerous and bellicose Iapodian community clearly suggesting that the Romans were only familiar with large communities. Mentioning the Aurupini, in terms of comparison, indicates the existence of a larger number of communities with a certain identity. Appian also noted that the Aurupini withdrew from their villages into town when Octavian approached them.\textsuperscript{21} Similarly, Appian describes the victory of Figulus against the Delmatae in 158 BC stating that the Delmatae from smaller settlements retreated to Delminium.\textsuperscript{22} Similarly to Delminium being the political centre of the Delmatae, this settlement mentioned in the context of the Aurupini was probably the political centre of the south Iapodian alliance.

The most important political centre of the communities that lived in the north – the Iapodes on the other side of the Alps, as called by Appian

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{14} At that time he himself led the campaign against the Iapydes, assigning the rest of the tribes to others to subdue. Those that were on the nearer side of the mountains, dwelling not very far from the sea, he reduced with comparatively little trouble, but he overcame those on the heights and on the farther side of them with no small hardship (Cass. Dio. 49. 35. 1–2) English translation by Earnest Cary.
  \item \textsuperscript{15} Olujić observed well that the Iapodes “who lived on the heights”, i.e., those who lived on the mountain, were neglected in the literature (Olujić 2007, 87). It is an important piece of information that shows the complexity of the terms the Iapodes and the Iapodian land.
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Sašić Beća 2022a, 124–125.
  \item \textsuperscript{17} The Iapodes in the Alps (App. Ill. 16. 47–48), Iapodes on the other side of the Alps (App. Ill. 18. 52). English translation by Marjetka Sašel Kos.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Sašel Kos 2005, 426–430; Džino 2010, 41; Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 68.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Sašel Kos 2005, 426.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Of the Iapodes in the Alps, the Moentini and the Avendeatae surrendered to him at his approach; the Aurupini, however, who are the most numerous and most bellicose among these Iapodes, moved from villages into their city, and when Caesar drew near they fled to the forests. Caesar occupied the city, although in the hope that they would surrender he did not have it burnt; when they surrendered to him, he permitted them to live in it (App. Ill. 16. 47–48). English translation by Marjetka Sašel Kos.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} This fortification settlement is mentioned by other literary sources such as Strabo, Claudius Ptolemy, Itinerarium Antonini, Ravenna Cosmography, and Tabula Peutingeriana (Strabo, 4. 6. 10; Ptol. Geog. 2. 16. 9; It. Ant. 274. 2; Anon. Rav. 4. 22; Tab. Peut. 4. 2). During the Roman period, the settlement was a municipium as corroborated by an epitaph from Salona (CIL 03, 08783 = CIL 03, 08783 + p. 2136 = CIL 03, 08783 + p. 2326 = EDH 052758 = EDCS-31400666). We can assume that Strabo identifies the Moentini community with the Monetium settlement (Strabo, 4. 6. 10). Moreover, the name of the third community that Appian mentions when writing about the Cisalpine Iapodes has been preserved in the name of settlements in the Roman period. Appian’s name of the community Avendeatae is present in different variants in different sources (Strabo, 4. 6. 10; It. Ant. 274. 1; Anon. Rav. 4. 22; Tab. Peut. 4. 2).
  \item \textsuperscript{22} App. Ill. 11. 30–33.
\end{itemize}
– was Metulum.23 Appian even calls it the capital of the Iapodes.24 This seems to be a strong political centre to which a larger number of Iapodian communities, called the Metulans by Appian, gravitated. It is not uncommon to identify the political and cultural centre with the name of the community. Similarly, we can again offer an example of Delminium for which Strabo says that it is the town after which the Delmatae got their name.25 Apart from Appian, this ethnic centre of the communities that inhabited the northern Iapodian territory is also mentioned by Dio and Strabo.26 The texts of Appian and Dio clearly show that it is a large hillfort with a large number of people with a good military organisation.27 An important piece of information is that there was a city hall in Metulum. Appian clearly indicates that this building was symbolic because women and children were kept there. The guards who protected the city hall were ordered to burn it if the Romans ever won.28 It is difficult to ascertain today what was actually this city hall mentioned by Octavian in his memoirs and quoted by Appian. It seems to be a larger building that did not have to be used for the purposes for which the city hall was usually used in Rome. However, this place or this building probably had a certain political and religious meaning only for the citizens of Metulum, not for the entire alliance. The existence of such a building suggests that this was a larger settlement, but we do not know much about a political alliance in which the indigenous community from Metulum played an important role.

Nevertheless, it is indisputable that Metulum was important for the identity of the entire Iapodian alliance. We can observe this in a dramatic description of its siege and capture as described by Octavian in his memoirs and subsequently adopted by Appian. Following the fall of Metulum, other Iapodian communities surrendered to Octavian like a domino effect.29 However, this does not mean that all of the Iapodes surrendered, but only the communities that were part of the alliance gathered around Metulum.

The existence of an alliance of communities or civitates is also confirmed through Appian’s information that the Poseni, who were conquered together with other communities from the so-called Transalpine alliance, rebelled following Octavian’s departure.30 This data clearly indicates that this was a loose alliance founded on the fight against a common enemy. The relationship with Rome shown by the Poseni speaks of the lack of an alliance as an instance of decision-making of a permanent nature.31 The uprising of the Poseni corroborates the existence of a fragmentary used Roman terminology for certain phenomena among indigenous communities. Džino and Domić Kunić gave an example of Caesar’s The Gallic Wars in which indigenous political constructs are “translated” into the Roman political system (Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 69).

23 App. Ill. 19. 54.
24 Strabo. 7. 5. 5. 315.
25 Cass. Dio. 49. 35; Strabo. 4. 6. 10.
27 App. Ill. 21. 59–60. There is a different interpretation of Appian’s term of the city hall (bouleuterion, βουλευτήριον) in Metulum. Older historiography has a hypothesis that the city hall in Metulum was a place of gathering of the leaders of the Iapodian communities (Alföldy 1965, 169). Čače, nevertheless, believes that there are no sufficient arguments for this hypothesis. He also concluded that Metulum is not the capital of the Iapodes (caput Iapodum) because the leaders of the Iapodian communities gathered here. In fact, he believes that Metulum was named the capital because it was the political and cultural centre of the Metulans who were the largest and the most powerful community in that period (Čače 1979, 74, 76). Olujić noted the possibility that the city hall was the centre of the Metulans community as well as the place of council and gathering of all Iapodian leaders (Olujić 2007, 95). Džino and Domić Kunić concluded that we should be critical of Appian’s mention of the city hall because he was an outside observer. The information comes from Octavian’s memoirs in which the author often
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identity of the Iapodes. In this case, the Poseni did not only act independently against Rome but against their own alliance who had to make a certain deal with Rome while surrendering.

In their imperial strategy or provincial politics, the Romans treated the Iapodian alliance as a single peregrine civitas. However, this does not mean that the fragmentary identities have disappeared, as observed in the example of boundary stones. One boundary stone with a carved name of a possible Iapodian community was discovered. Namely, the inscription discovered near Begovaća spring above Kosinjški Bakovac in Lika mentions the Ortoplinos who had a right of passage through the territory of the Parentinos to have access to a water source. The community named the Ortoplinos appears on a boundary stone from Jablanac near Senj where it is mentioned in the context of bordering with the Beci. The aforementioned Ortoplinos and alliances such as the Delmatian alliance and the Iapodes (Džino 2014, 222).

The question of the location of this community remains open (Olujić 2007, 97). Mayer and Wilkes assume that the Iapodes lived in the Una river valley, while Šašel Kos located this community in Lika (Mayer 1959, 251; Wilkes 1969, 51, 154–155; Šašel Kos 2005, 437). Olujić believes that the Iapodes from the Una River valley lived on the periphery of the Iapodian alliance. He concluded that Octavian did not wage war in this valley because the communities that lived there were not perceived as a threat to Aquileia (Olujić 2007, 200). However, a rich cultural heritage of the Iapodes from the Una River valley implies the existence of a numerous and powerful civitas. He did not dismiss the possibility of numerous communities. Therefore, it is not impossible that the Poseni were a community on the periphery of the Transalpine Iapodian alliance, i.e., that they inhabited the Una River valley in northwest Bosnia. On the other hand, if this community inhabited the region of Lika, it means that the Iapodian communities from the Una River valley were subdued during Tiberius’s Pannonian war (Bellum Pannonicum) or the Great Illyrian Revolt (Bellum Batonianum). This is less likely since Appian noted that all of the Iapodes surrendered after the conquest of Metulum, including the Iapodes from the Una River valley (App. Ill. 21. 61). After reading Dio’s description of the siege of Raetinium located this community in Lika, he means that the Iapodian communities from the Una River valley were defeated during the Great Illyrian Revolt, we get the impression that the defenders of Raetinium were familiar with the Roman military tactics, meaning they had already waged war against the Romans (Cas. Dio. 56. 11).

Ex conventione finis / inter Ortoplinos et Parentinos adiutus ad aquam / vivam Ortoplinis passus (Džino 2014, 222). According to Pliny the Elder, the Iapodes were a peregrine civitas that belonged to the Conventus Scardonitanus headquartered in Scardona in present-day Skradin. The text of Pliny the Elder shows us that, apart from the Iapodes, another fourteen Liburnian civitates were under Scardonitanus jurisdiction.

The position of the Iapodes in Conventus Scardonitanus

According to Pliny the Elder, the Iapodes were a peregrine civitas that belonged to the Conventus Scardonitanus headquartered in Scardona in present-day Skradin. The text of Pliny the Elder shows us that, apart from the Iapodes, another fourteen Liburnian civitates were under Scardonitanus jurisdiction.

The nation of the Liburni adjoins the river Arsia, and extends as far as the river Titus. The Mentores, the Hymani, the Encheleae, the Buni, and the people whom Callimachus calls the Alutae, Flanates from whom the Gulf takes its name, the Lopsi, Varvarini, Immunesque Asserates, et ex insulis Fertinates, Curricattae (Plin. HN 3.139). The nation of the Liburni adjoins the river Arsia, and extends as far as the river Titus. The Mentores, the Hymani, the Encheleae, the Buni, and the people whom Callimachus calls the Alutae, Flanates from whom the Gulf takes its name, the Lopsi, Varvarini, Immunesque Asserates, et ex insulis Fertinates, Curricattae (Plin. HN 3.139).
the jurisdiction of this convent. The number of Liburnian civitates (four of which are named) is a clear indicator that not all Liburnians belonged to Conventus Scardonitanus. It is possible that these fourteen civitates mentioned along with the lapodes, were the least developed Liburnian communities, somewhat similar to the lapodes, in terms of culture and civilisation. Čače assumes that the Roman administration joined these Liburnian communities to the lapodes although they were different from other Liburnians because they did not live in the coastal area or on the island and did not have benefits such as *ius Italicum*. The lapodes and these fourteen Liburnian civitates were probably under a stronger military administration during the first decades of the 1st century. If we observe the Narona and Salona conventi, it is clear that they were created primarily for tax control and jurisdiction control over the peregrine civitates in the inland of Dalmatia. Similar conclusions can be made for the Scardona conventus.

Although Pliny the Elder mentions the names of these districts in Dalmatia (Scardonitanus, Salonitanus, Naronitanus) as adjectives derived from the names of towns that were the centre of the conventus, there are indications that the conventus whose centre was in Scardona was named after the Liburnians. Namely, recent research suggests that this convent was named *conventus Liburnorum* during the Flavian dynasty. This would mean that the centre of jurisdiction of the lapodes during the Flavian dynasty changed its name with regard to the name from the period of the reign of Augusts as recorded by Pliny.

Earlier research was noticeably focused on the issue of the census of the Liburnians in Conventus Scardonitanus, while the Iapodes were mentioned only sporadically in this context. However, there must be a logical explanation as to why the lapodes belonged to the same conventus with fourteen Liburnian civitates. To come to certain conclusions regarding this problem, we must first analyse the source itself. It is assumed that Pliny the Elder used three main sources for describing Dalmatia – the works of Roman polymath Marcus Terentius Varro, the Map of Agrippa, and official provincial documents (*formulae provinciarum*). Pliny noted that Varro claimed that there were 89 civitates in the Narona conventus. This piece of information probably refers to the period when Varro visited Illyricum because of the wars with the Delmatae (78–76 BC) and the number of communities (civitates) was significantly smaller during the Early Principate. This is also corroborated by Pliny’s list of communities of the Narona conventus which contains a much smaller number of civitates. Therefore, we can assume that Pliny the Elder used *formulae provinciarum* for the list of civitates in the Dalmatian conventus. Scholars believe that *formulae provinciarum* for Dalmatia were created during the Late Republic when the province of Illyricum was established and that they were only supplemented during the Julio-Claudian dynasty. However, these additions were not insignificant and minor. *Formulae provinciarum* had to be changed after Tiberius’s campaign or *Bellum Pannonicum* (11–9 BC) when the Romans, officially, for the first time conquered the south Pannonian or north Dalmatian communities. Following *Bellum Batonianum*, Illyricum was divided into two military regions – Dalmatia and Pannonia. That was certainly reflected on the content of *formulae provinciarum*.

Comparably to research from Hispania, we can conclude that the establishment of capitals of *conventus* and territories was the exclusive privilege of the emperor, not imperial (provincial)
The censuses in Illyricum, i.e., in Dalmatia and Pannonia, were enumerated in three different ways. It is important to note that the Iapodes were surrounded by the communities which differed by the method of enumeration. The Iapodian assumed territory in the north bordered with the Pannonian communities for which Pliny the Elder also did not give any numerical data as he did for the peregrine civitates in the conventi of Narona and Salona. However, one 14th-century epigraphic monument suggests that the Pannonian communities were divided into gentes and centuriae. This is a well-known cenotaph of a boy from the Amantini. Apart from the name of the peregrine civitas, the monument reveals that the boy originates from the second centuria (centuria secunda) and gens Undius. Some scholars interpreted that the monument indicates that the Pannonian communities were divided into many centuriae that comprised a single gens. Many gentes comprised of a single Pannonian civitas. That was, in a certain way, an equivalent to Dalmatian civitates divided into decuriae. Centuriae and decuriae are founded on the decimal numerical system and these terms were used in military and civil contexts to approximately define the number of a group of people. On the other hand, there are opinions that the term centuria on the inscription dedicated to the boy from the Amantini refers to hostages, meaning that the boy was a military hostage who was surrendered to the Romans after Bellum Batonianum as a guarantee of surrender. In this case, centuria secunda would mean a group of hostages the boy belonged to, whereas the term gente Undius could refer to a prominent family the boy came from. However, we should have in mind that Appian suggested that, during Octavian’s conquest, the Paeones were organized by kinship corresponding to the term of gens. The Romans probably kept that

---

Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 562.


Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 565–572.

40 One monument from present-day Lebanon (the Roman province of Syria) mentions that Vibius Crispus was the governor of the province of Hispaniae Citerioris between AD 72 and 74 (legatus Augusti pro praetore) and was tasked to conduct a census (censibus accipientis) (AE 1939, 0860 = AE 1951, 0237 = AE 1949, p. 16 s. n. 24 = AE 1940, 0128 = AE 2001, 1993 = EDH 022485 = EDCS-1500129). The inscription censor convenus Caesar Augustani can also be dated during the Flavian dynasty (Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 573–574).

41 One of the largest changes was the official division of Illyricum into two provinces, Dalmatia and Pannonia (Šačić Beča 2022b, 102–104).
division even after the establishment of the provincial government because it did not interfere with their concept of administration. They could simply split rebellious gentes into different civitas and thus prevent their mutual anti-Roman activities. It is difficult to ascertain whether these gentes were divided into centuriae because literary sources share no data about this. However, we should have in mind that gentes do not always have an equal number of members, meaning that the Romans had to standardize their census, so they divided the gentes they encountered into centuriae. When it comes to the Iapodes, having in mind their geographic connection with the Paeones, one possibility is that the Iapodian civitas was divided into gentes or centuriae.

The supposed Iapodian territory bordered the indigenous communities from the conventus of Salona. As previously mentioned, Pliny the Elder mentions the number of decuriae for this community, unlike for the Iapodes. Historiography offers different theses about what could decuriae represent. Older literature associated decuriae with patriarchal, pre-Roman organisation, i.e., they represented certain communities of relatives (gentes). Some scholars, such as Wilkes, assume that decuriae represent some sort of local “kinship groups” which the Romans did not abolish, but incorporated into their administrative system. Apart from defining the term decuria, regional historiography tends to specify the number of persons in one decuria. However, it is likely that the number of one decuria cannot be specified, which means that it remains an open question. This is undoubtedly an important statistical question, however, it is less likely that we will have a precise answer in the future. By sharing the number of decuriae, Pliny the Elder helped us gain an insight into the size of a certain peregrine civitas. The lack of this piece of information for the Iapodes makes it difficult to make a comparison of their size with other communities from their surroundings.

Unlike the issue of the number of members of a decuria, we are much closer to the answer to the question about the character of decuriae. These units were formed by the Romans based on their tax and administrative needs. Having in mind that decuriae have an administrative character, it is wrong to conclude that they originated in the pre-Roman period. Indigenous communities did not achieve the level of cultural and historical development for the establishment of smaller units organised in such a way to be implemented in the Roman administrative system. Provincial...
administration built a system that enabled it to achieve the goals of the Empire in terms of tax and military policy. We can assume that the decuriae system encompassed the inland communities treated as imperial periphery. It is likely that the Romans did not treat the Liburnians and Iapodes as imperial periphery and thus enumerated them differently.

When it comes to the census of the Iapodes, we can assume that they were enumerated according to the number of civitates in their own conventus like the Liburnians. Literary source analysis has shown that the Romans distinguished different identities and fragmentary character of the Iapodian alliance in indirect and direct communication. The Romans clearly differentiated e.g. the Arupini from the Moentini, who were neighbouring communities, according to Appian’s description, gathered in an anti-Roman alliance. This alliance had geographical and cultural character rather than an ethnical one. It is obvious that large indigenous civitates, such as the Delmatae or Iapodes, from the period of the conquest, represent complex political alliances of regional elites that belong to similar cultural traditions. The different methods of population census in Dalmatian conventi should be observed through the perspective of Roman imperial policy because Rome had established the boundaries which it seemed the most appropriate for the operation of provincial administration. The case of Hispania is one example. In some parts of Hispania, without a developed urban way of life, ethno-territorial units appear in the population census. In the context of the Scardona conventus, civitates were the smaller ethno-territorial communities among the Iapodes. We can assume that Pliny emphasised that fourteen Liburnian civitates were under the jurisdiction of the Scardona conventus because other Liburnians were enumerated differently. On the other hand, all Iapodian civitates were enumerated in the same way so Pliny mentioned a generic name the Iapodes regardless of the number of communities. Pliny’s piece of information that refers to the Scardona conventus could be interpreted as a conventus under whose jurisdiction there were fourteen Liburnian civitates and all Iapodian civitates. Although the source does not share specific data about the number of Iapodian civitates, judging by the fact that Graeco-Roman authors know by name a certain number of communities that made up the Iapodian alliance, we can assume that apart from the Liburnians and Delmatae, the Iapodes were the most numerous peregrine civitas in the Roman administrative census. In the context of the peregrine civitates, the term “the Iapodes” should be understood as a term that was adopted from the period of the Roman conquests. The term that the Romans used in the 1st century AD for the alliance of indigenous communities of Lika, Ogulin-Plaški valley, and Pounje, became a term to signify one peregrine civitas during the reign of Augustus.

The Iapodian civitates from the Una River valley as an example of a separate geopolitical development and cultural identity during the Principate

The period of the first Roman emperors was marked by large-scale changes in Illyricum. When he was proclaimed as the princeps in 27 BC, one of the first decisions Octavian made was to make Illyricum the senatorial province. However, Octavian soon realized that Illyricum was very important to him due to its proximity to Italy. Judging from Dio’s text, this was the reason why Illyricum was soon re-included in the imperial provinces governed by legates (legatus Augusti pro praetor). Placing Illyricum under the administration of legates could be associated with Agrippa’s and Tiberius’s military campaigns in Pannonia after which the northern provincial borders were significantly extended. However, the administration in the province of Illyricum had many flaws which led to the Great Illyrian Revolt or Bellum Batonianum (AD 6–9). This large military rebellion of the indigenous population in Illyricum is one of the causes of the subsequent division of the province of Illyricum into Dalmatia and Pannonia. The aforementioned

63 Džino 2014, 222.
64 Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 575.
65 Cass. Dio. 53. 12. 4–8; Liv. 34. 4, 3. 25.
67 Šačić Beća 2022b, 91.
changes that took place under the Julio-Claudian dynasty had to reflect on the Iapodes as well. The Early Empire administrative changes were conditioned by military activities. This is likely the reason why only the northern Liburnian communities joined the Iapodes in the Scardona conventus. We can assume that these were the Liburnian communities who did not enjoy the trust of the Roman administration. Therefore, like the Iapodes, the aforementioned fourteen Liburnian civitates had to have stronger military control. Thus, a single military administration for the Iapodes and fourteen Liburnian communities was created. A sort of witness to this is the fragmentary epigraphic monument from Verona.68 The text of the aforementioned inscription from Verona implies that the Iapodian and Liburnian troops were hired as auxiliary units of the Roman army during the aforementioned Bellum Batonianum.69 It is particularly important that these Iapodian and Liburnian troops had a common commander, suggesting that there was a common military administration.

Despite the common administration, the example of Bellum Batonianum clearly shows that the Iapodes were not coherent in political terms during the Early Empire. Namely, the Iapodes in northwest Bosnia obviously supported the rebels since Cassius Dio mentions that Germanicus quelled the Iapodian Raetinium in the final year of the rebellion.70 Dio ś text reveals that Raetinium was in the Una River valley. Namely, Germanicus set forth from Siscia because the Roman headquarters was in that town so it is logical to expect conflicts in the regions gravitating toward Siscia.71 Moreover, the information that, on his way to Raetinium, Germanicus first destroyed Splonum, located in the Unac valley (the tributary of the Una River), suggests that

68 CIL 05, 3346.
69 There are different opinions when it comes to the inscription from Verona. While analysing the inscription (CIL 05, 3346), Suđ presented a hypothesis that Liburnia and Japydia shared a common destiny, as one unit separate from the provincial administration centred in Salona. Namely, Suđ believes that the Liburnians and Iapodes did not take part in Bellum Batonianum, instead their territories were organised as cordon sanitaire for the protection of eastern Italian borders (Suđ 1992, 55, 63). The second thesis is that the term [--- bella] Batonio from the Verona inscription can be observed separately from the term praefecti civitatum. It is possible that Bellum Batonianum is mentioned in the context of the military merits of the person to whom the monument was erected (Giunio / Cesarić / Sturnej 2018, 199). Moreover, Cače and Milivojević believe that Liburnia and Japydia were “regions” within the province of Illyricum. These authors also find indisputable that Liburnia and Japydia were comprised of different units of homogenous status. The inscription from Verona confirms that Liburnia and Japydia cannot be considered indigenous entities that fit into Illyricum. Cače and Milivojević define them as districts that were part of a provincial system and believe that Pliny recognised their regional demarcations (Cače / Milivojević 2017, 441–442, Milivojević 2021, 226). However, except Suđ’s analysis of the Verona inscription, there are no other arguments to support the hypothesis about a separate administration in the territory of the Liburnians and Iapodes during the rebellion. Moreover, Diō’s information that Germanicus waged war against the Iapodes in Raetinium suggests, nevertheless, that they took part in Bellum Batonianum (Cass. Dio. 56, 11–12).

70 Germanicus in the meantime captured Splonum among other places in Dalmatia, in spite of the fact that it occupied a site well fortified by nature, was well protected by walls, and had a vast number of defenders. Consequently he had been unable to make any headway either with engines or by assaults; but he took it as the result of the following incident. Pusio, a German horseman, hurled a stone against the wall and so shoot the parapet that it immediately fell and dragged down with a man who was leaning against it. At this the rest became alarmed and in their fear abandoned that part of the wall and ran up to the citadel; and later they surrendered both the citadel and themselves. From there the troops of Germanicus came to Raetinium, but did not fare so well here. For the enemy, overwhelmed by their numbers and unable to withstand them, set fire of their own accord to the encircling wall and to the houses adjoining it, contriving, however, to keep it so far as possible from blazing up at once and to make it go unnoticed for some time; after doing this they retired to the citadel. The Romans, ignorant of what they had done, rushed in after them, expecting to sack the whole place without striking a blow; thus they got inside the circle of fire, and, with their minds intent upon the enemy, saw nothing of it until they were surrounded by it on all sides. Then they found themselves in the direst peril, being pelted by the men from above and injured by the fire from without. They could neither remain where they were safely nor force their way out anywhere without danger. For it they stood out of range of the missiles, they were scorched by the fire, or, if they leaped back from the flames, they were destroyed by the missiles; and some who got caught in a tight place perished from both causes at once, being wounded on one side and burned on the other. The majority of those who had rushed into the town met this fate; but some few escaped by casting corpses into the flames and making a passage for themselves by using the bodies as a bridge. The fire gained such headway that even those on the citadel could not remain there, but abandoned it in the night and hid themselves in subterranean chambers. These were the operations at that point. (Translated into English by Earnest Cary.) Cass. Dio. 56, 11–12.
71 Mesihović 2009, 16.
Raetinium should be located in the Una River valley in northwest Bosnia.\footnote{Bojanovski 1974, 216; 218; 1988, 255; Kos / Šašel Kos 1995, 295–296; Zaninović 2015, 447; Šačić Beća 2018, 117.}

The description of the resistance of the local population against Germanicus’s troops shows that Raetinium was a typical Illyrian hillfort settlement with a bailey, mostly a settlement zone, and a citadel, a type of hillfort seat built on an elevation.\footnote{Cass. Dio. 56.11–12; Bojanovski 1988, 310; Olujić 2007, 199–200; Mesilović 2009, 16; 2011a, 386.} Raetinium was evidently an important and well-fortified Iapodian centre because Dio claims that the Romans suffered casualties there. Namely, the insurgents used the possibility provided by the home ground and defence system. By defending Raetinium, they set a fire in the bailey and retreated to the citadel where they threw fire missiles at Germanicus’s army. Dio does not specify whether Germanicus conquered Raetinium. However, it is reasonable to assume that Germanicus conquered this Iapodian settlement because he continued his operation toward Seretion. The location of Seretion is unknown, but it is assumed that it was located between the Dinaric watershed and the Sava River.\footnote{Kos / Šašel Kos, 1995, 301.} We should note that apart from Dio, Raetinium is not mentioned by other classical authors. Bojanovski believes that this settlement was developed into an important agglomeration during the Roman period, more specifically after Octavian’s war (35–33 BC). During the pre-Roman period, it was an oppidum like numerous others in the Una River valley.\footnote{Kos / Šašel Kos 1995, 301.} Similar to Metulum, Raetinium was probably a powerful political centre of one of the Iapodian communities. However, the settlement became more important for the wider Iapodian population as the result of Germanicus’s military campaign. Therefore, the common peril of waging war against the Romans resulted in the Iapodian communities choosing Pounje, Raetinium, the best-fortified settlement, as their defensive stronghold.

With the help of numerous epigraphic and archaeological finds, most scholars agree that Raetinium should be located in Golubić near Bihać.\footnote{Bojanovski 1988, 315.} In the second half of the 1st century, this indigenous community settlement became the administrative centre of the municipium of the same name as confirmed by an epitaph from AD 74 discovered in Germany.\footnote{CIL 13, 07023.} Bojanovski assumes that the territory of this municipium encompassed the territory between Pješevica and Kapela in the west, Petrova Gora in the north, and Grmeć in the northeast.\footnote{Bojanovski 1988, 312–313.} It is not uncommon for the settlements of the indigenous population, which had a long continuity of habitation and represented a certain ethnical centre during the Roman government, to get a municipal status. We can find analogous examples in other Iapodian settlements such as the Arupini whose municipal position is corroborated by epigraphic inscriptions.

Administrative organisation and cultural-historic development of municipium Raetinium

The Iapodes were one of the indigenous civitates under the administration of military prefeci during the military administration in Dalmatia in the first half of the 1st century. Such a type of administration is corroborated by the previously mentioned inscription from Verona and a fragment of an inscription from Privilica near Bihać mentioning praefectus civitatis.\footnote{Bojanovski as Bojanovski 1988, 312–313; Lintott 1993, 73; Ardevan 2005, 3346; Patsch 1898, 333–334; Bojanovski 1988, 313; Olujić 2007, 200.} They represented the occupier in the territory of a certain conquered community. Praefecti civitatum were military officers, usually legion centurions or commanders of auxiliary units, who were in charge of tax collection. These officers were appointed as the leaders of smaller integrated peregrine communities with still non-Romanized elites.\footnote{Kos / Šašel Kos 1995, 301.} Olujić believes that the Iapodes had a prefectoral administration due to the immense importance of the territory in terms of important transit roads towards Siscia and the sea.\footnote{Olujić 2007, 200.} Since praefecti civitatum appear in Dalmatia among the Maetzei and Daesitae, who were also prominent participants of the Bellum Batonianum like the Iapodes, we should not dismiss the possibility that the prefectoral administration was present...
among the peoples who were dangerous for the Roman government in the province. In support of this thesis is the fact that there were also rebellious civitates from Pannonia under the administration of praefecti civitatum. This is corroborated by a newly discovered inscription from Varazdinske Toplice (Aquae Balissae) mentioning that the Scordisci, Breuci, and Jasi had a military administration in the 1st century. Based on the testimony of Roman authors, we know that the alliances of the Breuci and Scordisci were a major obstacle to the Romans in their conquest of southeast Pannonia.

Following the establishment of the Roman government, local elites were Roman allies who helped the Romans to better control the conquered population. We do not know much about the local elites that existed during the Early Empire and we can assume that they participated in three forms of interaction – the fight for power between the elite and other segments of society, the relations between the regional elite, and the cooperation of the elite with the Romans. The elite in the peregrine civitates who lived at the periphery of provincial government, such as the inland of Dalmatia, had the biggest influence. This is shown by the inscriptions mentioning the peregrine civitates of the Daesitiae, Docleatae, Delmatae, and Maezaei. The Iapodes were also one of the peregrine civitates whose principes were mentioned in inscriptions. The complexity of identity of the indigenous population led to having several local leaders, principes, within one peregrine civitas. It remains unanswered whether the Iapodian principes, mentioned in the inscriptions from Golubić, were the leaders of smaller communities that used to comprise the Iapodian alliance or the Iapodian settlements castella, pagi, or even municipia since such cases were corroborated among the Docleatae and Delmatae. Classical sources, nevertheless, suggest that in the case of the Iapodes, they were the leaders of smaller civitates. Namely, there is no evidence about a prominent individual identity of smaller communities among the Docleatae and Delmatae as we do have for the Iapodes in Appian’s description of Octavian’s campaign. The fact that all inscriptions were discovered in one site at the source of the Privilica River near Golubić supports this idea. At this site, local community leaders from the Una River made sacrifices to a local deity thus confirming their connection with the local community. The association of the Iapodian elite and the deity revered by a wider community is an indication of their connection with that community and not the administration of some castella, pagi, or municipia. The principes whose inscriptions were discovered at the shrine of a local deity of water were probably the representatives of local Iapodian elites from the Una River valley, not of all Iapodes.

The votive altars discovered at the shrine of Bindus near Golubić revealed the existence of another administrative function among the Iapodes – praepositus. Praepositus appear as the dedicators on four preserved monuments in honour of Bindus. We should note that the Iapodes were the only ones from the inland of the Roman province of Dalmatia who have the title of praepositus. Scholars have different opinions about the role of praepositus in local administration. Since all inscriptions mentioning praepositus can be dated to the end of the 1st or the 2nd century, Patsch believes that praepositus changed prefects after the departure of legions from Dalmatia. On the other hand, Bojanovski believes that praepositus were elected during the period when the Iapodes were transitioning from prefectural administration to self-governance. Therefore, Bojanovski concluded that praepositus were executive bodies under the supervision
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of Roman prefects, elected from the members of local aristocracy. Although the term praepositus is associated with military administration, in this specific example these were obviously local leaders.

Everything suggests that praepositum, like principes, were elected from domestic, local elites. There are numerous arguments to support this thesis. One praepositus Licinius Teuda was not a Roman citizen. He is also titled as princeps of the lapodes, a function that could not be carried out by a foreigner. Apart from him, another praepositus was at the same time the leader (princeps) of the lapodes – Titus Flavius [--]ditanus. The monument of the latter reads that he was granted Roman citizenship by Emperor Vespasian.

The question is how could praepositum be principes at the same time? Scholars have different opinions regarding this problem. First of all, Patsch, Bojanovski, and Rendić-Miočević believe that several principes comprise a certain council of domestic aristocracy, whereas the title of praepositus was carried out by one person. They also believe that the council of principes probably elected praepositus. Alföldy shared a similar opinion stating that the lapodes did not have one princeps, but that different principes were in charge of individual communities that comprised the peregrine civitas of the Iapodes. Contrary to Alföldy, Grbić believes that the Iapodian principes were in charge of Iapodian settlements (castella, pagi) and not separate Iapodian communities (civitas). She concluded that praepositum chaired a council that consisted of principes. On the other hand, Perinić associated the title of praepositus with the army based on an analysis of three Bindus’s monuments. She reminded that although Dalmatia had been provincia inermis or the province without a permanent military crew since AD 86, certain Roman units, mostly auxiliary cohorts and vexillations of the legions, still resided in Dalmatia. Moreover, there were numeri, i.e., military units that were not integrated into the regular army. Its members were local soldiers so these units had a pronounced autochthonous character in terms of language, culture, and uniforms. Interestingly, the officer titled praepositus commanded the smallest units in this military formation. The analyses of epigraphic monuments from Dacia, Britania, and Germany have shown that these units were commanded by locals from an indigenous community whose members were also members of that unit. Therefore, Perinić concluded that one person could be praepositus and princeps at the same time, because a member of a local elite, manifested through the title of princeps, could be a numeri officer. The connection between the Roman army and local elites is a logical sequence of events. Roman imperial policy was looking for a way to get the support of the elite of indigenous communities. Awarding military titles to leaders of indigenous communities was one of the methods of easily integrating the communities into the Roman provincial system. Since the persons titled praepositus probably had stronger ties with the Roman provincial administration, it is quite possible that Rome entrusted them with the administration in the principes council under the condition that such a council existed. However, if the council of principes existed, it certainly did not choose which of its members would bear the title of praepositus, because it was likely a military function that was chosen by the Romans. Moreover, we should not dismiss the possibility that the title of praepositus has nothing to do with the potential council of local leaders. The term praepositus on the inscriptions of the local elite from the Una River valley primarily appears as part of their personal cursus honorum.

The existence of a separate Iapodian community in northwest Bosnia is also corroborated by the cult of the god Bindus. Namely, traces of this cult have not been found anywhere else, so it is assumed that this deity was revered only among the Iapodian population from northwest Bosnia. Bindus was an old deity of springs and waters, venerated by the Iapodes in the Una River valley, which was identified with the Roman Neptune during the interpretatio
Romana process. The popularity of that cult in this part of the Roman province of Dalmatia is also shown by the fact that a temple of this deity was found at the source of the Privilica stream near Golubić in which eleven votive altars dedicated to the cult of Bindus were found.97 It does not have to mean that the title of praepositus, when it comes to the lapodes, was typical of the community which lived in northwest Bosnia. It is possible that members of other communities also held this title in the Roman provincial troops. Moreover, praepositus was not necessarily princeps. This is confirmed by two votive altars from Golubić dedicated by persons whose titles were praepositus. These monuments can be dated to the second half of the 1st century and the first half of the 2nd century.

However, the existence of administrative titles of praefecti civitatum and principes civitatum among the lapodes does not exclude the existence of a municipal organisation already in the 1st century AD.98 An inscription from Germany Superior, discovered in Zahlbach near Mainz, Germany, revealed that Raetinium was a municipium already during the reign of Vespasian (69–71).99 This is a tombstone of a horseman Andes from the ala Claudia dated to the AD 74 where it was carved that Andes was a citizen of Raetinium (cives Raetinio). Moreover, granting Roman citizenship to local aristocracy by Emperor Vespasian, which can be seen in the example of praepositus and principes of the lapodes, suggests the municipalisation of Raetinium during the reign of this Emperor. Under Vespasian, Dalmatia became a civil province so municipia were established for easier administration.

A votive altar to Licinius Galba, a beneficiarius consularis from Legio I Adiutrix is another indicator that Raetinium had a municipal status.100 The discovery of this inscription confirmed the existence of a station of beneficiarii consularis in Golubić. Interestingly, this beneficiarius consularis dedicated a monument to the Iapodian god Bindus in the 3rd century, suggesting that the local tradition and culture persisted long after the establishment of the Roman government. This local cult probably unofficially entered the cult of the Roman army in the Una River valley through the recruitment of local men.101 Inscriptions from Golubić and its surroundings recorded several local names such as Maxa, Pantadienus, and Turranius that appear in 3rd-century inscriptions as well.102 Judging by the onomastics, during the Roman period, this region was inhabited by persons of Celtic origin. Katičić believes that these were the settlers who inhabited the Una River valley after the establishment of the Roman government and he justifiably rejects Alföldy’s thesis that the population in the Una River valley was of Illyrian-Celtic origin.103 The presence of foreigners is also evident in the finds of votive monuments dedicated to Roman deities and the oriental cult of the god Mithra.104

The settlement of foreigners is an indicator of the economic prosperity of the municipium Raetinium during the Early Empire. This prosperity is conditioned by the fertile land in the vicinity of the mining district of northwest Bosnia. Golubić, as the administrative seat of the municipium, was also well-connected with Salona and Siscia by roads. During this exploration, Bojanovski concluded that Golubić was found on the route of the road that went from Burnum to Siscia. Moreover, a crossroad that connected Salona with the inland was located in Burnum.105 The road near Golubić or Raetinium was the final section of Dolabella’s road recorded in the Solin inscription – ad imum montem Ditionum Ulciriun.106 Although this road was not recorded on itineraries, it was corroborated by numerous milestones discovered in situ.107 We can conclude that Raetinium was an important municipal centre at the far east of the territory that belonged
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to the powerful Iapodian alliance during the pre-Roman period.

Final considerations

Literary sources suggest that the Romans recognized fragmentary identities of the communities that made the Iapodian alliance during their conquests. This alliance was, like the Dalmatian one, formed for the defence against the common enemy. We can assume that the Iapodian communities were grouped into smaller alliances based on geographic connection. During Octavian’s conquests (35–33 BC), the sources mention different positions of the Iapodian communities depending on their settlement around the Velika and Mala Kapela. Since the Romans called this mountain range the Alps, contemporary literature uses the terms *Cisalpine Iapodes* and *Transalpine Iapodes*. The names of numerous Iapodian *civitates* have been preserved from the period of Octavian’s campaign: *Moentini, Avendeatae, Aurupini,* and *Poseni*. Two settlements are also mentioned – *Terponus* and *Metulum*, whereas one boundary stone revealed a community named the *Parentinos*. In terms of identity, it is especially important that Appian mentions Metulum as the capital of all Iapodes. In older historiography, Appian’s statement was taken literally. A new methodological approach to the analysis of literary sources suggests that this was a large hillfort, instead of a capital of the Iapodian alliance in a political sense. Good strategic position and defence infrastructure resulted in smaller local communities gravitating towards Metulum. Appian even mentions a city hall in Metulum which is, in fact, an example of the use of inadequate Roman terminology for a building of an indigenous population. This was a building which was not used like a city hall in Rome. This building possibly had a political or religious meaning only for the citizens of Metulum, not the entire alliance. Moreover, archaeological research suggests different cultural heritage and the existence of a fragmentary identity at the assumed territory of the Iapodes. All of this leads us to conclude that the Iapodes represent a generic name of communities that formed a loose anti-Roman alliance during the wars against the Romans. Following the establishment of their government, the Romans merged the Iapodian communities into one *peregrine civitas* and adjusted them to their provincial system.

In his *Naturalis Historia*, Pliny the Elder wrote that the Iapodes were one of the fourteen Liburnian *civitates* under the jurisdiction of *Conventus Scardonitanus*. We can assume that the Iapodes, like the Liburnians with whom they were under the jurisdiction of *Conventus Scardonitanus*, were enumerated by the number of *civitates* unlike the communities from the Narona and Salona *conventus* who were enumerated by the number of *decuria*. Unlike other indigenous communities in Dalmatia, the Romans did not treat the Liburnians and Iapodes as an imperial periphery, so they enumerated them differently. It is important to note that a new epigraphic monument (*AE* 2015, 082) implies that the name of the *conventus* was changed to *conventus Liburnorum* during the Flavian dynasty.

Together with the Liburnians, the Iapodes were under the military administration (*CIL* 05, 3346), which is not unusual for the communities that showed the strongest resistance towards the Romans. Such a form of administration was also present among other communities in Pannonia and Dalmatia. However, in the context of fragmentary identities of the Iapodes, it is important to emphasise that the communities from Lika were loyal to the Romans during *Bellum Batonianum*, whereas the communities from the Una River valley were rebellious indigenous communities. Dio left us the data that the Iapodes showed significant resistance towards Germanicus from their fort *Raetinium*, located in Golubić near Bihać. The most representative pieces of evidence about the Iapodian elites during the Early Empire originate from the same territory. The elites were Roman allies and helped the Romans to easily control the conquered population. The members of the Iapodian elite had two titles – *princeps* and *praepositus*. Classical source analysis and the results of archaeological explorations suggest that *principes* who appear in inscriptions from Golubić were local leaders of smaller *civitates*, not the entire Iapodian *peregrine civitas*. The title *praepositus* can be associated with the military. These were probably the leaders of local communities or *principes* who were probably the leaders of *numeri* units. These units were usually composed of members of the same
indigenous communities who were not Roman citizens. *Principes* who were *praeposium* at the same time possibly had a stronger influence in the community as they enjoyed the affectation of Roman provincial authority. Therefore, it is possible that representatives of the elite with the title of *praepositus* were at the head of the council of Iapodian *principes*, provided that the council existed. Like other settlements of the indigenous population, *Raetinium* became a Roman *munici-pium* in the 1st century. Finally, we can conclude that the Iapodes represent an excellent example which shows the complexity of the cultural and historical development of indigenous communities in the period of the Late Republic and the Early Principate.

Rezime

Geopolitički položaj i administrativna pripadnost Japoda u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji


Japodi su zajedno sa Liburnima bili pod vojnom upravom (CIL 05, 3346) što nije toliko neobičajeno za zajednice koje su Rimljana pružili jači otpor. Takav vid u prave imale su i druge zajednice u Panoniji i Dalmaciji. Međutim u kontekstu fragmetalnih identiteta Japoda važan je podatak da su zajednice iz Like bile odane Rimljanimu u periodu *Bellium Batonarium* dok su zajednice iz doline Velaše bili pod jurisdikcijom rimskih vojnih zajednica iz velike delimične prognoze. Dion nam je ostavio podatak da su Germaniku značajni odjeli za vrijeme Flavijeva naziv konventa *Reatinum* koji se locira u Golubiću kod Bihaća. Sa istog prostora potječu i najreprezentativniji dokazi o japodskim elitama u ranocarskom periodu. Elite su bile rimski saveznici koji su zapravo bili i zajednica koje su se bunele. Dion nam je ovo podatak da su Germaniku konvenuo u vrijednosti *Reatinum* koji se locira u Golubiću kod Bihaća. Sa istog prostora potječu i najreprezentativniji dokazi o japodskim elitama u ranocarskom periodu. Elite su bile rimski saveznici koji su zapravo bili i zajednica koje su se bunele.
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