

Geopolitical position and administrative affiliation of the Iapodes in the Roman province of Dalmatia¹

Amra Šaćić Beća
Sarajevo

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.

Key words: the Iapodes, alliance, *civitates*, identity, *Conventus Scardonitanus*, settlements, territory, elites, *principes*, *praepositum*, *Bindus*, *Raetinium*

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.² 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.³ 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.⁴ 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.

² Alföldy 1965, 40; Wilkes 1969, 158; Čović 1976, 134; Benac 1987, 778; Bojanovski 1988, 304; Šašel Kos 2005, 422; Olujić 2007, 200; Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 67–68.

³ Šašel Kos 2005, 422; Olujić 2007, 107–144; Milivojević 2021, 227.

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.⁵ 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 ethnic 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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸ Large regional differences are also observed among grave goods, as well as materials found outside of sepulchral context.⁹ 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.¹⁰ The Amber Road also significantly influenced the cultural development of the Iapodian communities that lived in the southwest during the Iron Age.¹¹ 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 koinè* region during the Iron Age.¹² Other Iapodian communities, such as the ones from the Una River valley, did not belong to the Adriatic cultural *koinè*. 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.¹³ 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

⁵ Olujić 2007, 107; Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 67–68; Hušeinović 2022, 168–171.

⁶ Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 68.

⁷ Balen-Letunić 2006, 34–35; Raunig 2004, 19.

⁸ Drechsler-Bižić 1987, 427; Raunig 2004, 19–20, 196–202.

⁹ Olujić 2007, 53–62; Blečić Kavur 2009a, 231–254; 2009b, 144.

¹⁰ Drechsler-Bižić 1970, 93–110; Balen-Letunić 2006, 31–32; Raunig 2004, 17.

¹¹ Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 68.

¹² Blečić Kavur 2009a, 235; 2009b, 144.

¹³ The information about the Iapodes that refer to older historical periods mostly uses a generic term. Analogy can be traced in the term the Illyrians used by Graeco-Roman authors when describing the events from Gentius's reign or the Illyrian kingdom.

by those on the heights and the other side of the mountain.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.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 considered the Velika and Mala Kapela to be an extension of the Alps as well as all of the Dinaric Alps.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.¹⁷ Contemporary literature uses the terms *Cisalpine Iapodes* and *Transalpine Iapodes* for these two alliances.¹⁸ Unlike Dio, Appian offered us a better insight in the structure of these alliances since he

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.

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*.

¹⁶ Šačić Beća 2022a, 124–125.

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 Marjeta Šašel Kos.

¹⁸ Šašel Kos 2005, 426–430; Džino 2010, 41; Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 68.

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.¹⁹ Appian mentions three communities by name – *Moentini*, *Avendeatae*, and *Aurupini*.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.²¹ Similarly, Appian describes the victory of Figulus against the Delmatae in 158 BC stating that the Delmatae from smaller settlements retreated to Delminium.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

¹⁹ Šašel Kos 2005, 426.

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 Marjeta Šašel Kos.

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).

²² App. Ill. 11. 30–33.

– 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

²³ Apart from Metulum, while describing the conflicts with the *Iapodes on the other side of the Alps*, Appian mentions another settlement – *Terponus* (App. *Ill.* 18. 53). Appian is the only source mentioning this settlement. Upon reading his description, we can conclude that this is a smaller and less fortified settlement than Metulum since its inhabitants had left it when the Roman army appeared. It is obvious that the local Iapodian community did not feel safe there. The mention of Terponus is important because this settlement named *πολις* by Appian was certainly the centre of one of the Iapodian communities. It is certainly another piece of evidence that the Iapodes were not a coherent community.

²⁴ App. *Ill.* 19. 54.

²⁵ Strabo, 7. 5. 5. 315.

²⁶ Cass. Dio. 49. 35; Strabo, 4. 6. 10.

²⁷ Olujić 1999/2000, 60–61.

²⁸ 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

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).

²⁹ App. *Ill.* 21. 61.

³⁰ App. *Ill.* 21. 61.

³¹ Čače rightfully emphasised that an independent fight of every community shows the lack of permanent common institutions. This independent battle confirms that there is no instance to which part of the sovereign rights of every community would be transferred (Čače 1979, 76–77). During the period of conquests, Rome's goal was to conquer, keep, and defend the imperial border zone. Džino noted that the existence of an imperial border zone accelerated the formation of secondary states, i.e., indigenous political

identity of the Iapodes.³² 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 Begovača spring above Kosinjski 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.³³ 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.³⁴ The aforementioned Ortoplinos and

alliances such as the Delmatian alliance and the Iapodes (Džino 2014, 222).

³² The question of the location of this community remains open (Olujčić 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). Olujčić 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 (Olujčić 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 in the Una River valley 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 (Cass. Dio. 56. 11).

³³ *Ex conventionione finis / inter Ortoplinos et Pare-/ntinos aditus ad aquam / vivam Ortoplinis pas(s)us⁵/D latus I (CIL 03, 15053 = AE 1901, 0230 = EDH 032922 = EDCS-30200440).*

³⁴ *Ex dec[r(eto)] / P(ubli) Cornel[i] / Do[[l]]label(l)ae / leg(a-ti) pr(o) pr(aetore) A[ug(usti)]⁵ / [-----] / -----int(er) Begos et Ortopli[n(os)] (ILJug 0919 = EDH 034587 = EDCS-10000930).*

Beci were recorded in the literary sources.³⁵ On the other hand, the inscription near Begovača spring is the only evidence of *civitas Parentinos*. The analysis of written sources indicates that the Ortoplinos and *Becos* should be associated with the Liburnian alliance.³⁶ However, their neighbours, the *Parentinos*, were part of the former Iapodian alliance. The location of the discovered inscriptions corroborates that all of the aforementioned *civitates* inhabited the Velebit region. The delimitation between the Parentini and Ortoplinos was the local demarcation that could have delimited two large alliances – Liburnian and Iapodian – during the pre-Roman period.

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.³⁷ The text of Pliny the Elder shows us that, apart from the Iapodes, another fourteen Liburnian *civitates* were under

³⁵ Plin. HN 140; Ptol. Geog. 2. 16; It. Ant. 274. 2; Anon. Rav. 4. 22; Anon. Rav. 4. 23; Rendić-Miočević 1968, 69–71; Imamović 1980, 48–51; Olujčić 2007, 206; Glavaš 2018, 20–21.

³⁶ Rendić-Miočević 1968, 71.

³⁷ *Arsiae gens Liburnorum iungitur usque ad flumen Tityum. Pars eius fuere Mentores, Himani, Encheleae, Bulini et quos Callimachus Peucetios appellat, nunc totum uno nomine Illyricum vocatur generatim. Populorum pauca effatu digna aut facilia nomina. Conventum Scardonitanum petunt Iapudes et Liburnorum civitates quattuordecim, ex quibus Lacinienses, Stulpinos, Burnistas, Olbonenses nominare non pigeat. Ius Italicum habent eo conventu Alutae, Flanates a quibus sinus nominatur, Lopsi, Varvarini, Immunesque Asseriates, et ex insulis Fertinates, Currictae (Plin. HN 3.139).*

The nation of the Liburni adjoins the river Arsia, and extends as far as the river Titus. The Mentores, the Himani, the Encheleae, the Buni, and the people whom Callimachus calls the Peucetiae, formerly formed part of it; but now the whole in general are comprised under the one name of Illyricum. But few of the names of these nations are worthy of mention, or indeed very easy of pronunciation. To the jurisdiction of Scardona resort the Iapydes and fourteen cities of the Liburni, of which it may not prove tedious if I mention the Lacinienses, the Stulpini, the Burnistae, and the Olbonenses. Belonging to the same jurisdiction there are, in the enjoyment of Italian rights, the Alutae, the Flanates, from whom the Gulf takes its name, the Lopsi, and the Varvarini; the Assesiates, who are exempt from tribute; and upon the islands, the Fertinates and the Curictae. (Translated into English by John Bostock and H. T. Riley.)

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 Iapodes, were the least developed Liburnian communities, somewhat similar to the Iapodes, in terms of culture and civilisation. Čaće assumes that the Roman administration joined these Liburnian communities to the Iapodes 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*.³⁸ The Iapodes 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.³⁹ This would mean that the centre of jurisdiction of the Iapodes during the Flavian dynasty changed its name with regard to the name from the period of the reign of Augustus 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 Iapodes 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*).⁴⁰ Pliny noted that Varro claimed that there were 89 *civitates* in the *Narona conventus*.⁴¹ 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 conventi*.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ Following *Bellum Batonianum*, Illyricum was divided into two military regions – Dalmatia and Pannonia.⁴⁵ 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)

³⁸ Čaće 1993, 6.

³⁹ By merging two fragments discovered in 1987/1988 and 2005, the text of a monument originally placed in the temple built during the reign of Emperor Titus in Scardona was reconstructed. Based on the analysis of the text of this monument and by taking into account all previous knowledge of the district imperial cult in Liburnia, Demicheli concluded that the name of the *conventus* in Scardona was *conventus Liburnorum*. The same author made a comparison of *conventus'* names in Hispanic provinces (Demicheli 2015, 93–104). The text of the inscription is the following:

Divo Augusto e[st] / divo Vespasian[o] / ex auctoritat[e] / [Imperatoris] T[iti] Caesaris divi Vesp[asian]i filii Vesp[asian]i] / [Augusti conventus Liburnorum] / Scardonis c[onsecravit(?)] (AE 2015, 1082 = EDH 072483 = EDCS-65000045).

⁴⁰ Domić Kunić 2004, 130–133; Čaće 2006, 73; Grbić 2014, 34.

⁴¹ Plin. *HN* 3. 132.

⁴² Domić Kunić 2004, 160.

⁴³ Domić Kunić 2006, 160; Džino 2014, 223.

⁴⁴ Domić Kunić 2006, 105–106; Džino / Domić Kunić 2013, 165–169; Šačić Beća 2022a, 42–43.

⁴⁵ Šačić Beća 2022b, 102–104.

governors and lower provincial officials.⁴⁶ The *conventi* in Hispania had a pronounced territorial and geographic dimension as suggested by epigraphic monuments.⁴⁷ Examples from Hispania also show that there was no single pattern for establishing *conventi*. In some cases, the identities of indigenous communities were taken into account. There are also examples where the criterion was the road connection between a community (*civitas*) and the centre of the *conventus*.⁴⁸ Epigraphic monuments corroborated that Vespasian used *coventus* to conduct the census of the population, not an ethnic unit.⁴⁹ Similar case must have happened in Dalmatia. Important administrative changes under Vespasian took place in the entire Empire.⁵⁰ The *conventus* to which the Iapodes belonged changed its name to *Conventus Liburnorum* under the reign of Vespasian. Using the examples from Hispania, we can conclude that the Iapodes belonged to this *conventus* as the result of geographical proximity to Scardona. This was the closest administrative centre to the Iapodes with access to the coast. All centres of Roman *conventi* had access to the coast because in this manner the inland communities were administratively connected to the coast or the Roman provincial administration. Unlike communities, or *peregrine civitates*, that were covered by the census in the *conventi* of Narona and Salona, the number of *decuriae* was not mentioned for the Iapodes.

The research founded on the analysis of Pliny's text from the third book of *Naturalis Historia*

⁴⁶ Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 562.

⁴⁷ AE 1984, 0553. (B) = AE 1987, 0561 = AE 1989, 0431–0432 = AE 1990, 0543 = AE 1997, 0862 = AE 2002, 0750 = HEp 1, 1989, 458 = HEp 3, 1993, 247 = HEp 7, 1997, 402 = HEp 4, 1994, 505 = EDH 002353 = EDCS08400327; AE 1972, 0282 = AE 1973, 0295 = AE 2016 + 00641 = EDH 009241 = EDCS-09700174; CIL 02, 4233; CIL 02 609; Pereira Menaut 1983; 1984.

⁴⁸ Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 565–572.

⁴⁹ 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 accipiendis*) (AE 1939, 0060 = AE 1951, 0237 = AE 1949, p. 16 s. n. 24 = AE 1940, 0128 = AE 2001, 1993 = EDH 022485 = EDCS-15000129). The *inscription censor convenus Caesaraugustani* can also be dated during the Flavian dynasty (Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 573–574).

⁵⁰ One of the largest changes was the official division of Illyricum into two provinces, Dalmatia and Pannonia (Šačić Beća 2022b, 102–104).

suggests that the indigenous communities 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.⁵¹ However, one 1st-century epigraphic monument suggests that the Pannonian communities were divided into *gentes* and *centuriae*.⁵² 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*.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ 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*.⁵⁶ The Romans probably kept that

⁵¹ Plin. HN 3. 147.

⁵² CIL 03, 03224 = EDH 074134.

⁵³ Mócsy 1957, 108; Domić Kunić 2003, 508–509; Grbić 2014, 224.

⁵⁴ Domić Kunić 2003, 508; Čače 2010, 62.

⁵⁵ Dušanić 1967, 69; Čače 2010, 63; Grbić 2014, 225–226, 301.

⁵⁶ ... *The country of the Paeones is wooded and extends from the Iapodes to the Dardanians. These Paeones did not live in cities, but rather according to clans throughout the countryside and in villages. They did not gather for consultation, nor*

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*.⁵⁷ 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*).⁵⁸ 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.⁵⁹ Apart from defining the term *decuriae*, regional historiography tends to specify the number of persons in one *decuria*.⁶⁰ However,

did they have collective leaders. The total of men capable of fighting was 100,000 but because of the absence of a common government, they were not united into a single unit (App. Ill. 22. Translated into English by Marjeta Šašel Kos).

⁵⁷ Domić Kunić noted that the term *centuria* is closely related to the term *decuriae*. It is possible that *centuria* represented an integral part of *decuriae* and had 15–20 persons (Domić Kunić 2003, 508). On the other hand, Čače accepted the definition of these terms in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* and concluded that the Romans called different groups of ten persons as *decuria* or a group of ten men, and groups of hundred persons as *centuria*. These terms were used in civil and military terminology in order to approximately estimate the size of a group of people (Čače 2010, 62).

⁵⁸ Patsch 1898, 335–364; Gabričević 1953, 114; Alföldy 1961, 307–319; Stipčević 1974, 164–165; Bojanovski 1988, 34.

⁵⁹ Wilkes 1969, 185.

⁶⁰ The first detailed paper that refers to the number of people that comprise one *decuria* was published by Gabričević in 1953 when writing about an inscription on a boundary stone from the vicinity of Vrlika (a small town in the Split-Dal-

matia County in Croatia) that marks a demarcation between two Delmatian communities (*ILJug 0758* (B) = EDH 034204 = EDCS-10000770). By combining topographic and ethnographic data with Pliny’s information about the number of Delmatian *decuriae*, Gabričević hypothetically concluded that one *decuriae* had 150–200 persons (Gabričević 1953). This conclusion influenced subsequent works of other scholars. When writing about indigenous communities in Dalmatia, scholars often use this hypothesis to suggest the number of certain indigenous communities such as the Ditiones, Delmatae, Daesitiates, Narensi, and others (Bojanovski 1975, 270; Suić 1976, 360; Čače 1979, 121; Domić Kunić 2003, 508; Šačić 2012, 100 fn. 30). More recently, the issue of *decuriae* was addressed mostly by Čače, Mesihović, and Grbić. However, Čače accepted Gabričević’s hypothesis in more recent papers, but rejected it in *Discripti in decurias* (Plin. NH. 3. 142–143) – *uređenje osvojenih područja pod Augustom* from 2010. In this paper, Čače concluded that a *decuriae* had 300–350 persons based on the analysis of the settlement of a territory where the *decuriae* system was recorded (Čače 2010, 76–77). Nevertheless, Mesihović defined *decuria* as a group of ten family communities with an obligation to pay taxes. Using mostly modern ethnographic and topographic data from Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Albania, Mesihović concluded that a *decuria* had 250 persons (Mesihović 2011b, 66–67; Mesihović 2018, 551–560). Unlike Čače and Mesihović, Grbić believes that the number of persons in one *decuria* cannot be defined, because, unlike Hispania, Pliny does not share any specific data for Dalmatia that could enable such an estimate (Grbić 2014, 229–301).

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.⁶¹ 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

matia County in Croatia) that marks a demarcation between two Delmatian communities (*ILJug 0758* (B) = EDH 034204 = EDCS-10000770). By combining topographic and ethnographic data with Pliny’s information about the number of Delmatian *decuriae*, Gabričević hypothetically concluded that one *decuriae* had 150–200 persons (Gabričević 1953). This conclusion influenced subsequent works of other scholars. When writing about indigenous communities in Dalmatia, scholars often use this hypothesis to suggest the number of certain indigenous communities such as the Ditiones, Delmatae, Daesitiates, Narensi, and others (Bojanovski 1975, 270; Suić 1976, 360; Čače 1979, 121; Domić Kunić 2003, 508; Šačić 2012, 100 fn. 30). More recently, the issue of *decuriae* was addressed mostly by Čače, Mesihović, and Grbić. However, Čače accepted Gabričević’s hypothesis in more recent papers, but rejected it in *Discripti in decurias* (Plin. NH. 3. 142–143) – *uređenje osvojenih područja pod Augustom* from 2010. In this paper, Čače concluded that a *decuriae* had 300–350 persons based on the analysis of the settlement of a territory where the *decuriae* system was recorded (Čače 2010, 76–77). Nevertheless, Mesihović defined *decuria* as a group of ten family communities with an obligation to pay taxes. Using mostly modern ethnographic and topographic data from Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Albania, Mesihović concluded that a *decuria* had 250 persons (Mesihović 2011b, 66–67; Mesihović 2018, 551–560). Unlike Čače and Mesihović, Grbić believes that the number of persons in one *decuria* cannot be defined, because, unlike Hispania, Pliny does not share any specific data for Dalmatia that could enable such an estimate (Grbić 2014, 229–301).

⁶¹ Čače 2010, 70; Džino 2010, 166; 2014, 223; Grbić 2014, 301.

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.⁶² 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.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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 reincluded in the imperial provinces governed by legates (*legatus Augusti pro praetor*).⁶⁶ 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).⁶⁷ 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

⁶² App. Ill. 16. 47–48.

⁶³ Džino 2014, 222.

⁶⁴ Ozcáriz Gil 2013, 575.

⁶⁵ Cass. Dio. 53. 12. 4–8; Liv. 34. 4; Strabo, 17. 3. 25.

⁶⁶ Cass. Dio. 53. 12. 4–8.

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.

⁶⁸ CIL 05, 3346.

⁶⁹ There are different opinions when it comes to the inscription from Verona. While analysing the inscription (CIL 05, 3346), Suić presented a hypothesis that Liburnia and Japydia shared a common destiny, as one unit separate from the provincial administration centred in Salona. Namely, Suić 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 (Suić 1992, 55, 63). The second thesis is that the term [--- bello] *Batoniano* 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 / Cesarik / Štrmelj 2018, 199). Moreover, Čače 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 heterogeneous status. The inscription from Verona confirms that Liburnia and Japydia cannot be considered indigenous entities that fit into Illyricum. Čače and Milivojević define them as districts that were part of a provincial system and believe that Pliny recognised their regional demarcations (Čače / Milivojević 2017, 441–442; Milivojević 2021, 226). However, except Suić’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, Dio’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).

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’s 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

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 if 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.⁷²

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.⁷³ *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.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵ 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.⁷⁶ 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 Germania.⁷⁷ Bojanovski assumes that the territory of this municipium encompassed the territory between Plješevica and Kapela in the west, Petrova Gora in the north, and Grmeč in the northeast.⁷⁸ 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 prefects 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*.⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰ Olujić believes that the Iapodes had a prefectural administration due to the immense importance of the territory in terms of important transit roads towards Siscia and the sea.⁸¹ Since *praefecti civitatum* appear in Dalmatia among the Maezaei and Daesitiates, who were also prominent participants of the *Bellum Batonianum* like the Iapodes, we should not dismiss the possibility that the prefectural administration was present

⁷² Bojanovski 1974, 216; 218; 1988, 255; Kos / Šašel Kos 1995, 295–296; Zaninović 2015, 447; Šačić Beća 2018, 117.

⁷³ Cass. Dio. 56.11–12; Bojanovski 1988, 310; Olujić 2007, 199–200; Mesihović 2009, 16; 2011a, 386.

⁷⁴ Kos / Šašel Kos, 1995, 301.

⁷⁵ Bojanovski 1988, 315.

⁷⁶ Alföldy 1965, 159; Bojanovski 1974, 117; 1988, 312; Raunig 2004, 14; Rendić-Miočević 1989, 743; Kos / Šašel Kos 1995, 295.

⁷⁷ CIL 13, 07023.

⁷⁸ Bojanovski 1988, 312–313.

⁷⁹ CIL 05, 3346; Patsch 1898, 333–334; Bojanovski 1988, 313; Olujić 2007, 200.

⁸⁰ Bojanovski 1988, 267, 313; Lintott 1993, 73; Ardevan 2012, 2; Bohec 2013, 32.

⁸¹ Olujić 2007, 200.

among the peoples who were dangerous for the Roman government in the province.⁸² 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 Varaždinske Toplice (*Aquae Balissae*) mentioning that the Scordisci, Breuci, and Jasi had a military administration in the 1st century.⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ 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.⁸⁵ The Iapodes were also one of the *peregrine civitates* whose *principes* were mentioned in inscriptions.⁸⁶ The complexity of identity of the indigenous population led to having several local leaders, *principes*, within one *peregrine civitas*.⁸⁷ 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*. *Praepositum* 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 *praepositum* in local administration. Since all inscriptions mentioning *praepositum* can be dated to the end of the 1st or the 2nd century, Patsch believes that *praepositum* changed prefects after the departure of legions from Dalmatia. On the other hand, Bojanovski believes that *praepositum* were elected during the period when the Iapodes were transitioning from prefectural administration to self-governance. Therefore, Bojanovski concluded that *praepositum* were executive bodies under the supervision

⁸² CIL 09, 2564 = CIL 03 + P. 282.

⁸³ *Q(uintus) Ga(vius) Q(uinti) / F(ilius) Pub(lilia) (tribu) / Fronto pr(imus pilus) leg-/ (ionis) XIII 5/ Gem(inae) praef(ectus) / civitatum / Scordisc(orum) et / Breuco(rum) / et Iasorum beneficio* ^{10/ Imperatoris traslatus / successionibus in leg(ione) IIII / Macedonic(a) dedicavit / Bachylus lib(ertus) eius} (EDH 075016 = Kušan Špalj 2015, 50–53, 152; Szabó 2020, 209–210; Šačić Beća 2022a, 462–467).

⁸⁴ Džino 2014, 222; Pelcer-Vujačić 2019, 101.

⁸⁵ Grbić 2014, 310; Pelcer-Vujačić 2019, 101–114; Mesihović 2021; Mesihović / Kapetanović 2022, 142–143.

⁸⁶ CIL 03, 14326 = EDH 052238 = EDCS-31300292 = lupa 23298; CIL 03, 14324 = EDH 052240 = EDCS-32300071 = lupa 23687.

⁸⁷ The evidence for this claim is an inscription from Montenegro mentioning *principi k(astelli) Salthua*. The inscription analysis has shown that the Docleatae had led the elites from their *castella*, one being *Salthua* which was located on the main road between Narona and Scodra (*ILJug* 1852 = *AE* 1906, 0031 = *AE* 1910, 0100 = EDH 029748 =

EDCS-10100807; Grbić 2014, 146, 148; Pelcer-Vujačić 2019, 102–103). Moreover, the title *princeps municipi Riditarum* appears among the Delmatae (*ILJug* 0793 = EDH 034276 = EDCS-10000805; Rendić-Miočević 1962, 318–319).

of Roman prefects, elected from the members of local aristocracy.⁸⁸ 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 Iapodes, a function that could not be carried out by a foreigner.⁸⁹ Apart from him, another *praepositus* was at the same time the leader (*princeps*) of the Iapodes – *Titus Flavius [---]ditanus*.⁹⁰ 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*.⁹¹ Alföldy shared a similar opinion stating that the Iapodes did not have one *princeps*, but that different *principes* were in charge of individual communities that comprised the *peregrine civitas* of the Iapodes.⁹² 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*.⁹³ 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, Britain, and Germania have shown that these units were commanded by locals from an indigenous community whose members were also members of that unit.⁹⁴ 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.⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶ 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*

⁸⁸ Patsch 1896, 134–136; Bojanovski 1988, 314.

⁸⁹ *CIL* 03, 14326 = EDH 052238 = EDCS-31300292 = lupa 23298.

⁹⁰ *CIL* 03, 14324 = EDH 052240 = EDCS-32300071 = lupa 23687.

⁹¹ Patsch 1896, 135–136; Bojanovski 1988, 314; Rendić-Miočević 1989, 863.

⁹² Alföldy 1965, 40–41.

⁹³ Grbić 2014, 76.

⁹⁴ Southern 1989, 84–89.

⁹⁵ Perinić 2005, 138.

⁹⁶ Imamović 1977, 95–105; Bojanovski 1988, 314; Perinić 2005, 137; Huseinović 2022, 174–175.

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 Iapodes, 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 Iapodes does not exclude the existence of a municipal organisation already in the 1st century AD.⁹⁸ An inscription from Germania 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 Iapodes, 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 *beneficarii 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 Ulcirum*.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

⁹⁷ Imamović 1977, 97; Bojanovski 1988, 314; Perinić 2005, 137; Olujić 2007, 199.

⁹⁸ This is, among others, confirmed by the inscriptions from the Dindari and Daesitiates (*AE* 1961, 0297 b = *AE* 2010, 1163 = *ILJug* III, 1558; *ILJug* III, 1582).

⁹⁹ *Andes Sex(ti) f(i)lius / cives Raeti-/nio eq(ues) ala / Claudi(a) an(norum) XXX 5/ stip(endiorum) V h(ic) s(itus) e(st) h(eres) f(aciendum) c(uravit)* (*CIL* 13, 07023 = *EDCS*-11001084 = *lupa* 15812).

¹⁰⁰ *CIL* 03, 15066 = *CIL* 03, 15062 = *CIL* 03, 15063.

¹⁰¹ Perinić 2005, 139.

¹⁰² Bojanovski 1988, 311; Olujić 2007, 202.

¹⁰³ Alföldy 1965, 55–63; Katičić 1964, 21; 1965, 53–76.

¹⁰⁴ *AE* 1939, 174 = *ILJug* 1666; *AE* 1939, 175 = *ILJug* 1667; *CIL* 03, 10033; *ILJug* 1679.

¹⁰⁵ Bojanovski 1974, 210, 230.

¹⁰⁶ *CIL* 03, 3198b (p. 2275, 2328, 19) = *CIL* 03, 10156b = *CIL* 17 / 4 (p. 130–122), Tab. III - IV (= III 3201, 10159 cf. p. 2328¹⁹) = *AE* 2006, 1004 = *ILJug* 263.

¹⁰⁷ Bojanovski 1974, 210.

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 *praepositum* at the same time possibly had a stronger influence in the community as they enjoyed the affection 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 *municipium* 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

Literarna vrela ukazuju da Rimljani u fazi osvajanja prepoznaju fragmentalne identitete zajednica koje su činile Japodski savez. Taj savez je slično kao Delmatski bio formiran sa ciljem da se odbrane od zajedničkog neprijatelja. Može se pretpostaviti da su se japodske zajednice grupisale u manje saveze koji su primarno bili utemeljeni na geografskoj povezanosti. U periodu Oktavijanovih osvajanja (35 -33.god.p.n.e) izvori spominju različito pouzicioniranje japodskih zajednica ovisno od njihovog naseljavanja prostora oko Velike i Male Kapele. S obzirom da Rimljani spomenute planine nazivaju Alpama u savremenoj literaturi pojavljuje se izraz *Cisalpine Iapodes* i *Transalpine Iapodes*. Iz perioda Oktavijanove kampanje sacuvana su imena više japodskih *civitates* *Moentini*, *Avendeatae*, *Aurupini* i *Poseni*. Spominju se i dva naselja *Terponus* i *Metulum*, dok na osnovu jednog terminacijskog natpisa znamo za zajednicu koja se zvala *Parentini*. U smislu identiteta posebno je važno spominjanje *Metuluma* koji Apijan spominje glavni grad svih Japoda. U starijoj historiografiji Taj Apijanov podatak se shvatao doslovno. Novi metodološki pristup analizi literarnih vrela ukazuje da je ipak riječ o riječ o velikoj gradini koja nije nikakva prijestolnica japodskog saveza u političkom smislu. Zbog dobrog strateškog položaja i odbranbene infrastrukture *Metulumu* su vjerovatno gravitirale

manje, lokalne zajednice. Apijan spominje čak i postojanje vjećnice u *Metulumu* što je u stvari primjer upotrebe neadekvatne rimske terminologije za jednu građevnu inigenog stanovništva. U pitanju je građevina koja se nije koristila u svrhu u koje se obično u Rimu koristila vijećnica. Moguće je da je to mjesto odnosno građevina vjerovatno je imalo određeno političko ili religiozno značenje samo za stanovnike *Metuluma*, a ne za cio savez. Također arheološka istraživanja su ukazala na različite kulturološke tekovine i postojanje fragmentalnog identiteta na pretpostavljenoj teritoriji Japoda. Sve ovo dovodi do zaključka da pojam Japodi predstavlja generičko ime za zajednice koje su periodu ratova sa Rimljanima formirale labav antirimski savez. Nakon uspostave vlasti Rimljani su japodske zajednice objedinili u jednu peregrinsku *civitas* i tako ih prilagodili svom provincijalnom sistemu.

U enciklopedijskom djelu *Naturalis Historia* Plinije Stariji je zabilježio da su Japodi zajedno sa četranaest liburnskih *civitates* bili pod jurisdikcijom Skardonitanskog konventa. Može se pretpostaviti da su se Japodi kao Liburni sa kojima su zajedno bili pod upravom Skardonitanskog konventa popisivani prema broju *civitates* za razliku od zajednica iz Naronitanskog i Salonitanskog konventa koje su popisivane po broju dekurija. Za razliku od drugih indigenih zajednica u Dalmaciji, Liburne i Japode Rimljani nisu tretirali kao imperijalnu periferiju pa su stoga drugačije popisivani. Važno je spomenuti da novi epigrafski nalaz (AE 2015, 082) implicira da je za vrijeme Flavijeva naziv konventa promjenjen u *conventus Liburnorum*.

Japodi su zajedno sa Liburnima bili pod vojnom upravom (CIL 05, 3346) što nije toliko neobičajeno za zajednice koje su Rimljanima pružale jači otpor. Takav vid u prave imale su i druge zajednice u Panoniji i Dalmaciji. Međutim u kontekstu fragmentalnih identiteta Japoda važan je podatak da su zajednice iz Like bile odane Rimljanima u periodu *Bellum Batoniarum* dok su zajednice iz doline Une bile među onim indigenim zajednicama koje su se bunile. Dion nam je ostavio podatak da su Germaniku značajan otpor pružili Japodi iz svog utvrđenja *Reatinum* koje se locira u Golubiću kod Bihaća. Sa istog prostora potječu i najreprezentativniji dokazi o japodskim elitama u ranocarskom periodu. Elite su bile rimski saveznici te zahvaljujući njima Rimljani su lakše kontrolisali pokoreno stanovništvo. Kod Japoda predstavnici elita se pojavljuju sa dvije titule *princeps* i *praepositus*. Analiza antičkih izvora i dosadašnji rezultati arheoloških istraživanja sugeriraju da su princepsi koji se pojavljuju na natpisima iz Golubića lokalne vođe manjih *civitates*, a ne cijele japodske peregrinske *civitas*. Titula *praepositus* se može povezati sa vojskom. U pitanju su vjerovatno vođe lokalnih zajednica odnosno *principes* koji su možda bili na čelu jedinica *numeri*. To su jedinice koje su obično bile sastavljene od pripadnike

iaste indigene zajednice koji nisu imali rimsko građanstvo. *Principes* koji su istovremeno bili i *praepositum* vjerovatno su imali jači utjecaj u zajednici pošto su uživali veću naklonost provincijalne rimske vlasti. Stoga je moguće da su se predstavnici elita sa titulom *praepositus* nalazili na čelu vijeća japodskih *principes* pod uslovom da je to vijeće postojalo. Kao i druga naselja indigenog stanovništva *Raetinium* je u prvom stoljeću postao rimski *municipium*. Na kraju se može zaključiti da Japodi predstavljaju odličan primjer iz kojeg vidimo kompleksnost kulturno-historijskog razvoja indigenih zajednica u periodu kasne republike i ranog principata.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

AE	L'année épigraphique, Paris
CIL 03	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum III</i> (ed. Th. Mommsen), Supplementa 1889–1902, Berlin 1873.
CIL 17	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum XVII, Miliaria Imperii Romani / Pars quarta, Illyricum et provinciae Europae Graecae. Fasciculus primus, Miliaria provinciarum Raetiae et Norici</i> , A. Kolb, G. Walsner; Gerhard Winkler, Manfred Gerhard Schmidt; Ulrich Jansen (eds), Berlin 2005.
EDH	Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg. <i>Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften</i> . http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/home?&lang=de .
EDSC	Epigraphik Datenbank Clauss/Slaby, Frankfurt. http://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epi_de.php .
HEp	HispaniaEpigraphica Online Database. https://eda-bea.es/ .
ILJug	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMXL e MCMLX repertae et editae sunt</i> , A. et J. Šašel (eds), Situla 5, Ljubljana 1963 (št. 1–451); <i>Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMLX e MCMLXX repertae et editae sunt</i> , A. et J. Šašel (eds), Situla 19, Ljubljana 1978 (št. 452–1222); <i>Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMII et MCMXL repertae et editae sunt</i> , A. et J. Šašel (eds), Situla 25, Ljubljana 1986 (št. 1223–3128).
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (Massachusetts) – London.
Lupa	UBI ERAT LUPA – Roman Stone Monuments, Friederike und Ortolof Harl, Bild-datenbank zu antiken Steindenkmälern. http://lupa.at .

Sources

- Appian, *Appian and Illyricum*, Kos, M. Š. (ed.) Situla 43, 52–81. Ljubljana 2005.
- Dio Cassius, *Dio's Roman history*, Cary, E. (ed.), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1954.
- Itinerarium Antonini, *Itineraria Romana I*, 2nd, Cuntz, O. (ed.), Stuttgart 1990.
- Livy, *History of Rome (Complete)*, Burton, N. (ed.), Chicago (Illin.), 2012.
- Plinius Secundus (C.), *Naturalis historia*, Libri III/IV, Winkler, G. / König, R. (ed.), München – Zürich 1988.
- Ptolemy's Geography (trans. T. Naggy), in: Fehér B. / Kovács P. (ed.), *Scriptores geographici antiquiores (Aetia occupationes Romanae Usques ad a.D.54): Fontes Pannonia Antiqua I*, Károli Egyetemi Kiadó, 2005.
- Ptolemej Klaudije, *Ptolemy's Geography: An Annotated Translation of the Theoretical Chapters*, Berggren, J. L. (ed.), New Jersey 2010.
- Ravennatis Anonymi, *Cosmographia et Guidonis Geographica*, Schnetz, J. (ed.), Itineraria Romana II, Stuttgart 1990.
- Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo*, Jones, H. L. (ed.), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1954.
- Tabula Peutingeriana, in: *Monumenta cartographica Jugoslaviae, I antičke karte, Posebna izdanja knj.* 17, Škrivanić, G. A. (ed.), Beograd 1974.

Works cited

- Alföldy, G. 1961, Die Stellung der Frau in der Gesellschaft der Liburnen, *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 9, 1961, 307–319.
- Alföldy, G. 1965, Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien. Mit einem Beitrag von András Mócsy, Budapest 1965.
- Ardevan, R. 2012, Römische Offiziere als Praefecti Civitatum im Donaubecken, *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai – Historia* 57 (1), 2012, 1–12.
- Balen-Letunić, D. 2006, Japodi: arheološka svjedočanstva o japodskoj kulturi u posljednjem pretpovijesnom tisućljeću, Ogulin 2006.
- Benac, A. 1987, O etničkim zajednicama starijeg željeznog doba u Jugoslaviji, in: Benac A. (ed.), *Prahistorija jugoslovenskih zemalja, Željezno doba*, vol. V, Sarajevo 1987, 737–802.
- Blečić Kavur, M. 2009a, Japodske podlaktične narukvice: simbolika ženskog principa u optjecanju ideja i djela jadranske kulturne koinè, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 42 (1), 2009, 231–258.

- Blečić Kavur, M.* 2009b, The significance of Amber in the Kvarner region, in: Palavestra, A. / Beck, W. C. / Todd, M. J. (eds), Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Amber in Archaeology, Belgrade 2006, Beograd 2009, 142–155.
- Bohec, L. Y.* 2013, The Imperial Roman Army, London – New York 2013.
- Bojanovski, I.* 1974, Dolabelin sistem cesta u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji, Djela LXVII, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja 2, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1974.
- Bojanovski, I.* 1975, Le municipes inconnus dans le pays Ditiones (Bosnie occidentale), Živa antika 25, 1975, 265–271.
- Bojanovski, I.* 1988, Bosna i Hercegovina u antičko doba, Djela LXVI, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja 6, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1988.
- Čače, S.* 1979, Prilozi proučavanju političkog uređenja naroda sjeverozapadnog Ilirika, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 18(8), 1979, 43–125.
- Čače, S.* 1993, Broj liburnskih općina i vjerodostojnost Plinija (Nat. hist. 3, 130; 139–141), Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 32, 1993, 1–36.
- Čače, S.* 2006, South Liburnia at the Beginning of the Principate: Jurisdiction and Territorial Organization, in: Čače, S. / Kurilić, A. / Tassaux, F. (eds), Les routes de l'Adriatique antique: géographie et économie: actes de la Table ronde du 18 au 22 septembre 2001, Zadar / Putovi antičkog Jadrana: geografija i gospodarstvo: radovi s Okruglog stola održanog u Zadru od 18. do 22. rujna 2001, Bordeaux 2006, 65–79.
- Čače, S.* 2010, Discripti in decurias (Plin. Nat. hist. 3, 142–143) – uređenje osvojenih područja pod Augustom, in: Dukić, J. / Milošević, A. / Rapanić, Ž. (eds), Scripta Branimiro Gabričević dicata / Zbornik u čast Branimira Gabričevića, Trilj 2010, 57–81.
- Čače, S. / Milivojević, F.* 2017, Rimski Ilirik u 1. st. pr. Kr.: nekoliko zapažanja / Roman Illyricum in the first century BC: A few remarks, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 110 (2), 2017, 425–450.
- Čović, B.* 1976, Od Butmira do Ilira, Sarajevo 1976.
- Demicheli, D.* 2015, Conventus Liburnorum, conventus Scardonitanus Sicut homines, et lapides sua fata habent, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 108 (1), 2015, 91–108.
- Domić Kunić, A.* 2003, Plinijeva geografija i etnografija Ilirika (s osobitim obzirom na panonski dio iliričkog prostora), Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Zagreb.
- Domić Kunić, A.* 2004, Literarni izvori za iliričke provincije (Dalmaciju i osobito Panoniju) u Naturalis historia Plinija starijeg, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu 37 (1), 2004, 119–171.
- Domić Kunić, A.* 2006, Bellum Pannonicum (12.–11. st. pr. Kr.): posljednja faza osvajanja južne Panonije, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu 39 (1), 2006, 59–164.
- Drechsler-Bižić, R.* 1970, Cerovačka donja spilja. Iskopavanja 1967. godine, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu 4 (1), 1970, 93–110.
- Drechsler-Bižić, R.* 1987, Japodska grupa, in: Benac, A. (ed.), Prahistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja, Željezna doba, vol. V, Sarajevo 1987, 391–441.
- Dušanić, S.* 1967, Bassianae and its Territory, Archaeologia Jugoslavica 8, 1967, 67–81.
- Džino, D.* 2010, Illyricum in Roman Politics, 229 BC – AD 68, Cambridge 2010.
- Džino, D. / Domić Kunić, A.* 2013, Rimski ratovi u Iliriku – povijesni antinarativ, Zagreb 2013.
- Džino, D.* 2014, The formation of early imperial peregrine civitates in Dalmatia: (Re)constructing indigenous communities after the conquest, in: Janković, M. A. / Mihajlović, D. V. / Babić, S. (eds), The Edges of the Roman World, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle upon Tyne 2014, 219–231.
- Gabričević, B.* 1953, Dvije ilirske općine s područja Vrlike, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 55, 1953, 103–119.
- Glavaš, V.* 2018, The legends of rock: stories, landscape, and boundaries in the central Velebit mountain, in: Milošević, L. / Zaro, G. / Katić, M. / Birt, D. (eds), Landscape in Southeastern Europe. Studies on South East Europe, Reihe: Studies on South East Europe, Münster 2018, 15–33.
- Grbić, D.* 2014, Plemenske zajednice u Iliriku – pre-durbane administrativne strukture u rimskim provincijama između Jadrana i Dunava (I–III vek), Beograd 2014.
- Giunio, K. / Cesarik, N. / Štrmelj, D.* 2018, Šest baza počasnih statua iz Jadera/ Six Honorary Statue Bases from Iader, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu 35, 2018, 193–218.
- Huseinović, E.* 2022, The valley of the Una river, the land of the “Illyrian” Iapodes, Godišnjak Udruženja “Bathinus” Acta Illyrica 6, 2022, 157–189.
- Imamović, E.* 1977, Antički kultni i votivni spomenici na području Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1977.
- Imamović, E.* 1980, Međašni natpisi na području rimske provincije Dalmacije, Prilozi Instituta za istoriju 17, 1980, 27–59.
- Katičić, R.* 1964, Suvremena istraživanja o jeziku starosjedilaca ilirskih provincija / Die neusten Forschungen über die einheimische Sprachschicht in den illyrischen Provinzen, in: Benac, A. (ed.), Simpozijum o teritorijalnom i hronološkom razgraničenju Ilira u praistorijsko doba održan

15. i 16. maja 1964, Posebna izdanja V, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja 1, Naučno društvo SR Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1964, 29–58.
- Katičić, R.* 1965, Zur Frage der keltischen und pannonischen Namengebiete im römischen Dalmatien, *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja* 3, 1965, 53–76.
- Kos, P. / Šašel Kos, M.* 1995, Map 20 Pannonia – Dalmatia, in: *Barrington atlas of the Greek and Roman world*, New Jersey 1995, 286–309.
- Kušan Špalj, D.* 2015, *Zgodovina rimske naselbine Aquae Iasea / History of Roman Settlement Aquae Iasea*, u: *Najnovije rimske najdbena območju Varaždinskih Toplic / Recent Discoveries of Roman Remains in the Region of Varaždinske Toplice* (exhibition catalog), Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu 2015, 50–53.
- Lintott, A.* 1993, *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*, London – New York 1993.
- Mayer, A.* 1959, Die Sprache der alten Illyrier, Volume 2 *Schriften der Balkankommission: Linguistische Abteilung*, Volume 16 of *Schriften der Balkankommission*, Wien 1959.
- Mesihović, S.* 2009, Supplementum rebellio Illyrici I – Germanikova “pounjska ofanziva”, *Historijska traganja* 4, 2009, 9–33.
- Mesihović, S.* 2011a, Rimski vuk i ilirska zmija, Sarajevo 2011.
- Mesihović, S.* 2011b, Plinijeve peregrinske civitates na prostoru današnje Bosne i Hercegovine / The Plinian peregrine civitates in the territory of present-day Bosnia-Herzegovina, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 104 (1), 2011, 55–78.
- Mesihović, S.* 2018, *Bitka za Ilirik*, Sarajevo 2018.
- Mesihović, S.* 2021, *Principes of civitates peregrinae in province Illyricum Superior*, Sarajevo 2021.
- Mesihović, S. / Kapetanović, M.* 2022, *Novopronađeni epigrafski spomenik princepsa Mezeja u Jajcu*, *Godišnjak Udruženja “Bathinus” Acta Illyrica* 6, 2022, 139–156.
- Milivojević, F.* 2021, *Cezarov Ilirik*, Zagreb 2021.
- Mócsy, A.* 1957, Zur Geschichte der peregrinen Gemeinden in Pannonien, *Historia* 6 (4), 1957, 488–498.
- Olujić, B.* 2007, *Povijest Japoda*, Zagreb 2007.
- Olujić, B.* 1999/2000, Japodi, Apijanovi plemeniti barbari, *Opusc. archaeol.* 23-24, 1999-2000, 59–64.
- Ozcáriz Gil, P.* 2013, Divisiones administrativas y conventuales y realidades etno-territoriales, in: Santos Yanguas, J. / Cruz Andreotti, G. / Fernández Corral, M. / Sánchez Voigt, L. (eds), *Romanización, fronteras y etnias en la Roma antigua el caso hispano*, *Revisión de Historia Antigua VII, Anejos de Veleia. Acta* 12, Departamento de Estudios Clásicos – Vitoria-Gasteiz, Universidad del País Vasco / Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Servicio Editorial 2013, 557–579.
- Patsch, C.* 1896, Iapodi, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine* 8 (1), 1896, 113–140.
- Patsch, C.* 1898, Iapodi, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine* 10 (3), 1898, 335–364.
- Pelcer-Vujačić, O.* 2019, The civic identity of the elite in the Roman settlements of south-eastern Dalmatia, in: Alberti, L. (ed.), *Interconnections in the Mediterranean Through Time: Montenegro and Italy: Proceedings of the Bilateral Round Table Held at the University of Montenegro* (23rd September 2016), Roma 2019, 101–116.
- Pereira Menaut, G.* 1983, La formación histórica de los pueblos del Norte de Hispania. El caso de Calaecia como paradigma, *Veleia* 1, 1983, 271–287.
- Pereira Menaut, G.* 1984, Nueva tabula patronatus del NW de Hispania, *Studia Paleohispanica. Actas del IV Coloquio Internacional de Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas*, Vitoria 1984, 299–303.
- Pereira Menaut, G.* 1988, Cambios estructurales versus romanización convencional. La transformación del paisaje político en el norte de Hispania, in: González, J. / Arce, J. (eds), *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*, Madrid 1988, 245–258.
- Perinić, Lj.* 2005, The cult of Bindus Neptunus in the Roman army, *Histria antiqua: časopis Međunarodnog istraživačkog centra za arheologiju* 13, 2005, 135–143.
- Raunig, B.* 2004, *Umjetnost i religija prahistorijskih Japoda*, Djela LXXXII, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja 8, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1988.
- Rendić-Miočević, D.* 1962, Princeps municipi Ridentarum, *Arheološki radovi i rasprave* 2, 315–334.
- Rendić-Miočević, D.* 1968, Novi Dolabelin “terminacijski” natpis iz okolice Jablanca, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 3 (1), 1968, 63–74.
- Rendić-Miočević, D.* 1989, *Iliri i antički svijet (ilirološke studije)*, Split 1989.
- Southern, P.* 1989, The Numeri of the Roman Imperial Army, *Britannia* 20, 1989, 81–140.
- Southern, P.* 2007, *The Roman Army: A Social and Institutional History*, Oxford 2007.
- Stipčević, A.* 1974, *Iliri: povijest, život, kultura*, Zagreb 1974.
- Suić, M.* 1976, *Antički grad na istočnom Jadranu*, Zagreb 1976.
- Suić, M.* 1992, Liburnija i Liburni u vrijeme velikog ustanka u Iliriku od 6. do 9. god. poslije Krista (uz CIL V.3346), *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu* 24/25 (1), 1992, 55–66.
- Szabó, A.* 2020, Dedicatio Pannoniában, *Studia Epigraphica Pannonica* 11, 2020, 195–238.
- Šačić, A.* 2012, *Kulturno-historijski razvoj ilirskog naroda Naresa (civitas Narensium)*, *Godišnjak*

- Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja 41, 2012, 97–112
- Šačić Beća, A. 2018, Administrativne jedinice nepoznatog imena iz istočne Bosne i Podrinja, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta Historija, Historija umjetnosti, Arheologija 5, 2018, 111–133.
- Šačić Beća, A. 2022a, Sjeverna Bosna u okvirima rimske Panonije / Northern Bosnia within the Bounds of Roman Pannonia, Sarajevo 2022.
- Šačić Beća, A. 2022b, The issue of origin and division of the Province of Illyricum, Arheološki radovi i rasprave 21 (1), 2022, 87–110.
- Šašel Kos, M. 2005, Appian and Illyricum, Ljubljana 2005.
- Wilkes, J. J. 1969, Dalmatia, London 1969.
- Zaninović, M. 2015, Ilirski ratovi, Zagreb 2015.