

Géza Alföldy, *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*. Mit einem Beitrag von Andreas Mócsy. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965. Pp. 233, folding map.

A book on the Roman province of Dalmatia is most welcome: that it should appear under the imprint of the Hungarian Academy signalises the continuation of research on the Danubian provinces of the Roman Empire, begun so brilliantly more than thirty years ago under the leadership of Andreas Alföldi with the 'Dissertationes Pannonicae'. Already the province of Pannonia has recently been the subject of studies by A. Mócsy and the Czech scholar P. Oliva. Many years ago K. Kerényi produced a study of the 'Personennamen' of Roman Dacia in which he pioneered the study of the population of a Roman province by a collection and analysis of all the epigraphic evidence, a method adopted and developed by Mócsy for Pannonia and now by Géza Alföldy for Dalmatia.

Dalmatia has been unduly neglected. The work of H. Cons (*La Province romaine de la Dalmatie* [Paris 1882]) is now completely out of date and, while the inscriptions were collated thoroughly for CIL III by Mommsen and Hirschfeld, much new evidence has come to light, notably through the labours of C. Patsch at Sarajevo and Vienna and Fr. Bulić at Split in the early years of this century. In spite of this, little has been added on Dalmatia to the brief but brilliant survey in M. Rostovtzeff's 'Social and Economic History of The Roman Empire' (Second ed. p. 237 f., 638 ff.). A's book goes a long way to fill this gap, although the paucity of archaeological evidence forces him to rely almost exclusively on the evidence of inscriptions. A brief review of the chapter headings will serve to indicate the scope of his study.

After an introductory chapter dealing with modern research, the quantity and distribution of the epigraphic evidence, the creation and boundaries of Roman Dalmatia, there follows a long section (ch. 2) on the location and ethnic character of the native population at the time of the Roman conquest. The main body of the work is taken up in a detailed review of the individual communities and their populations of Dalmatia during the first three centuries A. D. in a strictly geographical scheme, Liburnia (ch. 3), Salona and its area (4), southeast Dalmatia (5), and the large area of the province beyond the Dinaric Alps (6). Next a chapter (7) giving a synthesis on the provincial population as a whole, with sections on the pre-Roman society, Roman policy towards the native population, their recruitment into the Roman army, the *civitates peregrinae* and spread of citizenship, and finally a section on immigrants from Italy and elsewhere in the Empire. A's last chapter deals with town and country in the early and later Principate, and the progressive spread of urbanisation. For the Late Empire A. Mócsy contributes a short study on the population, based mainly on the large quantity of late tombstones from Salona and its vicinity. There is an adequate index, a list of literary authorities cited, and three sketchmaps. Misprints are few (e. g. p. 68 l. 10 *Cerici* should be *Carici*) and the book is well produced. Notes at the end of each chapter are an inconvenience; far better at the foot of the page as was done with Mócsy's 'Pannonia'. A's citation of *testimonia* is somewhat haphazard, some items appearing in the text, other texts being relegated to the notes in an inconsistent fashion.

The aim is proclaimed as a study of the internal history of Dalmatia, rather than the political and military record of a province of the Roman Empire; thus nothing on administration, the provincial army, or the consular senators who governed Dalmatia. It is based on a collection of all the inscriptions relating to people who dwelt in Dalmatia whatever their category, Italian and other foreign immigrants, legionary and auxiliary veterans, and natives of the province. The study of Latin *nomina* to determine the origin of residents in the province, stemming largely from the work of W. Schulze, is one of A's main themes. The second is the nomenclature of the native population, a field now greatly illuminated by the works of H. Krahe, A. Mayer and D. Rendić-Miočević (see also A's own valuable study in 'Beiträge zur Namenforschung' 15 [1964], 55-104). For this A's catalogue of *nomina* and *cognomina* is fundamental

and it is astonishing that it has not been possible to publish this as part of this volume, as with Mócsy's study of 'Pannonia'. The frequent citations of 'Personennamen im Druck' when dealing with both Roman and native names makes it impossible to comment upon judgements upon individual *nomina* and the more general conclusions arising from this part of the work. One can only hope that it will appear soon.

The reliability of epigraphic evidence for an accurate picture of a provincial population is still a debated problem. In Dalmatia the evidence totals 4400 inscriptions, giving a slightly smaller ratio to the total population of the province throughout the Principate than the evidence for the personnel of the legions, 7000 individuals out of perhaps 6-7 million in the first three centuries A. D. giving a proportion of 1%; for the army the proportion is about 1-2% (cf. p. 24.). Yet great caution is necessary. In a severely critical review of Mócsy's 'Pannonia' the late E. Swoboda (Gnomon 34, 1962, 387-393; see the reply by Mócsy in 'Acta Arch. Acad. Scient. Hung.' 15 [1963], 427-30) expressed a view that not only were conclusions based on a scatter of inscriptions unreliable, but they could even produce a picture that might be quite at variance with the true situation. On the evidence of four inscriptions Mócsy concluded that the area around Emona was thickly settled with Italian families to the exclusion of the native population when, Swoboda argues, the archaeological evidence for the persistence of native settlements into the Roman period is sufficient to disprove this (Gnomon loc. cit. 389-90). One can turn to A.'s study with more confidence. For instance he suggests (p. 108 f.) that the area around the *colonia* at Salona was settled almost entirely by Italian immigrant families, to whom were later added legionary veterans from the provincial army, to the exclusion of the native Delmatae. In this case far more is known of the background to the settling of the *colonia*. The whole of the cultivable *territorium* appears to have been re-surveyed on the system of *ager centurionatus* (as at other *coloniae* Iader and Epidaurum; as yet there is no evidence for Naronā). Apart from names on tombstones found in the area there is other evidence to suggest an exclusion of the native population. Like the other *coloniae* in the province Salona began as a *conventus civium Romanorum* and acquired strong links with the house of Caesar during the civil war, when the Delmatae who surrounded them had made an alliance with the Pompeians, attacked Salona and harassed Caesar's commanders such as the able A. Gabinius, Q. Cornificius, and the resourceful P. Vatinius, who were all based on Salona and other *conventus*. The settling of the *coloniae* may have taken place after Octavianus' campaigns against the Delmatae in 34-33 B. C., when they were intended to follow up the victories over the peoples of the interior and to secure the Adriatic for any future war with M. Antonius, rather than a convenient means of settling turbulent and greedy veterans. Against this background the expulsion of the unfriendly natives from the rich lands around Salona is a reasonable deduction which can be supported by epigraphic evidence adduced by A. By contrast, the Dalmatian centre at Rider (Danilo Kraljice), not twenty miles from Salona, had patently very little Italian settlement, the names on tombstones being almost universally of native origin.

Flavian urbanisation and the spread of citizenship in the interior of Dalmatia will furnish another topic for examining A's use of epigraphic evidence. In one case there is no doubt: Scardona is called *municipium Flavium* on a tombstone (III 2802)¹, although no Flavii are attested at the city. The only tribe attested there is Sergia, on the tombstone of a magistrate (III 2810), which A. takes as that of the city (p. 86). Yet normally Quirina should be the tribe of a Flavian foundation, as at Doclea in the south. The particular family, the Turranii, bear a name which is probably Venetic in origin and is fairly common in Liburnia (though absent from *colonia* Iader): elsewhere they are found at Salona, including an aedile of Scardona. Sergia is one of the tribes of Salona, and some of the Turranii may have moved from there to Scardona where they became members of the *ordo*, retaining their old tribe Sergia. The point is important: one record cannot establish a tribe for a city when it is established for other cities in the same province and when the family in question appear to have come from another city. In addition to Scardona, no less than seven cities are claimed as Flavian foundations: Arupium, a Iapydian settlement in the Lika polje (III 3006 a dedication to Nerva *decreto decurionum*); Bistue Vetus (two tombstones of one family of Flavii who were decurions, 'Wiss. Mitt. Bos. u. Herceg.', 11, 107 ff.) at Varvara in the Rama valley southwest of Sarajevo; Bistue Nova (III 12765, a decurion called Flavian in the late second century) at Han Vitez in the Lašva Valley northwest of Zenica; the city at Skelani (?Gerdis) on the river Drina in northeast Dalmatia (perhaps a goldmining centre; the Claudii in this area may, as A. suggests (p. 154), date to mining under Nero, cf. Plin. H. N. 33, 67) (III 14219/7 with Flavii and mention of decurions in A. D. 158); the city Rogatica east of Sarajevo (Srpska Spomenik, 77 [1933], 16 from Rude, *Flavius dec. m. (?) mun. Fl. . .*). For Doclea the evidence is the large number of Flavii amongst the *honestiores* (p. 150 notes 115 f.), while finally there is the *municipium* at Rider (no clear evidence; magistrates first attested in late second century and A. suggests [p. 97] a Flavian or Hadrianic foundation, though later he regards it as definitely Flavian [p. 201]): All are claimed as Flavian cities. On the actual evidence, however, Scardona, the city at Rogatica, and Doclea are definitely

¹ Roman numerals without prefix refer to volumes of 'Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum'.

Flavian foundations; for the remainder, doubt must be registered. The chance find of one or two inscriptions cannot give any real certainty for the date when *municipia* were created. The point is worth marking, lest it become accepted without question that the Flavian emperors were responsible for a large number of cities in the interior of the province.

A. deals only briefly with the conquest and organisation of Dalmatia as a Roman province; perhaps too briefly. Much that is relevant to the early development of the province and its population can be found in the activities of various Roman magistrates across the Adriatic. The story is one of neglect, unrivalled even for the haphazard policies of the oligarchy which ruled the Republic. Alliance by Gentius with Perseus of Macedon brought a Roman praetor L. Anicius Gallus to eliminate his small kingdom based on the Ardiaei in 168 B. C. No permanent Roman commitment resulted from the settlement which followed Gentius's defeat, and for the next hundred years or so campaigns were undertaken largely because of problems and situations which had little or nothing to do with Illyria. For instance the attacks on the Delmatae in 156 5 B. C. were intended to keep up the fighting efficiency of Roman troops – at least that is the version of Polybius (32,13) – while the attack by Sempronius Tuditanus on the Iapudes and Istri in 129 B. C. were made to escape from a difficult political situation at Rome. According to Appian (Ill. 11), L. Caecilius Metellus Delmaticus spent the winter of 118–7 B. C. among the Delmatae at Salona merely to add another triumph to his family's honours. The disasters suffered by Caesar's forces during the civil war reveal that although trading *conventus* were established at Iader, Salona, Narona, Epidaurum, and Lissus, Roman control had not been established any distance inland on any sector of the mainland between Istria and Epirus. Much credit for the establishment of Roman control in Illyricum is always given to Octavianus' operations against the Iapudes, Delmatae and other peoples in the 35–33 B. C., for which Appian offers a full account based on the Memoirs of Augustus. Yet the conquests of these were undertaken in the context of the fierce rivalry which then existed between Octavianus and M. Antonius. They were designed to secure the Adriatic against invasion from the east, to restore Octavianus' tarnished reputation as an army commander after the war against Sextus Pompeius, and to train his still inexperienced army to battle worthiness. These aspects have recently been illuminated fully by W. Schmitthenner (*Historia* 7 [1958] 189 ff.). The foundation of the *coloniae* may well have been the work of Octavianus in 33 B. C. or shortly afterwards, strengthening the Caesarian *clientela* in that area, an insurance that the events of Caesar's war with the Pompeians would not be repeated – at least in the Adriatic. Vague statements by Appian (Ill. 28) that Octavianus subdued the whole of Illyria once led E. Swoboda to argue vast conquests for these campaigns including the whole interior of Dalmatia as far as Serbia and Macedonia ('Octavian' und 'Illyricum' 1932 cf. the review by R. Syme in *JRS* 23 [1933], 69 ff.). That even a 'theoretical pacification' and an extension of the *finis imperii* over the powerful peoples beyond the Dinaric Alps inhabiting what is now the Republic of Bosnia (called Pannonians by Strabo 7, 5, 3, but later included in Dalmatia) which A. appears to admit (p. 26) and compares to the theoretical control over the land between the Rhine and Elbe achieved by the Elder Drusus between 12 and 9 B. C. is out of the question. The whole notion that Octavianus did anything during these years beyond modest expeditions against the Iapudes and the Pannonians of the upper Save around Siscia, later coeving the Delmatae around Salona into making a submission, is quite unthinkable. One only has to look at the map of Octavianus' march traced out in admirable detail by G. Veith more than fifty years ago (*Feldzüge des C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus etc.*, *Schriften der Balkan-kommission* vii Wien 1914). The campaigns were modest in scope but solid in achievement: but they were no contribution to solving the main military problem which confronted Augustus in later years, that of creating a viable network of frontier communications to link the main armies at his disposal. This task, in effect the opening up of the land route between North Italy and the East, was the work of M. Agrippa, M. Vinicius, and above all Tiberius, in the Bellum Pannonicum of 14–9 B. C. and was proudly recorded by Augustus in the *Res Gestae* c. 30 'Pannoniorum gentes qua[s] ante me principem populi Romani exercitus numquam adit, devictos per Ti. [Ne]ronem qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus imperio populi Romani s[ub]ieci protulique finis Illyrici ad r[ip]am fluminis Dan[u]i'. It was during that war that Dalmatia had to be given over into the keeping of Augustus 'owing to the nearness of the Pannonians', explains Cassius Dio (54, 34, 3), that is the strategic problems of approaching the peoples from two directions, southwards into Bosnia from the Save valley and by defensive operations to stop the enemy escaping across the Dinaric Alps into the desolate karst hinterland of Dalmatia. This meant the absorption of all the coastal cities into a new imperial command of Illyricum; until then proconsuls had operated over a whole sweep of hill territory from the Alpine foothills of Transpadana to the coastal hinterland of southern Dalmatia. The spread of citizenship and institution of *municipia*, especially in Liburnia, seems to begin from about this time (the earliest record dates to 10 B. C., III 10117 Arba); in this part of the province urbanisation and citizenship came early, the native population were closer to the inhabitants of northeast Italy than in the rest of Dalmatia, where the gap between even the native aristocracy and the ruling classes of the Italian dominated cities on the coast remained

unbridged for at least a century. Following on this A. accepts the view of Patsch that Octavianus was responsible for the scheme of military bases on the line from Burnum (occupied by leg. XX, later leg. XI) – Kadina Glavica – Andetrium – Tilverium (occupied by leg. VII) and on through Imotskipolje to Bigeste near Narona. That the route taken by Octavianus in the course of his operations against the Delmatae in 34–35 B. C. (cf. Veith op. cit.) seems to follow the same line must mislead. The screen of forts in this scheme was not designed solely to deal with problems in the hinterland; they are designed as part of a system to secure Illyricum as a whole and counterbalance the other bases of legions at Emona, Poetovio (occupied probably about 13 B. C.), Siscia (not proven as a legionary base, but it was the headquarters of the army of Illyricum in the war of A. D. 6–9) and Sirmium. Such a scheme was designed to secure the interior of Illyricum without the expense of instituting a blanket coverage of the interior with a network of roads held by troop detachments; because this was the solution which was forced upon the Romans after A. D. 9 there is no reason to assume its existence during a period when the Illyrians had submitted without a great struggle after 9 B. C., and when Augustus was confidently planning large new conquests in Central Europe. The above remarks are intended to emphasise how the unevenness of evidence still distorts a picture which should now, thanks to the labours of Veith and others, be viewed in perspective. The *Bellum Pannonicum* of 14–9 B. C. is far more important in the Roman conquest of Illyricum than anything that preceded it.

Otherwise as regards the period before A. D. 9 few points call for comment. The inscription from Narona of P. Servilius Isauricus cos. published by Patsch nearly sixty years ago (Narona, col. 23 fig. 12) is not a building slab (A. p. 134 'Bautafel') but a statue base. Following Patsch A. connects this with the consul of 48 B. C. and assumes a proconsulate in Illyricum. Servilius was a Caesarian and received a second consulate in 41; he may have gone to Illyricum as Octavianus' man after the meeting at Brundisium (incidentally, the inscription is not mentioned in any of the standard reference works up to Broughton's MRR). Otherwise nothing is known of his career after his second consulship in 41 B. C. The lettering on the stone, however, belongs to a later date, with ligatures which make it unlikely to be earlier than the second century. The statue may belong to a consular of a later age with these names: polyonymous senators of the second century revive names of illustrious memory. For instance Servilius Vatia occurs in the nomenclature of T. Iulius Maximus (cos. suff. A. D. 112, cf. ILS 1016), while for comparison a statue base at Doclea records the senatorial names Cn. Serto[r]ius C. f. Brocc[us] Aquilus [...]. Agricola Ped[an]ius F[uscus] Salinat[or] Iulius Servian[us] (III 13826).

There is some confusion with regard to the early Greek settlement in the early Fourth Century. Issa cannot be claimed for certain as a colonial foundation of Dionysius I of Syracuse (as A. p. 106) unless one accepts an emendation to the text of Diodorus (15, 3, 4). When the Parian colonists on Pharos were attacked by the Illyrians Dionysius sent help to them through his prefect at Ἰσσοῖς, where he had established a settlement a few years previously. As it stands the prefect of Dionysius must have come from a settlement at Lissus (Lesh) at the mouth of the Albanian Drin; or should the text be emended to make Issa Dionysius' settlement? The latter place seems more likely on geographical grounds, since a force could get from there to Pharos within a matter of hours, whereas Lissus is a one hundred and twenty mile sea voyage to the south. On the other hand there is no trace of any Greek settlement at Lissus, later one of the principal Illyrian strongholds, while the coinage of Issa suggests that it was a Syracusan colony (see the admirable discussion of the problem by R. L. Beaumont, JHS lvi [1936] 202 ff.). The point is relevant to the later history of Dalmatia, since, if Dionysius' settlement was at Issa, then the later *conventus civium Romanorum* developed on places which had no tradition of Greek settlement (Iader, Salona, Narona, Epidaurum and Lissus) and foreshadows the clash between Greeks and Roman settlers reflected in the political alignments during the war between Caesar and Pompey. A.'s discussion of this is not clear since he describes *both* Issa and Lissus as settlements of Dionysius without reference to the problem of Diodorus (p. 106, p. 143 n. 101).

Otherwise A.'s discussions of the well known problems for the history of communities are models of clarity, on the problem of Pliny's duplication of some Liburnian communities in his list for *regio X* (an earlier source) and their later inclusion in the province of Dalmatia (H. N. 3, 130, 139) on pp. 68 ff. The earlier list of Pliny is clearly, as A. notes, of the Augustan period, but it must also date to the period before Dalmatia was included in a newly constituted *provincia* of Illyricum which took place about 11 B. C. Similarly one finds at last a full discussion of the problem of the date for the foundation of *coloniae*; apart from the brief paper of B. Saria (Laureae Aquincenses 1 [1938] 245 ff.) there had been no proper discussion of this problem since Mommsen in CIL III. The obvious occasion for their foundation is 33 B. C. when Octavian strengthened the Caesarian *clientela* across the Adriatic by establishing the old *conventus* on a more secure footing. Against this has always been ranged the fact that Illyricum does not appear in the list of provinces where Augustus settled *coloniae militum* (Res Gestae 28). Yet it is clear that the colonies in Dalmatia were not veteran settlements (as F. Vittinghof, Kolonisation etc., 124 note 4 first observed); there are Augustan veterans in Dalmatia but they are all

much later than colonies. All the early evidence from the *coloniae* themselves suggests that they grew directly out of the earlier civilian settlements. After A. D. 9 veterans are known at the Roški Slap waterfall near Scardona (men of leg. XI from nearby Burnum) and at Pagus Scunasticus near Bigeste when the government granted land for veterans of leg. VII which was then included in the colony of Narona (see A. in *Historia* 13 [1964] 173 ff.). Even the Claudian colony at Aequum was based largely on a pre-existing *conventus* (III 2733 cf. A. p. 119 f.). The civilian character of the early population at Salona and Narona is emphasised by A. (pp. 108 ff., 134 ff.).

Perhaps the most serious criticism that can be made of A.'s method is that there is a tendency to produce an answer for many problems without indicating that real conflict or inadequacy of the evidence should not allow this. This tendency is most obvious in the section dealing with the location of the tribes. A. masters the haphazard record of Appian and Strabo and with the evidence of Pliny is able to produce a tolerably accurate map of the political geography of Dalmatia at about the time of the Augustan conquest. Moreover the evidence is linked with the distribution of native names on the tombstones, and in particular illustrates how strong was the Celtic element in many of the peoples of northern Dalmatia, especially among the Iapudes (p. 40 f.) and in the peoples who dwelt on the middle Drina and the Morava in the northeast (p. 54 f.). The most remarkable discovery by A. concerns the population who dwelt around Plevlje in what is now Northern Montenegro. A large number of the names attested belong to the Delmatae around Split and A. suggests (p. 59) a considerable resettlement made by the government, presumably during the first century A. D. In addition he suggests that city at Plevlje, known hitherto only by the abbreviation *municipium S*, was that of the Siculotae (attested for that region by Pliny and Ptolemy), and deduces that they were displaced Delmatae moved from the coast when veterans were settled under Claudius at Siculi (Biač) on the *territorium* of Salona (Plin. H. N. 3, 141). The intention may have been to repopulate an area where the people, probably the fierce Pirustae, had been almost exterminated. In spite of this there is a better identification for the city at Plevlje, namely *Σπλαῦνον*, a stronghold attacked by the Roman army in A. D. 9. In this case the crucial inscription (III 8303) must be restored *mun(icipium) S[p]lo(nistarum)* rather than *mun(icipium) S[icu]lo(tarum)*, as A. suggests (p. 57–8). The argument is complicated and involves the strategy of A. D. 8–9 by the Roman army in Illyricum (cf. the reviewer in *Acta Ant. Acad. Scient. Hung.* XIII [1965] 111–125). Alföldy proposes to identify Splonum with the city at Šipovo in northwest Dalmatia (p. 158), but this is unlikely as Splonum was approached from the south in the scheme of Roman strategy. In addition to the inscriptions which mention *municipium Splonistarum* all are from Salona except one, and that comes from Plevlje (Srpska Spomenik 98 [1940–48], 130).

Further south there must be some doubt as to the location of the Daorsi (or Daversi) who dwelt around the Lower Neretva (Strabo 7, 5, 5). Once part of the kingdom of Gentius they were the only Illyrian people to produce a coinage, modelled on that of the Greek communities in the area, which suggests that they were trading in the Adriatic. A.'s suggestion (p. 47) that they were centred on Stolac, landlocked in the Bregava Valley more than twenty miles inland, is surely too remote for a people who portrayed a sea-going oar-driven merchantman on their coins. Much more likely that they were around the Lower Neretva, if not on the coast itself. Other evidence of a later date rules out the Daorsi at Stolac. An inscription from there reveals a native family who received the *civitas* from one of the Flavii, and became magistrates (*IIIviri*) of Narona (Vid near the mouth of the Neretva). Hence A.'s conclusion that the Daorsi were attributed to Narona under the Flavians (p. 138), by an extension of the *territorium*, although as late as A. D. 93 a *miles* of coh. III Alpinorum stationed in the province was described on his discharge certificate as *Davers(us)* (XVI 38) cf. also XIII 7507 mid first century). Clearly whoever were the people around Stolac added to Narona under the Flavians they were not the Daorsi.

Various points can be made in detail on the coastal cities. Is not the *colonia Seniensis* of Tacitus *hist.* iv. 45 the city of Etruria (*colonia Seniensis*, Plin. H. N. 3, 51) rather than Senia (Senj), the small city in northern Liburnia, as A. assumes (p. 76)? There is no evidence that the latter was a *colonia*, while the complaints of the senatorial exile Manlius Patruitus against the conduct of the populace of the city would hardly have passed directly to the Roman senate without some reference to the governor – if, indeed, a senator would ever be sent to exile in a province ruled by an imperial legate? Far better exile in Etruria as Mommsen concluded (III p. 387). A Liburnian hill settlement at Cvijina Gradina near Obrovac has been reasonably identified as the Clambetae of the Peutinger Map. On the evidence of one inscription with the tribe Sergia (III 2884) A. assumes the existence of a city (p. 83 f.). Yet Clambetae is not recorded by Pliny or any earlier source, and this part of Liburnia (Ravni kotari) appears to have been completely urbanised under the Julio-Claudians. Moreover, Sergia figures among these early cities and was that of the nearest to Clambetae, Corinium (Cvijina Gradina near Karin), where the many natives with the *nomen* Iulius and tribe Sergia point to early citizenship. More likely Clambetae was a *vicus* on the *territorium* of Corinium. A. argues that III 8783 (Sućurac near Salona) reads *municip.*

Pazina[tium] Splonistarum Ar[upin(orum)] and connects the name of the first city with the *civitas Pasini* on Plin. H. N. 3, 140, somewhere in southern Liburnia (perhaps Padjine in Mokroplje north of Burnum, cf. A. p. 88). But on an examination of an impression of the stone W. Kubitschek pronounced the reading as *municipp. Azina[tium]* etc. (III p. 2136). A place Azina appears as an *origo* on a praetorian recruiting list (VI 2388 frg. 9 vic. *Azin.*) and a tombstone from Salona (III 8762) gives a *cognomen* or ethnic *Azinas*. Thus a city Azina (not, however, the Assino of *Ravennas* iv. 19, as A. Mayer, *Sprache der alten Illyrier* [1957], 65) with inhabitants Azinates which attained municipal status in the second century.

On the problems of the provincial capital Salona A. reveals clearly the desperate need for some proper archaeological investigation to be undertaken on a site where the standing monuments are numerous and where nothing has been lost through modern development. Apart from the Christian period, into which much of the efforts of Bulić and his Austrian collaborators were directed before the Great World War, the archaeological evidence, or rather lack of it, prevents anything but the most tentative conclusions for the early development of the city. The most striking feature is that Salona appears to have been two cities, consisting of two walled areas adjoining one another, an easterly *urbs vetus*, the westerly *urbs nova*, but proper excavation is required before anything specific can be advanced about the chronological relationship of the two defensive circuits. The earlier may date from the early years of the *colonia*, possibly on the line of the defences constructed by the Caesarian *conventus* against the Pompeians and the Delmatae; the later and larger circuit may be the result of the wall construction carried out in A. D. 170 by the newly-raised legions II and III Italicae, together with newly raised *cohortes Delmatarum milliariae* (III 1979, 1980, 6374 cf. 8655), some of which inscriptions are still built into the north wall of the *urbs nova*. A.'s explanation for the two tribes Sergia and Tromentina being attested fairly evenly at Salona is that the latter represents an original Caesarian foundation, while Sergia comes from a second settlement added by Octavianus, probably in 33 B. C. (p. 99 ff.). He rejects however, any connection between this double settlement and the fact that in some early sources the name of the city is often given in a plural form *Salonae* (thus Caes. B. C. 3, 9, 1, although singular in *bell. Alex.* 43 2 f.). On the archaeological evidence for the *via munita*, the adornment of the road to Andetrium with monumental tombs (III 2072), reference should have been made to the important excavations by M. Abramić in 'Vjesnik Hist. Arch. Dalm.' 52 (1950) p. 104.

A. proclaims the object of his study as the 'innere Geschichte' of Dalmatia as opposed to the 'äußere Geschichte' or the external political and military history of a province of the empire. (p. 1). Yet it is not an easy task to draw such a distinction – and in some respects it is dangerous to attempt to do so. In such a study that A. offers, in effect a detailed examination of romanisation, involving urbanisation, the spread of citizenship, and the recruitment of the native population into all grades of imperial service, it is necessary to look in far more detail at the development of the provincial aristocracy and its contact with that of the empire as a whole. This means far more than citing at intervals the isolated cases of senators 'belonging' to such and such a city. By the early second century A. D. the whole fabric of imperial government, the emperor himself and the senatorial oligarchy were closely involved with communities all over the Mediterranean as men of provincial origin held a greater and greater position at the centre of power. No one who seeks to study the imperial government or for that matter individual provinces, either in the late Republic or the Empire, can neglect the links between leading families and provincial communities, formed either through campaigns, governorships, or family origins (Witness the studies of Badian, Syme, Münzer, Groag, A. Stein, etc.). Why do some areas of the empire southern Spain, Narbonensis, North Africa produce numerous families who obtain the *latus clavus* yet Dalmatia, with many flourishing coastal cities, apparently produced so few? Is it because the distinction between Italian settlers and the native population persisted for a much longer period than was the case elsewhere? Throughout the first century A. D. the coastal cities of Dalmatia, with the exception of Liburnia, are dominated by families of Italian origin. Many hold equestrian rank and serve as equestrian officers in the various branches of the imperial service; yet unlike some other provinces around the Mediterranean the earlier generations which reach equestrian rank do not lay the foundations for a senatorial family a generation or so later. What is the reason? The only major senatorial family from Dalmatia, the Iulii of Aequum, came from the Claudian veteran colony twenty miles inland from Salona. The character and development of a provincial aristocracy can reveal much about the population of the province as a whole, often more valuable than conclusions arrived at on the basis of chance finds of tombstones.

For much of the Principate the condition of the mass of the population of Dalmatia was little affected by incorporation into the Roman empire; true, there are numbers of tombstones and an improvement in building techniques but otherwise the Illyrians show themselves as conservative and reluctant to change their way of life. The beginnings of Roman control were hardly auspicious, with the terrible wars in the later years of Augustus – no doubt for many years after A. D. 9 the Pax Romana was most precarious,

with the provincial government always vigilant against any disturbance in the interior. The chances of this happening, however, diminished as the Roman government took a firmer hold on the interior. The great strategic roads constructed under the legate P. Cornelius Dolabella (A. D. 14–20) were designed to secure the victories of A. D. 9, but they began also to foster ties between the centres of Roman power and wealth in the coastal cities and the peoples of the interior, ties which hitherto had been non-existent. Exploitation of gold and other minerals, which may have begun soon after the final conquest (cf. Florus 2, 25), had certainly begun under Nero; the iron mines in the northwest around Stari Majdan were probably already developing before the end of the first century, as also was the working of the argentiferous lead at Srebrenica in the Drina valley to the East. Yet despite this economic progress and the urbanisation which appears to have begun under the Flavian emperors, the gap between the coastal cities and the interior remained great. In the second century, however, one can see some of the native aristocracy from the interior gaining admittance to the ruling circles of the coastal cities. In the south one of the newly enfranchised *honestiores* of Flavian Doclea dominates not only his own community (he and his wife built the city *basilica* at their own expense in memory of their son who, when he died at the age of fifteen, had obtained 'every honour that the laws permitted', cf. III 12692, cf. 13819) but also the older communities on the coast: he was *sacerdos* at the colonies of Narona and Epidaurum, *Ilvir* at Iulium Risinium, *Ilvir quinquennalis* and *pontifex* in the colony of Scodra, as well as *Ilvir quinquennalis* and *Flamen* of Titus in his own city (III 12695 cf. p. 2253). This worthy of Doclea, M. Flavius T. f. Quirina Fronto, clearly dominated the whole of southeast Dalmatia. Yet there is no further development of the family, no imperial office or even equestrian rank. The same is the case with other men; note T. Flavius T. fil. Tro. Agricola, decurion of Salona, *aedilis Ilvir* of Aequum, *Ilvir quinquennalis* and *disp(unctor)* of Rider, *curator* of Splonum. A tribunate of leg. X Gemina appears to have been added to the stone later (III 2026, ILS 7162). Note also P. Aelius Rastorianus (III 8783 see above p. 294 for the reading) at Salona who, apart from holding the *equus publicus*, was *Ilvir quinquennalis* of Bistue vetus and Bistue nova, *dispunctor* of Narona, *quaestor* of Azina, Splonum, Arupium. Yet apparently no link between these *potentiores* of the interior and the large number of *honestiores*, mostly of first century date, from Italian families who held not only urban magistracies but also equestrian posts in the emperor's service (III 8733, 8736, 8737, 2018, 8739, 10094, 2049 from Salona, III 2916, 9960 from Iader, III 8406 Epidaurum, III 1711 Acruvium, III 1717 Risinium). Normally this is the stratum in which one seeks the ancestors of later senators, but of the few senatorial families who originated from Dalmatia none is known to have arisen from this class.

Borghesi suggested that L. Tarius Rufus (suff. 16 B. C.) might be of Dalmatian origin. A men of humble family he acquired a vast fortune and invested in derelict land in Picenum (PIR⁴L 14). The Tarii Rufi attested at Nedinum (III 2877, 2878) may have reached Liburnia from his estates in Picenum: there have always been close links between Picenum and Liburnia across the Adriatic (for some iron age evidence see the important paper by M. Suić, Vjesnik Arch. Hist. Dalm. Iv [1955] 71–97). Not of Dalmatian origin but closely connected with the province were the illustrious Calpurnii Pisones, one of the most influential of senatorial families under the Julio-Claudians (see R. Syme, Roman Revolution 424). A dedication to Bona Dea was set up on the island of Pag by Calpurnia, daughter of the ill-fated L. Piso augur (cos. 1 B. C. cf. PIR² C 290) who died in A. D. 24 (cf. J. Šašel, Živa Antika xii [1963] 287 ff.). The Calpurnii had close ties, presumably in the form of estates and clients, in Istria and Liburnia. L. Piso Caesonius (cos. 58 B. C.), father-in-law of Caesar, was *Ilvir* of Pola with L. Cassius Longinus, brother of Caesar's assassin (Inscr. Ital. IV fasc. 1, 65, 81, 708). The Calpurnii also played an important part in spreading the *civitas*: at Corinium (apart from Aenona, the nearest city to Pag) there are Calpurnii with native *cognomina* of an early date (Calpurnia C. f. Ceuna III 2857, 2891, 2892; Calpurnia Volaesa III 2886 cf. III 9970, 9976, JÖAI xii [1909] Bb. 33 n. 5, xvii [1915] Bb. 157; on the Calpurnia in general cf. J. Šašel, Bericht IV. Int. Kongr. griech. u. lat. Epigraphik, Wien 1962). The evidence is cited by A. (p. 75 cf. note 48) but not exploited. It is not enough to refer simply to 'Italian families' at Pag, when one is dealing with the senatorial Calpurnii Pisones. Note also that a member of the family governed Dalmatia a generation later under Claudius (probably the consul of A. D. 27, III 12794 cf. PIR² C 293). Who is the C. Pontilius Fregellanus honoured as consul and patron at Salona (III 8715)? – possibly identical with the Pontius Fregellanus expelled from the Senate in the last year of Tiberius (Tac. ann. vi 48, though see A. Degraffi, Athenaeum xxix [1941] 133 ff., R. Syme JRS 39 [1949] 13 f.). No other Pontilii are known in Dalmatia, although Pontii of a later date occur at Salona (III 2480, 2482, Vjesnik Hist. Arch. Dalm. 52, 5; also an early bilingual inscription at Issa III 3076). On the evidence of the *cursus* at Nedinum (III 9960 cf. p. 2168, ILS 1015 and add. p. CLXXIII), and the presence of Octavii among the *honestiores* of the same city, A. assumes the eminent Flavian jurist C. Octavius Tadius Tossianus L. Iavolenus Priscus cos. suff. A. D. 86 (to give him his full styles; incorrectly on A. p. 83) as a senator of Dalmatian origin. The *cursus*, which gives his career complete up to the proconsulate of Africa early under Trajan, was set

up by an *amicus* P. Mutilius P. f. Cla. Crispinus (the tribe indicates that he was a native of Nedinum). One of Iavolenus' posts was legate of leg. IV Flavia felix when it was still stationed at Burnum early under Domitian (it was transferred to Moesia about A. D. 86) and this may explain his *amicus* who set up his *cursus* at Nedinum, not far from Burnum. There is, however, other evidence which rules out his being of Dalmatian origin. The combination of the names Tadius and Iavolenus is rare and points to Umbria, probably Iguvium (thus Syme, *Serta Hofilliana* [1940] 227, W. Kunkel, *Herkunft u. Sozialstellung d. röm. Juristen* [1952] 138 ff. but rejected by A. p. 94 note 126); furthermore Iavolenus Priscus is the name by which he was generally known, with no mention of Octavius (in consulate *Fast. Pot. Ann. Ép.* 1949, 23; in Germany XVI 36, diploma of 90). A.'s treatment of the consular Iulii from Aequum is unsatisfactory. Cn. Minicius Faustinus Sex. Iulius Severus (*suff.* 127) was probably adopted by Cn. Minicius Faustinus consul ten years before (cf. John Morris, *Listy Filologické* 86 [1963], 41) and is known normally as Sex. Iulius Severus (thus in consulate XVI 72; apart from the full names with both *praenomina* of his *cursus* [III 2830 cf. p. 1059 Burnum] the adoptive *praenomen* Cn. appears in one other instance, cf. M. Abramčić, *Bull. Inst. Arch. Bulg.* xvi [1950], 237, 3–4). Iulius Severus does not originate from the Delmatae, but from the Italian settler families at Aequum. He was probably the grandson of Sex. Iulius Silvanus who, on the founding of the *colonia* at Aequum early under Claudius, was elected by the vote of veterans of leg. VII C. p. f. one of the first aediles, and later became *quattuorvir* and *pontifex*: before the foundation of colony he had been *summus* [*curator c. R.*], head of the civilian settlement of Roman citizens already existing at Aequum. His tribe is Aniensis, unknown for any city of Dalmatia, and suggests that he was a first generation Italian settler (III 2733 Aequum). It is not to be wondered that with such a background Iulius Severus became the best general of his generation (Dio 59, 13, 2), sent to repress the Jewish rebellion by Hadrian: even in the middle of the first century pioneer civilian settlers in the territory of the Delmatae will not have neglected the need to defend themselves in emergencies. Severus' son (or perhaps nephew), Cn. Iulius Verus (cos. c. A. D. 151) was a leading consular general under Pius and Marcus, having probably served his military tribunate in Judaea during the rebellion in 132–4 under the eyes of Severus (III 8714 and III 2732 cf. E. Groag RE 10, 850 n. 525). High military commands followed and late in life he was designated to a second consulship but died before he was due to hold the office in A. D. 180 (cf. A. Degrassi, *Fasti Consolari* p. 50). Sad to relate A. (p. 133 note 216) has missed the whole story of the Iulii of Aequum by overlooking the conjunction of the two parts of Verus' *cursus* (made by E. Ritterling, cf. ILS 8974). More could be added, all 'innere Geschichte' and relevant to the 'Bevölkerung' of Dalmatia. What of the *ignotus* whose fragmentary *cursus* found in the Salona theatre shows marks of unusual imperial favour (Bull. Dalm. 33, 4303 A – AE 1922, 30)? He may be a legate, as also may be P. Coelius Balbinus Vibullius Pius (cos. ord. 137), members of whose household were buried at Salona (III 2295 cf. 2294, 2561 13295 also 2687 Tragurium). Groag (PIR² C 1241) suggested a Dalmatian origin, though governorship is just as likely (cf. R. Syme, *Gnomon* 31 [1959] 513). The catalogue continues. What of the Liburnian Raecii and Trebii who rose from city councillors under Augustus, though the legionary centurionate, equestrian rank, and into the Senate in the late second century? *Honestiores* in the Augustan period (III 3149 Crexi, Q. Fonteius Raeci f. *Ilvir* under Tiberius), then come Q. Raecius Q. f. Cla. Rufus (III 2917 from Iader, but the tribe suggests his home was probably Curicum.) *primuspilus* of leg. XII Fulminata decorated during a long career by Titus and Trajan. His wife was Trebia M. f. Procula, daughter of M. Trebius Proculus holder of the *equus publicus* and *Ilvir* of Arba (III 2931). This Raecius was probably the grandfather of the senator C. Raecius Rufus of Arba, whose freedman carried out the wish of his patron to give his city a proper public water supply in A. D. 173 for the first time (III 3116): his interest in this may have arisen from his having been *curator aedium* in A. D. 166 (VI 360). The lack of any coherent account of the provincial aristocracy is the only serious fault in A.'s study. The absence of proper discussion obscures that part of the picture of the population which should be clearest of all. Moreover, when A. does refer to such evidence there are defects. The equestrian *ignotus* at Curicum (III 2126) who was *protector Auggg.* cannot be Severan (as A. p. 75 suggests) but of the time of Gallienus or later. The realities and ramifications of *honestiores* add information to our picture to the population of the cities. A young worthy of Salona in the early third century was C. Valerius C. f. Trom. Respectus Terentianus, a *clarissimus iuuenis* who died after a post in the vigintivirate (III 1989 and 1990 cf. JÖAI vi [1903] Bb. 81 f.). His mother, Caedicia L. f. Luc[illa] Crispinilla may be related to Lucia Lorenia Cornelia L. f. Crispinia Crispina, a *clarissima puella* at Rome, who was probably the daughter of L. Lorenus Crispinus suffect consul before 244 (VI 1448, 2108 cf. Barbieri, *L'Albo senatorio* 218 n. 1089). Such evidence puts flesh on the bones of *nomina* listed as 'of Italian origin'.

The development and vicissitudes of a Romanised aristocracy composed partly of Italian and other settlers, partly of native born provincials is one of the few avenues by which one can approach the study of a provincial population. These people set up inscriptions in profusion and what has survived

of them rewards any enquiry. Elsewhere there is darkness: where can one seek, for instance, the ancestors of the Illyrian soldier emperors who rescued the empire from military disintegration in the crisis of the third century? Or even the great of them all, the administrator Diocletian, whose palace built for his retirement still dominates the modern city of Split? Even if these questions will perhaps never be answered, what epigraphic evidence there is should be exploited to the full. With this exception, Alföldy has done all that can be done with the evidence at present available from Dalmatia.

Birmingham

J. J. Wilkes