

DOI: [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.37075/AIR.2022.04.02](https://doi.org/10.37075/AIR.2022.04.02)

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN THE ROMAN PROVINCE OF DALMATIA

David Termer¹

SUMMARY

This article deals with the local self-government of the Roman province of Dalmatia. The object of research is both the division of individual autonomous towns and municipalities according to their types and the internal organisation of these self-governing units. For each type of municipality, we describe the officials who worked there, and their established competencies are, all following the primary sources. To finish, we present the conclusions on the reasons for the dating of the municipalities and colonies' foundations in the province.

KEY WORDS

Roman Province; Dalmatia; Public Administration

¹ JD. David Termer, lawyer, e-mail: david.termer@aktermer.cz. I studied these administrative units as a part of my PhD Thesis, which dealt with the public administration of the Roman province of Dalmatia. I changed and extensively revised its text with Assoc. Prof. Dr Václav Marek's valuable comments and revisions from the Institute of Greek and Latin Studies of Charles University, to whom I am deeply grateful.

I. INTRODUCTION

„It is the banality that the Roman empire was fundamentally no more than a collection of citystates, around which the emperor provided a protecting frontier that was paid for by their taxes.“² „For the administration of Rome’s provinces, cities were the crucial organizing principle without which the system could not have worked.“³

I believe the above quotations capture the essence of Roman public administration under the Principate and the later Roman Empire. It is not possible to consider the entire provinces as ‘city states’, which are self-governing units (in particular *civitas*, *municipium* and *colonia*) within the province of Dalmatia. These administrative units are the subject of this article.⁴ The research follows the primary sources – the literature and inscriptions. Then, the secondary sources shed further light on the findings and place this knowledge into the right context.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF MUNICIPALITIES IN THE PROVINCE OF DALMATIA

As for the territorial scope of the study, the research focuses on municipalities located within the province of Dalmatia,⁵ following the suppression of the revolt of Bato the Daesitiate, that is including the territory of the later province of *Praevalitana*, which separated from Dalmatia in connection with the reform of the administrative division of the state at the beginning of the later Roman Empire. The study spans until the year 395 AD when the division into its western and east parts was finished.

The territory of the province was divided into self-governing units for administrative purposes. This included, on the one hand, native communities (*civitas*), and on the other, cities with municipal status (*municipium*, *colonia*).

² C. R. Whitaker. Roman Africa: Augustus to Vespasian. A. Bowman, E. Champlin, A. Lintott (ed.). *The Cambridge Ancient History. V. X. 2nd rev. ed.* Cambridge, CUPress, 2010, p. 603.

³ J. Edmondson. Cities and Urban Life in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, 30 BCE – 250 CE. D. S. Potter (ed.). *A Companion to the Roman Empire.* Oxford, Blackwell, 2006, p. 253.

⁴ D. Termer, *Provincial and municipal administration in the Roman province of Dalmatia. Dissertation.* Univerzita Karlova, Právnická fakulta, 2019 (<https://dspace.cuni.cz/handle/20.500.11956/111658>).

⁵ Termer (2019).

These were larger territorial units with a limited possibility of self-government. There were other communities and territorial units within these self-governing corps. In terms of administrative division, these (*vicus*, *castellum*, *pagus*) were parts of the bigger units under the jurisdiction of the municipal authorities. This chapter will present an overview of the types of documented municipalities within the territory of the province of Dalmatia, based on the degree of their autonomy, their organisational system of public authority and relations to central power.

1. *Civitas*

The provincial governor (the incumbent of the Empire) defined *civitas* territory, as in the case of *municipia* and colonies. Sometimes, the process of territorial division of the province preserved the existing tribal areas. Other times it abolished them establishing new boundaries to divide the rebellious tribes into more territorial units to make pacification more achievable. The relocation of entire tribes within a province or even to another one was no exception. Other than preventive security, there may have been further reasons for relocation, such as the need for land to settle retired legionnaires. There are some documented examples of such practices within the province of Dalmatia.⁶

One could find a *civitas* in some less economically attractive localities outside the provincial current of Italian settlers. Gradually, municipal cities appeared in the region too. However, most of the *civitates* survived until the *Constitutio Antoniana*. Then, because of the widespread Roman citizenship of the free population of the Empire the further establishment of municipal cities was obsolete.

The inhabitants of a *civitas* were *peregrini*, except for the local nobility, who received Roman citizenship *ad personam*. Roman military commanders cooperating with tribal leaders initially administered the *civitas*. The gradual Romanisation and, at the same time, the centralisation of state power within the Roman Empire, increased this share of authority, while on the other hand, more local officials were taking part in the self-government.

⁶ For example, in the early Principate, part of the Delmatae tribe was most likely relocated from the coast to the Montenegro region, to a place devastated during the suppression of the Baton Rebellion, which Wilkes infers from the onomastic material found in the area, following Alföldy. J. J. Wilkes. *Dalmatia*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1969, p. 176.

2. *Colonia, Municipium*

One could see the establishment of self-governing towns such as *colonia* where the location favoured trade development, that is, the coastal line and close to busy roads. It brought many privileges for the local ruling class, but carried many obligations towards their city, and the state. They had to administer larger areas, including the surrounding agricultural land, to ensure the food supply and space for all other economic activities. As a rule, especially in the initial period of the province's life, these cities and territories were populated by inhabitants of Italian towns.

These were cities with the highest level of local self-government. They were hotbeds of Romanisation, and their inhabitants received Roman citizenship – the city council members (*ordo decurionum*), only selected magistrates or, often in the case of *colonia*, all the citizens (i.e., the free persons).

Discussing self-government and urban planning, the distinctions between the *municipium* and *colonia* were not fundamental and were unclear in practice. For this reason, we discuss them together. Nevertheless, *coloniae* were an offshoot of Rome itself, with all the consequences this entailed. The *municipium* was a foreign body, getting certain attributes of the Roman jurisdiction from the outside. The colonies primarily included towns which originally Italian immigrants founded (often veterans, especially during and after the civil war at the beginning of the Principate). The *municipia* were part of the Romanisation of the conquered territory, although even here the influx of the Italian population was no exception.⁷

3. *Vicus, Castellum, Pagus*

Vicus refers to a village, a settlement without its own self-government on the territory of the *municipium*, colony or native *civitas*. In the countryside, several of these villages formed a *pagus*.⁸ In Dalmatia, an inscription from the province of Dacia documented *vicus Pirustarum*.⁹ It is possible to deduce similar status of other municipalities from the context.¹⁰

Castellum refers to a small fortress, sometimes organised as a *vicus* or even a *pagus*.¹¹ Numerous *castella* from the province of Dalmatia are known. An

⁷ Edmondson (2006), p. 257 nn.

⁸ M. Bartošek. *Encyclopaedia of Roman Law*. Prague, Panorama, 1981, p. 322.

⁹ *CIL* III, p. 944 nn; Wilkes (1969), p. 173.

¹⁰ Municipality of *Clembatae* (Cvijina Gradina), the village of *Tragurium* (Trogir), the village of Rider (Danilo Kraljice). The latter village later received *municipium* status. Wilkes (1969), pp. 211, 227 and 241.

¹¹ Bartošek (1981), p. 96.

inscription from Split attested the *Castellum Daesitiatum*.¹² It describes the public roads improvement under the governorship of Dolabella. The well-known work of Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis Historia*) mentions other *castella* in the province.¹³

The *pagus* could be a populated rural district, municipality, village or any larger settlement than a *vicus*.¹⁴ Within the province of Dalmatia, we know the *pagus Scunasticus* (14–37 AD) as an inscription found in the village of Ljubuški documented.¹⁵ It was about a veterans' settlement who received land for cultivation from the colony of its location, Naronna, as per the inscription.

III. ADMINISTRATION OF MUNICIPALITIES IN THE PROVINCE OF DALMATIA

1. *Civitas*

Most of the original population of the province lived, as mentioned above, in municipalities called *civitas*. Pliny's *Historia* gives us the list of these municipalities during the beginning of the province.¹⁶ This municipal system remained prevalent throughout the province lifelong. Next, we will deal with the officials of the *civitas*, as they are known to us from the province of Dalmatia.

¹² [Ti(berius) C]aesar divi Augusti filius / [A]ugustus imp(erator) pontif(ex) max(imus) / trib(unicia) potest(ate) XXI co(n)s(ul) III / viam a Salonis ad Hedum castel(lum) / Daesitiatum per mill[i]a(!) passuum / CLVI munit / et idem viam ad Batinum flumen / quod dividit Breuc[o]s Oseriatibus / a Salonis munit per mi[lli]a(!) passuum / CLVIII / [et idem viam --] / munit ad inum montem Ditionum / Ulcirum per millia(!) passuum / a Salonis LXXVIID / P(ublio) Dolabella leg(ato) pro / pr(aetore). CIL III, 3198b, found in Split, dated 19 – 20 AD.

¹³ E.g., „in hoc tract sunt Burnum, Andetrium, Tribulium, nobilitata proeliis castella“ Plin. HN III, 142. „In this region are the fortresses of Burnum, Andetrium, Tribulium, fortresses famous from battles...“ Author's translation.

¹⁴ Bartošek (1981), p. 245.

¹⁵ Divo] Augusto et / [T]i(berio) Caes[a]ri Aug(usti) filio Aug(usto) / sa[cr]um / veterani pagi Scunastic(i) / quibus colonia Naronit(ana) / agros dedit. AE 1950, 44; ILJug 113, found in Ljubuški, dated 14 – 37 AD.

¹⁶ Based on this source, the situation in the province in the early Principate period can be reconstructed as follows: *Conventus Scardonitanus*: *civitas* of the Iapods and 14 *civitates* of the Liburnian tribe. *Conventus Salonitanus*: *civitates* of Delmatae (342), Deurs (22), Ditions (239), Maezei (269) and Sardeats (52). *Conventus Naronitanus*: *civitates* of the Daesitiats (103), Daversi (17), Docleats (33), Glinditions (44), Melcumans (24), Nares (102), Pirusts divided into Scirtaras (72), Ceraunas (24) and Siculotes (24), Vardae (20), Daraemists (30), Dindars (33) and Deretins (14). The data in parentheses indicate the number of lower administrative units called *Pliniem decuriae*. Plin. HN 3, 139; 3, 142; 3, 143.

A. *Praefectus Civitatis*

As G. Alföldy states, at the beginning of the Principate, most of the *civitates*, as in other provinces, were under direct supervision and control of Roman military commanders (*praefecti civitatis*). They were at the head of the administration while leading some military formations in the province. Usually, two neighbouring municipalities were under the supervision of one Prefect. Under the Flavian dynasty, there was a transition from this military administration to higher self-government of the municipalities, which we discuss below.¹⁷

In Dalmatia, the documents verify this official by a total of four inscriptions, and *de facto* in two cases, it is not sure whether it was the *praefectus civitatis* or another official.

The oldest of these inscriptions, originating from Verona, is an epitaph dedicated to the person, who “lead, commanded” (*praefuit*) tribal areas of the Iapydes and the Liburnians at the time of Baton’s rebellion (6–9 AD).¹⁸ The question remains, however, whether it was *praefectus civitatis* in the true sense of the word or an *ad hoc* appointed military commander, whose task was mainly to administer and command an area of exceptional strategic importance at the time of the uprising. In the case of the uprising spreading westward, this would be the last place to stop the rebels from invading the flatlands of Italy.

The doubts about *praefectus civitatis* begin with the verbal analysis of the inscription. Here the text used the verb *praefuit* with this person as a compound of the preposition *prae* and the verb *esse*. Although, *praefectus* is the past participle of the verb *praefacere* and is a composite of the preposition *prae* and the verb *facere*. There are, however, even more reasons for doubt. Alka Starac proposes that these tribes (the Liburnians and the Iapydes) had no *praefectus civitatis* at the time.¹⁹ I am inclined to accept this opinion. The position of these two regions, Liburnia and the territory of the Iapyde tribe differed from the rest of the province that it bordered in Italy. These tribes had already undergone a considerable degree of Romanisation before the formation of the province of Dalmatia. There were many municipalities, some

¹⁷ G. Alföldy. *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*. Budapest. Akadémiai Kiado, 1965, S. 177; see Wilkes (1969), p. 193.

¹⁸ [bello] *Batoniano praefui(t) Iapudiai et Liburn(iai) sibi et libertis T(estamento) F(ieri) I(ussi)*. CIL V 3346.

¹⁹ A. Starac. The countryside in Liburnia. Davison, D., and Gaffney, V., and Marin, E. (ed.). *Dalmatia. Research in the Roman Province 1970 - 2001. Papers in Honour of J. J. Wilkes*. Oxford, 2006, p. 108.

of which had already reached municipal or colony status, and others were working towards it. Moreover, thanks to Pliny, we know that the Iapydes gathered in one single *civitas*; and the Liburnians organised fourteen different *civitates* shortly after.²⁰ So, if there was no separate *civitas* for all the Liburnians, then there would not be a *praefectus* to control it.

The second inscription shows one centurion of the *Legio XI Cl.p.f.*, which functioned as *praefectus civitatis* for two *civitas* – Maezaei and Daesitiae in northern Dalmatia. Another one (75 AD) found in central Italy proves that.²¹ It is the only one that conclusively certifies the province military commander in the office as *praefectus civitatis*. During the early days of the province's Romanisation, this was the proper state of native communities' administration.

The other two inscriptions are of a later date. The official named here could no longer be a military commander working on the territory of Dalmatia, as the province was a *provincia inermis* since 86 AD.

On the inscription from Prijepolje – Kolovrat²² (171–250 AD) mentioned a *praefectus civitatis civitatum Pirustarum*. The plural used conclusively proves his performance of this function in several municipalities. These may refer to the villages of the Siculot, Cerauni and Scirtar tribes if the reading of „*Pirustarum*“ in the edition of the inscription is correct.²³ Wilkes discussing at length the text concludes that the reading of „*Pirustarum*“ and Alföldy's conclusions regarding the municipalities concerned are possible but uncertain.²⁴ On the contrary, he was assuredly a Roman citizen of native origin, not a Roman military commander. Thus, local tribal leaders with Roman citizenship (granted *ad personam* after the last Roman legion left Dalmatia) possibly took over this position.

The last inscription comes from Bihač (201–400 AD). It documented *praefectus civitatis*, assuming its correct reading and dating – between the

²⁰ *Plin. HN* 3, 139.

²¹ ...*Marcelli leg. XI Cl.[p.f.pr]aef. civitatis Maeze[iorum item Daesit]iatum. CIL IX 2564*, found in central Italy, 75 AD.

²² *D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / P(ublio) Ael(io) Pladome/[no] Carvanio an(norum) [--] / [praef(ecto)] civitatum / [Pirustaru?] m praef(ecto) / i(ure) d(icundo) mun(icipii) Aureli S[---]lo(---) / [et] Aelia<e> Pantoni con/[iu]gi eius viva<e> parentibus / pientissimis A{t}je(ii) / Titus Lupus et Firmi/nus h(eredes) p(onendum) c(uraverunt) / h(ic) s(itus) e(st).* CIL III 8308, found in Prijepolje – Kolovrat, dated 171 – 250 AD.

²³ Alföldy (1965), S. 58.

²⁴ Wilkes (1969), p. 304.

third and fourth century AD.²⁵ There are no further details about the Prefect in question to know due to the incompleteness of the text. However, its dating infers the idea a local officer, since, at that time, there were no Roman legions in the province.

B. Praepositus, Princeps, Praefectus, Praetor

G. Alföldy states that as the pacification of the territory and the Romanisation of the local population progressed, the Roman administration of the province gave the competencies of *praefecti civitatis* to local aristocrats as *praefecti* or *praepositi*. The prefect was accompanied by *principes*, acting as leading representatives of the individual municipalities in the territory of the respective *civitas*.²⁶ J. J. Wilkes takes a similar view, adding that the replacement of Roman military commanders in office (*praefectus civitatis*) by members of the local aristocracy occurred by the end of the I c. AD.²⁷

At least four inscriptions (the other two from the island of Krk we will discuss below) present the local aristocrats as leaders of native communities, referring to them as *praeposites*. They come from the area of the Iapyde tribe.²⁸ The last of these inscriptions does not explicitly mention the Iapydes, but we could infer this from the place of discovery.

In the case of these *praeposites*, one cannot conclude unequivocally, in my opinion (as Alföldy and Wilkes), that these officials replaced the Roman military commanders in the position of *praefectus civitatis* after this function ceased to exist. The counterargument is simple because much later inscriptions (see above: *CIL* III, 8308 –note 20 and *CIL* III 15065 – note 23) verify *praefectus civitatis* in the province. They prove the native origin of this official in the first case. In other words, we have evidence that these persons were

²⁵ ----]V[---] / [--- pr]aefec[t---] / [civ?] itati[s? ---- // ----]S[---] / [---]V[---- // ----]V[----- //]M(?) [----- // -----] I(?) [-. *CIL* III 15065, found in Bihač, dated 201 – 400 AD.

²⁶ Alföldy (1965), S. 177.

²⁷ Wilkes (1969), p. 193.

²⁸ *B[i]ndo Neptuno / sacr(um) / Licinus Teuda / praep(ositus) et pri[n(ceps)] / Ia[p]odum / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito)*. *CIL* III 14326, found in Bihač, dated 1 – 150 AD.

[T(itus) F]lavius / []ditanus / [civ(itate?) d]on(atus) ab / [Imp(eratore)] Vespasiano / Ca[es]are Aug(usto) / pra[e]positu[s] / et p[rin]cep[s] / Iapo[d]um / [v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito)]. *CIL* III 14324, found in Bihač, dated 69 – 79 AD.

T(itus) Loantius / Rufus / praepositus / Iapodum / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito). *CIL* III 14328, Bihač. 51 – 150 AD.

----] / [---] AVI(?) [---] / [--- pr]aep[osit- ---] / [-. *CIL* III, 15064, found in Bihač, dated 101 – 300 AD.

still at the head of the *civitas* in the province under the name *praefectus civitatis*. Therefore, the view that this official disappeared is mistaken. One should consider the different situations in the areas inhabited by the Liburnian and Iapyde tribes from the rest of the territory. As mentioned above, these areas were at a much more advanced level of Romanisation, and *praefecti civitatis* may not have been active here.

Therefore, we can only assume that these persons (*praepositi*) were pre-municipal officials managing their entire community (*civitas*) or part of it. Their competencies may have been at the same time similar and quite different to those of *praefectus civitatis* in other communities. However, I cannot conclude that they replaced the prefects in office. Given the earliest possible dating of all the inscriptions, keeping the range in the footnote, these could be pre-municipal officials of one of the twolater known *municipia* in this territory, Arupium and Metulum.

One cannot overlook the striking similarity in time, place, and substance with the pre-municipalofficials from the village of Curicum on the island of Krk, where two discovered inscriptions show local public officials. Their identification and status have been under discussion for a long time. The inscriptions mark the officers with the abbreviation *PRA*. They took care of public buildings (city fortifications and the temple of the goddess Venus). The scientists found the first text (52 BC–48 BC) in the middle of the XIX c.²⁹ and the second³⁰ (30 BC–30 AD), in 1990. A. Kurilič made its only publication in his article part of a collection of works dedicated to the ancient province of Dalmatia.³¹ Both inscriptions date back to the moment when the city received its *municipium* status, given the fact that there are no local verifications for typical authorities and officials under the municipal status (*duumviri, quatuorviri, decuriones*). Wilkes dates the formation of the *Curicum municipium* between 41 and 54 AD.³²

Since Mommsen's time, there has been no dispute over reading the abbreviation *PRA* as *praefecti*. It changed when Lujko Margetič published an article

²⁹ „*Turus Patalius Granp (---) Opia(vi) f(i)lius/ Venetus Lastimeis Hosp(olis) f(i)lius/ pra(eto)res murum locaverunt lo(n)g(um)/ p(edes) CXI alt(um) p(edes) XX eisde(m) probav(erunt)*.“ CIL III 13295, found in Krk, dated 52 – 48 BC.

³⁰ „*Turus Livius/Hospotis f(i)lius) et Vo/lses Oplinocus/ Noventi f(i)lius pr(a)tores ae/dem Ven(eris) ex pec(unia)/ pub(lica) refi(ciendum) cur(averunt) idemq(ue) proba(ve)runt*.“ A. Kurilič, Recent epigraphic finds from the Roman province Dalmatia. Davison, D., and Gaffney, V., and Marin, E. (ed.). *Dalmatia. Research in the Roman Province 1970 – 2001. Papers in Honour of J. J. Wilkes*. Oxford, 2006, p. 137, found in Krk, dated 30 BC – 30 AD.

³¹ Kurilič (2001), p. 137.

³² Wilkes (1969), p. 487 nn. Also: Alföldy (1965), SS. 74, 201.

in 1987³³. He objects to the above reading of the abbreviation as *praefecti* and concludes that no one of the known prefectures resembles this function and proposes to read it instead as „*praetors*.“ The editors of Heidelberg University’s inscription database accepted this reading for both inscriptions.

In her contribution to the collection of works in honour of J. J. Wilkes, A. Staracová deduces that Curicum was *praefectura peregrini iuris* before getting municipal status and states that the reading of the abbreviations as *praefecti* is without doubt correct. She does not dispute Margetič’s opinion or his reading of this abbreviation as *praetores*, the question is whether she was aware of his contribution.³⁴

Despite many correct conclusions, Margetič’s argument does not seem entirely convincing. The absence of similar officers elsewhere in the province of Dalmatia raises doubts about the correctness of the reading of this abbreviation as *praetores*. I have dealt with this issue in detail in my article entitled „Pre-municipal Administration of the Municipality of Curictae in Liburnia“.³⁵ The findings confirmed that it is not possible to favour any of the older readings of this abbreviation when there should be at least one more option, the reading as *praepositi*. Unlike *praetores*, the inscriptions documented their presence as pre-municipal officials in the province conclusively, as mentioned above. The question at hand must, therefore, remain open.

One must take a similar view of other local officials, *principes civitatis*. Four other inscriptions documented them in the province of Dalmatia in addition to the above inscriptions (*CIL* III 14324 and *CIL* III 14326, note 28).³⁶ According to Alföldy, it was the auxiliary corps of *praepositi*, recruited from

³³ L. Margetič. O natpisu o gradni krčkih gradskih bedema sredinom 1. st. pr. n.e. *Arheološki radovi i rasprave* 10 (1987), pp. 171–183.

³⁴ Starac (2006), p. 107.

³⁵ D. Termer. Premunicipal Administration of Curictae, Liburnie. *Právněhistorické studie* 48, 2 (2018), pp. 131–142 (<https://doi.org/10.14712/2464689X.2018.44>).

³⁶ *Caius Epicadi filius princeps / civitatis Docl(e)atium hic situs / hoc fieri iussit genitor sibi et / suis set(!) fili eius Plassus Epicadus / Scerdis Verzo et summa adiecta / eff<e>cit(!) istud opus est pietas natiq[ue] / hoc auxsisse(!) videntur et decorant / facto et docent esse pios. AE 1910, 101; AE 1906, 32; ILJug 1853, found in Nikšić, dated 151 – 200 AD.*

[D(is) M(anibus)] / P(ublius) A[el(ius)]? --- / pri[nceps? civ(itatis)?] / Dinda[rrior(um)]? decurionatu? / funct[us? ---] / v(ivus) f(ecit) s(ibi) [et suis poste]ris[que eorum] / h(ic) [s(itus) e(st)]. AE 1910, 216; ILJug 1544, found in Srebrenica, dated 131 – 200 AD.

Ulpiae T(iti) f(iliae) / Proculae an(norum) XX / T(itus) F(lavius) Valens Varron(is) / f(ilius) princeps Desitiati(um) / et Aelia Iusta / Scenobar[bi f(ilia)] / [- . ILJug 1582, site of The Breza, dated 101 – 150 AD.

---] / principi / Delmatarum / ann(or)um XXII / Claudia Tib(eri) fil(ia) / [- . CIL III 2776, found in Šibenik, dated 51 – 100 AD.

local aristocrats.³⁷ Wilkes describes them as the successors of the prefects who took over their power after the Romanisation of the territory.³⁸ J. Edmondson considers them to be native leaders who were allowed by the Roman government to retain authority over their people for fifty years or more in remote regions since the process of formation of *civitates* did not occur overnight.³⁹ Given the current knowledge of primary sources, we cannot unequivocally resolve the issue.

However, *princeps civitatis* could not signify an office, but an expression of the prominent position of these persons in their communities, as was the case with the *princeps municipii* mentioned below (see note 82). The fact that the inscriptions (see note 28) sign the persons mentioned in both cases as „*praepositus et princeps*“ of Iapodum supports this reasoning. Given that *praepositus* was a function, as the above inferred, *princeps* title usage could express belonging to the ruling families within a given *civitas*.

2. *Municipium and Colonia*

In the province of Dalmatia, we find only two types of urban formations under the regime of municipal administration: *colonia* and *municipium*.⁴⁰ Although these terms are not synonymous as they differ in historical origin and municipal governance arrangements (see above), I continue to use the term municipal status for both types of cities, distinguishing them from the native *civitates*.

In the inscriptions from the province of Dalmatia, we often come across a synonymous designation for municipalities with municipal status: *res publica*. The Heidelberg database published 22 inscriptions that indicate such a designation for a *municipium* or colony (cities across the entire province). The inscriptions' later date is the trend in the material observed. Most of them date

³⁷ Alföldy (1965), S. 177.

³⁸ Wilkes (1969), pp. 287. Similarly, in his contribution to *The Cambridge Ancient History* decades later, the same author writes: „Elsewhere the *civitates peregrinae* organized after the conquest were administered by senior Roman centurions or regimental commanders. After two generations of this regime, the Flavian era saw power being returned to the local nobility. These now begin to appear on inscriptions with the Latin title of *princeps* or chief, either of a particular stronghold (*castellum*) or of the local community (*civitas*). Out of this class, a few were entrusted with rule of their own people and designated their official role in the new order with the title *praepositus*, an elevation normally accompanied by the conferment of Roman citizenship.“ J. J. Wilkes. *The Danubian and Balkan provinces*. Bowman, A., and Champlin, E., and Lintott, A. (ed.). *The Cambridge Ancient History*. V. X. 2nd rev. ed. Cambridge, CUP, 2010, pp. 545, 588.

³⁹ Edmondson (2006), p. 256.

⁴⁰ Alföldy (1965), S. 198.

from the late Principate or the later Roman Empire. It corresponds to occurrences in cities with extensive archaeological work. We have eight inscriptions for Salona, seven for Doclea, and only one for Naronna. While the first two villages continued their prosperity and significance until the later Roman period, Naronna had been declining economically and politically since the end of the second century. For the *municipium* of Crex, there are two inscriptions, appointing the municipality as *res publica*; one refers to Naronna, Aquae, Domaviana, Epidaurum and Alvona (see the examples in the note⁴¹). A common feature of the selected three inscriptions and most of the others is their dedicatory nature in honour of the emperor or his family.

Another synonym for towns with municipal status found in the sources is *Oppidum civium Romanorum*. Pliny the Elder mentioned them in his *Historia*.⁴² The list of municipalities (all under today's Montenegro) includes Risinium, Acruvium, Butua, Olcinium, Scodra and Lissus. Indeed, these correspond to a *municipium* or colony since all of them already had similar status at the time Pliny wrote about them. Pliny also uses the general term *oppidum* for other *municipia* within the province.⁴³

The main political instrument in a community with municipal status was the council (*ordo decurionum*), a collective body deciding on fundamental issues about municipality's operation and electing individual magistrates. The highest magistrates were *duumviri*, *aediles*, while *quaestores* supplemented them. These officials held one year mandate from the first of January.^{44, 45}

The appointment of municipal magistrates in the western part of the empire kept the fixed order. First, the candidate for the highest office in the city had to act as *quaestor*, then, *aedile* and only after graduating from these two lower

⁴¹ P[[ro[sal(ute)] dd(ominorum) [nn(ostrorum) Imp(eratoris)]] / C[[aesaris G(ai) [I]uli Veri]] / M[[aximini Aug(usti) et]] / G(ai) [[I]uli Veri M[aximi]] / nobilis(s)imi Caes(aris) [res p(ublica)] / Naronitano[rum]. AE 1980, 678, found in Metković, dated 236 – 238 AD. [[O]taciliae]] / [[Se]verae]] / [[Aug(ustae)]] / [[coniugi]] / [[Philippi]] / [[Aug(usti)]] / [[matri]] / [[Phil(i)ppi]] / [[nobilissimi]] / [[Caes(aris)]] / [[res p(ublica) Doc(learium)]] / [[d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)]]]. CIL III, 12685, found in Podgorica, dated 244 – 247 AD. [Imp(eratori) Caesari] [---] / [--- Pi]o Felic[i Aug(usto)] / [Parth(ico) max(imo)] Britt(annico) [max(imo)] / [Germ(anico) max(imo)] pont(ifici) [max(imo)] / [trib(unicia) potes]tate [---] / [imp(eratori) ---]V co(n)[s(uli) ---] / res p[ub]lica / Saloni[anorum]. CIL III 14684, found in Split, dated 211 – 217 AD.

⁴² Plin. HN 3, 142.

⁴³ Plin. HN 3, 140.

⁴⁴ B. Sitek. *Tabula Heracleensis (Lex Iulia municipalis)*. Olsztyn. Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski, 2006, p. 62.

⁴⁵ *Lex Irni*. 6B 51 – 60.

positions could aspire to one of the *duumviri* offices.⁴⁶ According to *Tabula Heracleensis*, only persons over thirty years of age could be magistrates of the *municipium*, except for those who served in the legions, for at least three years in cavalry or six years infantry. Furthermore, they had to be persons of integrity, not allowing access to people with inappropriate professions (e.g., actors, gladiators). Freedmen were usually rejected from these offices,⁴⁷ although this rule was not strictly followed in the provinces, as evidenced by numerous examples of inscriptions mentioning dismissed magistrates.⁴⁸

A. *Ordo Decurionum, Curiales (Decuriones)*

M. Bartošek defines the *ordo decurionum* as a group of estates consisting of lifelong members of city councils in the countryside and provinces, their families and descendants. City councils also oversaw appeals against decisions of city magistrates by atwo-thirds majority. Even under the Principate, this was a privileged class, but from the III c. AD onward, their position deteriorated, and they were responsible for all burdens imposed on municipalities, making them one of the most exploited social strata at the time.⁴⁹ According to the same author, they used *curia municipalis* for the *ordo decurionum* during the later Roman Empire, and its members were *curiales* (a synonym of the former *decuriones*).⁵⁰

According to A. H. M. Jones, the city council (*ordo, curia*) was the main constituent of the city's self-government. It consisted of *decuriones (curiales)*, citizens who settled and owned land in its territory, with a lifetime membership. The number of council members varied significantly based on its size. In the West, it was common to have up to a hundred decurions in the council, but a smaller number of cities had a larger one, up to 600 members. In the East, the sizable was the norm. Its primary task was to elect magistrates every year, both regular and occasional, who managed the city's administration.⁵¹ It decided by majority vote.⁵² The *Ordo decurionum* had the right to issue

⁴⁶ A. H. M. Jones. *The Later Roman Empire*. Oxford. Basil Blackwell, 1964, p. 730.

⁴⁷ *Tab. Heracl.* 89 – 107.

⁴⁸ See, for example, the second inscription in the footnote 67. Furthermore, in the inscription database of the University of Heidelberg, 39 inscriptions appear under the word forms *Ilvir* and *libert*.

⁴⁹ Bartošek (1981), p. 243.

⁵⁰ Bartošek (1981), p. 125.

⁵¹ Jones (1964), p. 724.

⁵² *D. 50.1.19 Scaev. l. 1. quaest.*

generally binding decrees within the *municipium*.⁵³

Not all decurions were equal within the council; the nobility had a more privileged position (see below *princeps municipii*). *Decuriones* bore the entire burden of the costs of taxes, securing the city's operation, the organisation of games and more. The central government provided the city with funds for fortification or restoration following natural disasters. With the decline of urban life, which began as early as the middle of the second century, this public function grew difficult, and the decurions tended to get rid of it. Therefore, there were laws which bound them to this duty hereditarily and imposed specific conditions to acquit them of these obligations.⁵⁴

As in other provinces of the Roman Empire, in Dalmatia, the assignment of the *municipium* status meant to grant selected residents with *ius Latii* (Roman citizenship). This was not just one type of citizenship, there were different degrees. Mostly it was *civitas sine suffragio*, i.e., incomplete citizenship, without the right to elect Roman officials. As a rule, *duumviri* and *decuriones* received this *ius*. We believe it was *ius Latii maius*.

Sometimes, however, the new *municipium* got only *ius Latii minus* and at that time, only the chief magistrates received Roman citizenship, while the *decuriones* remained "foreigners" (*peregrini*). As an example of a city within the province of Dalmatia, Wilkes cites the Flavian *municipium* Rider, which he infers from inscriptions that list local *decuriones*, who are, however, not Roman citizens.⁵⁵ The residents of the Spanish *municipium* Irni got the same status.⁵⁶

The Heidelberg database has 220 inscriptions for the province of Dalmatia under the word base „*decurio*“.⁵⁷ After closer examination and cate-

⁵³ *Lex Irni*. 5A C, D; D. 50.9.1 Ulp. l. 3 op.; D. 50.9.3 Ulp. l. 3 apell.; D. 50.9.4 Ulp. l. sing. de off. cur. r. publ.; D. 50.9.2 Marc. l. 1 publ.; D. 50.9.5 Ulp. l. sing. de off. cur. r. publ.; D. 50.9.6 Scaev. l. 1 dig.

⁵⁴ D. 50.2.1 Ulp. l. 2 op.; D. 50.4.2 Ulp. l. 21 op.; D. 50.4.3 Ulp. l. 2 op.; D. 50.4.4 Ulp. l. 3. Op.; D. 50.4.6 Ulp. l. 4. de off. procons.; D. 50.4.8 Ulp. l. 11 ad ed.; D. 50.4.9 Ulp. l. de off. procons.; D. 50.5.1 Ulp. l. 2. op.; D. 50.5.2 Ulp. l. 3. op.; D. 50.5.13 Ulp. 23 ad ed.; D. 50.5.3 Scaev. l. 3 reg.; D. 50.5.8 Pap. l. 1 resp.; D. 50.4.1 Herm. l. 1 epit.; D. 50.5.11 Herm. l. 1 iur. epit.

⁵⁵ Wilkes (1969), p. 241. An example is the inscription AE 1975, 677 cited below in footnote 68. The name *Verzo* is demonstrably of Illyrian origin (see G. Alföldy. *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia*. Heidelberg, Winter Universitätsverlag, 1969, S. 325).

⁵⁶ *Lex Irni*. 3A 21.

⁵⁷ Sixteen inscriptions appear under the partial word base *curialis* (*curial*), but none of them refers to the decurion, possibly except for the partial inscription ILJug 2372. In the remaining

gorisation, we can conclude that many of them (120 inscriptions) refer to specific decurions from Dalmatian cities, a finding not valid certainly about all of the texts due to their incompleteness. I give an example of three of them depicting decurions from the municipalities of Diluntum, *municipium* S. and Risinium.⁵⁸

In the remaining cases, the following applies:

- The inscription often ends with a statement that the city council gave the place or funding for the installation of the inscription by its decision – *decreto decurionum*;⁵⁹
- Alternatively, these are *decuriones* – military commanders and, thus, not members of the city council;⁶⁰
- In three cases, these are decurions from the municipalities of the province of Dacia;⁶¹
- In two cases, the council appointment is *ordo decurionum*.⁶²

cases, it is either „*magistri mercuriales*“ or the *cognomen* of the person mentioned on the inscription.

⁵⁸ *D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / P(ublio) Aplio Plas/so patri pientis/simo dec(urioni) m(unicipii) Dil(unti) / et A[nniae fil(iae)] infelicissi/mae def(unctae) an(norum) VIII / P(ublius) Aplius Anni/us v(ivus) sibi et / suis fecit.* AE 1980, 677; AE 1939, 300, found in Ravno – Trebimlja, dated 131 – 200 AD.

D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / G(---) Suricino / et Sep(timiae) Candidae / avis q(ui) v(ixerunt) a(nnos) LXXV / et illa an(nos) LX et Aur(elio) Maximo / d(ecurioni) m(unicipii) q(ui) v(ixit) an(nos) LV / et Aur(eliae) Maditae q(uae) / v(ixit) a(nnos) XXXX par(entibus) / et Aur(eliae) Venuco/ni sorori q(uae) v(ixit) a(nnos) XVI / Aur(elius) Lavius d(ecurio) m(unicipi) / et sibicipi) v(ivus) p(osuit). AE 1980, 698, found in Prijepolje – Kolovrat, dated 231 – 270 AD.
D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) / L(ucio) P(aconio?) Barbaro / d(ecurioni?) m(unicipii?) R(isinii?) q(ui) v(ixit) an(nos) / XX m(enses) III d(ies) IIII / L(ucius) P(aconius?) Barbarian(us) / et Aur(elia) Panto / filio incon/parabili(!) et / sibi vivi in/felicis(s)imi / p(osuerunt). AE 1979, 451, found in Plevlja – Komini, dated 201 – 300 AD.

⁵⁹ E.g. *L(ucio) Tettio / Epidiano ann(or)um) / VII L(ucius) Tet[t]ius Sper/ches pater V(iri) / Iul(ialis) vivos(!) posu(it) l(ocus) d(at)us) -----d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* AE 1953, 104, found in Iader, dated 30 BC – 30 AD.

⁶⁰ E.g. *[Ap]ollini / [A]jug(usto) sac(rum) / [- Au]rel(ius) Ve/[r]us dec(urio) [eq(uitum)] / coh(ortis) III Al[p(inorum)] / iterata / statione // l(ibens) p(osuit).* AE 1975, 677, found in Šipovo, dated 141 – 200 AD.

⁶¹ E.g. *Cocceio Umbriano / decurioni auguri et pontifici / civitatis Paral(is)ensium(!) / provinciae Daciae / Cocceius Severus / filius patri pientissimo.* CIL III 2866, found in Benkovac, dated 201 – 270 AD.

⁶² E.g. *Imp(eratori) C(aesari) / G(aio) Vibio / Traebo/niano(!) / Gallo P(io) / F(elici) Inv(icto) Aug(usto) / ordo dec(urionum) / col(oniae) m(etallae) D(omavianae).* CIL III 12728, found in Srebrenica, dated 251 – 253 AD.

B. *Duumviri (Duoviri), Quattuorviri*

These were the highest city officials, sometimes forming a joint office called *quattuorviri* with *duoviri aediles* in the early Principate.⁶³ In older inscriptions from Dalmatia, one may also come across the magistrate-type *quattuorviri*. *Aediles* later separated from this foursome, and *duumviri* remained the chief city representatives. In the five-year during tax census preparation, *attribute quinquenales* supplemented this function. Then these officials were in charge of drawing up the required inventory of persons and property and its timely submission to the central authorities (*census*).⁶⁴ According to A. H. M. Jones, cities in the western part of the Empire were commonly lead by the *duumviri*, who presided over the council, carried out the city's judicature and organised games with the aediles.⁶⁵

The highest city magistrates held all the executive power that did not belong to the lower officials and, to a limited extent, had judicial authority (hence *duumviri iure dicundo*). Unfortunately, neither *Tabula Heracleensis* nor *Lex Irnitana* in their preserved forms hold a comprehensive section describing the competencies of the *duumviri*, the same as the Fiftieth Book, Digest. However, the sources documented some individual competencies, including, for example, the right to decide on city finances,⁶⁶ public roads and sewers⁶⁷ and, finally, to perform the entrusted part of judicature.⁶⁸

In the Heidelberg database, there are 203 inscriptions for the province of Dalmatia, listing the municipalities: 200 with the word *Ivir* these include *IIIviri*, one, with *quattuorvir*, and two, *duumvir* (see three examples of them in the footnote⁶⁹).

⁶³ Bartošek (1981), p. 140.

⁶⁴ *Tab. Heracl.* 142 – 156.

⁶⁵ Jones (1964), p. 725.

⁶⁶ „*Eisque (quaestoribus) pecuniam communem municipum eius municipii exigendi, erogandi, custodiendi, administrandi, dispensandi arbitratum II virorum ius potestasque esto.*“ *Lex Irni.* 3A 19. „They (the quaestors) have the right and power to collect, expend, guard, administer and distribute the municipal means of their municipium, according to the decision of the duumvirs.“ Other competences of duumvirorum in financial matters: *Lex Irni.* 8C 79.

⁶⁷ *Lex Irni.* 9A 82.

⁶⁸ *Lex Irni.* 9B 84, 85; 9C 86, 87; 10A 88 - 90; 10B 91 – 93.

⁶⁹ [D(is)] M(anibus) // [M(arco) Na]evio Firmo / [dec]urioni col(oniae) / [Aequ]ensium aedili d[uumvi]ro qui vixit ann(is) / [---] Naevio Natalioni / [patri ei]usd(em) M(arci) Naevi Fir(mi) / [qui vi]xit annis LXXX / [Cla]udia Syra / [mate]r filio piissim(o) / [et mari]to obsequentiss(imo) / p(osuit) AE 1925, 136; *ILJug* 1964, found in Hrvace, dated 101 – 200 AD.

The first refers to the decurion, the aedile and the *duumvir* of the *Aequum* colony, Marcus Naevius Firmus, and his father. The dedicator is the mother of the latter. The inscription comes from the II c. AD, that is, from the peak period of the Principate. It shows the career progression of this official to the highest post within the city administration.

The second inscription is older and depicts two people, one of whom is a freeman who, as *duumvir*, approved the construction of the city gate and tower. Assuming the correct dating of the inscription *municipium* Lissus, which followed the older tradition of establishing strategically significant settlements, here it was not later than the lifetime of Julius Caesar.⁷⁰

The last inscription, like the first, is a tombstone inscription. This time, the dedicators (as usual) are the children of Titus Alia Saturninus (a *decurio* and *IVvir* of the *municipium* Varvaria settled during the reign of Tiberius). Considering the dating (151–300 AD), it would be evidence that *IVviri* still existed in the provincial cities at the time of the late Principate or the beginning of the later Roman Empire.

C. Aediles

M. Bartošek concisely characterises *Aediles* using the motto *duoviri aediles* as the municipal equivalent of the Roman Aediles.⁷¹ Among tasks performed by these magistrates A. H. M. Jones mentions several public services, as listed below.⁷² According to *Tabula Heracleensis*, the upkeep of marketplaces, public roads, public spaces, and shrines was the responsibility of the aediles.⁷³ *Lex Irnitana* lists the competencies and responsibilities of the municipal aediles, including the grain supply, shrines and holy places management, maintenance of roads, sewages and markets, and scales checking, ensuring the order during quiet hours, and other activities imposed on them by the decurions. Additionally, the aediles had limited authority entrusted

L(ucius) Gaviarius L(uci) f(ilius) T(iti) n(e)pos aug(ur) C(aius) [Iuliu]s / Caesaris l(ibertus) Meges IViri qu(in)que(nnales) por[tam] / et turrim ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) d(e) p(ecunia) p(ublica) reficiu[ndas] / coeraverunt eidemque pr[o]baverunt constat HS || [I] (trium milium)? D?]. AE 1982, 765; AE 2004, 1096. Found in Lezha (Albania), dated 60 – 48 AD. *D(is) M(anibus) / T(ito) Al[l]io Satur/nino dec(urioni) mun(icipi) / Varvariae / IIIvir(o) iure / dic[un]d(o) Alli / Maximina / et Maximus / patri b(ene) m(erenti).* AE 1969/70, 457; AE 1971, 298; ILJug 844. Found in Kristanje, dated 151 – 300 AD.

⁷⁰ Alföldy and Wilkes speak of the reign of Emperor Augustus. Alföldy (1965), S. 143; Wilkes (1969), p. 257.

⁷¹ Bartošek (1981), p. 140.

⁷² Jones (1964), p. 725.

⁷³ *Tab. Heracl.* 20 – 82.

over some sections of administration.⁷⁴ They served in the office for one year in pairs when the council (*ordo decurionum*) elected them (see above).

The Heidelberg database shows 66 inscriptions within the province of Dalmatia and lists these municipalities (see the three below).⁷⁵ The first features Titus Flavius Laedio as *aedile* and *IVvir* in the colony of Narona, who had the tombstone inscription made in memory of his parents and brother, who died at twelve. The father of the inscription commissioner, T. F. Plassus, did not hold any significant office in the village, although he lived to his 50. It is an inscription from the peak period of this city, which began to decline in the middle of the II c. AD.

In the next two, the aediles could have come from the colony of Narona, given their place of finding, as an inscription from the village of Janjina on the Pelješac peninsula (1–150 AD) documented them. This peninsula was part of the territory of the colony of Narona. The text mentions the customer of the inscription, Annea (from the voting tribe Tromentina Aper, son of Publius), and Annea Tiron, the son of Publius, to whom the inscription is dedicated similarly. However, the text refers first to the customer's late wife, Calvidia Secunda, the daughter of Publius. Given this filiation, possibly, the two men were siblings: indeed, not father and son. They held the lifelong office of *aedile* and *IVviri*.

The third inscription (III c. AD) is again from the colony of Narona. An association of craftsmen and textile workers (*collegium fabrum et centonariorum*) commissioned it in honour of Tito Flavius Herennio Iason, its prefect, and his father. He was also active in the city administration as a curial and *aedile*.

⁷⁴ *Lex Irni*. 3A 19.

⁷⁵ *T(ito) Flavio Blodi filio / Plasso patri / pientissimo an(norum) L / et Flaviae Tattae matri / an(norum) XXXX bene meritae / et T(ito) Flavio Epicado fratri / an(norum) XII et T(ito) Flavio Laedioni / [---] aed(ili) IIIvir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) Naronae / [---] Laedio filius vivos(!) sibi et suis fecit*. ILJug 117, found in Stolac, dated 71 – 150 AD.

[C]alvidiae P(ubli) filiae / [Se]cundae uxori / piissimae / [- An]naeus P(ubli) filius Tro(mentina) Aper / [aed]ilis IIIvir i(ure) d(icundo) et / [- An]naeo P(ubli) filio Tironi / [ae]d(ili) IIIvir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) et / [- An]naeo P(ubli) filio Apro / et [sib]i et suis. CIL III 8451, found in Janjin, dated 1 – 150 AD.

T(ito) Fl(avio) Herennio / Iasoni eq(uiti) R(omano) dec(urioni) / col(oniae) Sal(onitanae) pont(ifici) / ---aed(ili) praef(ecto) coll(egii) / fab(rum) et cent(onariorum) fil(io) / Herenni Iaso(nis) v(iri) e(gregii) patroni / col(oniae) Sal(onitanae) ob amore(m) / patriae quem ob / merita sua conse/cutus est et erga / honorificentiam / quam civibus exhi/bet coll(egium) s(upra) s(criptum). ILJug 678, found in Solin, dated 201 – 300 AD.

D. Quaestores

These were the lower city magistrates who were in charge of the municipal financial agenda.⁷⁶ According to *Lex Irnitana*, the quaestors were in concern with taking care of the city's finances (*pecunia communa*), having the right and power to collect, spend, guard, administer and distribute these funds (*ius exigendi, erogandi, custodiendi, administrandi, dispensandi*), but only as an executive body. The decision on their use belonged to the *duumviri* and the decurions.⁷⁷

In the Heidelberg database, fourteen inscriptions refer to the word *quaestor*, of which ca. eight relate to the municipal quaestors operating in this province (see the three examples in the note⁷⁸).

In the first, the parents of the prematurely deceased Publius Aelius (son of Publius Iuvenalis and the quaestor and *duumvir* of the *municipium* Delminium) commissioned the text. The late son and his father, mentioned in the inscription as the customer, were Romanised illyrians, most probably from the Delmatae tribe.

The second inscription mentions Publius Aelius Rastorianus. He served in various official positions in five municipalities in the province. Publius held the office of quaestor in three of them, of which the Arupium *municipium* from the Lika is easy to find. The second is the *municipium* Splonum. It is connected either to *municipium* S. in the location of today's village of Plevlje

⁷⁶ Jones (1964), p. 725.

⁷⁷ *Lex Irni*. 3A 20; 8C 79.

⁷⁸ *D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublio) Aelio P(ubli) filio / Iuvenali dec(urioni) / municipi(i) Delmine/nsium quaestori / Iiviro vixit annos / XXXIII P(ublius) Aelius / Victor Varanus / dec(urio) municipi(i) eius/dem IIIvir q(uin)q(ennalis) et / Aelia Buo parentes / filio pientissimo / posuerunt et sibi / et suis*. ILJug 782, found in Tomislavgrad, dated 131 – 200 AD.

D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublio) Ael(io) Rastoriano / eq(uo) p(ublico) decur(ioni) Iiviro / et q(uin)q(uennali) munic(ipii) [Bis]/tuatium dis[p(unctori) ci]/vitat(is) Naron[ens(ium)] / q(uaestori) municipp(iorum) Azina[tium] / Splonistarum Ar[upin(orum)] / et Ael[iae] Pro-cili[anae?] / defunct(ae) ann(orum) [] / Albia Crisp[ina?] coniugi / incompara[bili] et fi[liae] infelicissim[ae] / et sibi. CIL III 8783, found in Sučuraj castle, dated 151 – 300 AD.

T(ito) Flavio / T(iti) fil(io) Tro(mentina) / Agricolae / decur(ioni) col(oniae) Sal(onitanae) / aedili Iivir(o) iure / dic(undo) dec(urioni) col(oniae) Aequi/tatis Iivir(o) q(uin)q(uennali) disp(unctori) / municipi(i) Riditar(um) / praef(ecto) et patron(o) coll(egii) / fabr(um) oba eius coll(egium) / fabr(um) ex aere conlato / curator(i) rei pub(licae) Splonis/{s}tarum trib(uno) leg(ionis) X g(eminae) p(iae) f(idelis) // T(ito) Vettio / Augustali / decurioni / colon(iae) Salon(itanae) / quaestori / aedili Iivir(o) / iure dic(undo) praef(ecto) / et patrono coll(egii) / fabr(um) ob merita / eius coll(egium) fabr(um) / ex aere conlato. CIL III 2026; CIL III 2087, found in Solin, dated 71 – 150 AD.

in Montenegro⁷⁹ or with a *municipium* around today Šipovo in the valley of the Vrba River.⁸⁰ The problem is the localisation of the third *municipium*, labelled *municipium Azinatium* on the inscription, any other inscription source does not document this settlement.⁸¹

The third inscription mentions a prominent holder of official ranks, the late T. Flavius Agricola. He was active in four municipalities in various capacities, but the text does not cite his office as a quaestor. However, it has this information for T. Vetius Augustalis for the colony of Salona.

E. Princeps Municipii, Principales

According to A. H. M. Jones, *principales* were an internal, privileged group among the decurions, who effectively controlled the administration of the community and regularly usurped power. A limited number of decurions (usually five to ten) had previously gone through all the offices in the *municipium*.⁸²

M. Mirkovičová states that this is an often-found term on inscriptions not only in Dalmatia, but also in other west provinces, and points out that *princeps municipii* may have been the chairperson of the *ordo decurionum*.⁸³

In the province of Dalmatia, we know about five inscriptions documenting this official, which indicates that it was a common phenomenon in municipalities and colonies in the region during its entire existence (see for the examples in the note⁸⁴).

⁷⁹ M. Mirkovič. *Municipium S.* Belgrade. Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu, 2013, pp. 56.

⁸⁰ Alföldy (1965), S. 158; Wilkes (1969), p.273.

⁸¹ Alföldy identifies this town with Plini's *civitas Pasini* stating that the village gained municipal status in the second half of the second century. Wilkes does not dispute this view. Plin. *HN* 3, 140; Alföldy (1965), S. 88; Wilkes (1969), 317.

⁸² Jones (1964), p.731.

⁸³ Mirkovič (2013), p. 89.

⁸⁴ *D(is) M(anibus) / Q(uinto) Rutili[o] / Q(uinti) filio Titian[o] / I(vir) q(uin)[q(uennali)] / et / Q(uinto) Ruti[lio] / Q(uinti) filio Proc[ulo] / I(vir) q(uin)[q(ennali)] / filio / eiu[s] / principi m[u]nicipi R[i]ditarum. CIL III 2774, found in Šibenik, dated 131 – 200 AD. S(e)p(timius) Maxi/mia[nus] / v(ir) p(erfectissimus) prin(cipalis) col(oniae) [S]al(onia) (itanorum) / vivo sibi et co(n)iugi su(a)e dulcis/sim(a)e posuit qui / vicsit(!) annis LXV / depo(s)itus die III Nonas Feb (ruarias). CIL III 9540, found in Solin, dated 301–400 AD. Sexto / Aur(elio) Lupi/ano Lupi / filio princip(i) / decuriones / collegae et pop(ulares) et peregrini incolae / civi optimo ob / merita pos(uerunt) / epulo dedi/cata / l(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). AE 2002, 1115; AE 2005, 1183, found in Plevlja, dated 151–200 AD.*

The first inscription lists the names of the duumvirs from the *municipia* Rider, Q. Rutilius Titianus and his son Q. Rutilius Proculus. It is worth only citing the son as *princeps municipii*, inferring that this position was not hereditary.

S. Maximianus made the second inscription in memory of himself and his previously deceased wife referring to himself on the inscription as *principalis coloniae Salona*.

The last inscription is in honour of S. Aurelius Lupian. It refers to him as *princeps* and fellow decurions and the village citizens described his merits.

F. *Praefectus Pagi et Castelli*

As the title of the position suggests, this was an official who performed the entrusted tasks in the territorial unit administration within the municipality. We have one inscription from the territory of the province of Dalmatia, proving the existence of the prefecture on the island of Hvar (*Praefectura Salonitana Pharica*)⁸⁵, mentioned by J. J. Wilkes.⁸⁶

According to Paulys, mentioned Lucius Anicius was the administrator of the lighthouse on the island of Pharos (Hvar), whose rank was among the lower officials active in the *municipia* administration, collectively called *praefecti pagi et castelli*.⁸⁷ However, the designation of this official on the inscription in question as *praefectus fabrum* is not consistent with this. Such a designation instead refers to a junior officer in command of army craftsmen.⁸⁸

IV. FREQUENCY, DATE AND REASONS FOR THE FOUNDATION OF TOWNS WITH MUNICIPIUM OR COLONIA – STATUS IN THE PROVINCE OF DALMATIA

The research focuses on individual cities with municipal status within the province, examining the reasons and date of their creation presenting the findings and the conclusions. The study embraces nine colonies and 45 *municipia*. It skips cities whose location in the province is uncertain (e.g., Stridon or

⁸⁵ *L(ucio) Anicio L(uci) f(ilio) / Paetinati / IIIvir(o) iure dic(undo) / quinquennal(i) prae(fecto) / quinq(uennali) Drusi Caesar(is) / Germanici praefec(to) / quinq(uennali) P(ubli) Dolabellae / pontifici flamini / Iuliae Augustae praef(ecto) / fabr(um) / praefectur(a) Phariac(a) / Salonitan(a)*. CIL III 14712, found in Solin, dated 25–54 AD.

⁸⁶ Wilkes (1969), pp. 228.

⁸⁷ K. Ziegler, und H. Gärtner, (Hrsg.). *Paulys Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Part 22.2*. Stuttgart. Metzler, 1954, p. 1333.

⁸⁸ Bartošek (1981), p. 260.

Azinatium).⁸⁹

1. Reasons for Foundation

In the categorisation of reasons for the foundation of individual *coloniae* or *municipia*, I rely on the division made by M. Mirkovičová, who lists the following: 1. native communities arising and gaining status because of their importance and advanced Romanisation (type 1); 2. cities arising from veterans settlements, usually near a military camp (type 2); 3. colony of Roman citizens on *ager publicus* and organised as a Roman city (type 3); 4. a mining town (type 4); A city founded on an important trade route or junctions (type 5).⁹⁰

It may combine these reasons, e.g., in the case of municipium S., which is the subject of interest of this author, the grounds under types 1 and 2 apply. Therefore, given the complex basis for the city's foundation, the statistics should reflect several places. So, it counts the cumulative motives for the foundation of a city per each type, according to the above list. We consider other methods like selecting the foundation predominant explanation or giving figures of both individual and cumulative types, e.g. In my opinion, the subjective assessment may distort the result beyond a tolerable degree. It brings a lack of clarity, and as a result produces a fragmented image of the situation. On the contrary, the chosen method gives us a clear list of reasons for a city's foundation and its frequency within the territory of the given province. For each type, the number in parentheses shows the number of province's towns where the given reason for its formation was completely dominant; therefore, it is the only one for the given city.

The investigation produced the following results: type 1–45 (9); type 2 (4); type 3 (16); type 4 (2); type 5 (43).

From these figures, we can see that the predominant reasons for the emergence of *coloniae* or *municipia* were those listed under type 1 and type 5 (80% together of all grounds).

In the first case, it is due to the progressive Romanisation of the population (40.90%), because of which the native communities approached Roman standards so closely that they gained a status of municipal-type city; thus, a considerable part of their people become citizens of Rome.

We found as many occurrences as in type 1 in type 5, which is the location on an important trade route (39.09%). This reason is quite logical and could be fundamental in other provinces.

⁸⁹ For the full list see Termer (2019), p. 133.

⁹⁰ Mirkovič (2013), p. 65.

The type 3 occurrences (14.54%) show how many foundations depended on the initial colonisation by the Italic ethnicity. It began before the creation of the independent province of Dalmatia or with the secondary colonisation, which happened shortly after its formation. Not surprisingly, these were coastal towns spread evenly along the province's coastline from the peninsula of Istria in the north to present-day Albania in the south, except for the shore between Salona and Epidaurus. It was without *municipia* but the Colony of Narona at the mouth of the Neretva River. Usually, but not exclusively, they had *colonia* status; respectively, their foundation was during the early Principate, the reign of Julius Caesar, or even earlier.

The other two types of municipal formation were only marginal, which is not surprising for type 2 (3.63%) because Dalmatia soon became a province of *inermis*. On the contrary, it is remarkable for type 4 (1.81%) since mining existed in more places than just near the nameless *municipium* in the valley of the river Vrbas (nowadays village Šipovo) and *municipium* Domavia by the Drina River.

Overall, we find that the most significant impulse for granting the status of a city was the development of already existing native communities. They gradually proved loyalty to the emperor and Roman values and gained this status. Often these occupied a strategic position from an economic or military point of view. Thus, the direct colonisation of the territory of a new (or future) province by an Italic ethnicity was of secondary importance.

2. Date of Foundation of the Municipium or Colony

During the research, we considered that the date of granting municipal status to individual cities is not always precise. We always mention the doubts referring to secondary sources.⁹¹ The dating is according to the period of the reign of individual emperors, alternatively of two consecutive emperors or according to imperial dynasties. The foundation time is defined broadly in one of the instances.

Statistics of the foundation dates of the provincial cities allow us to follow the developmental trends in society, especially the Romanisation and the economic development in the province. Undoubtedly, it is interesting to trace the disappearance of these cities as a symptom of the economic and political decline. However, reliable information is lacking in most cases.

According to our findings, we could divide into several periods the number of foundations of cities: 1) by Julius Caesar (before 44 BC): 8; 2) during the reign of Octavian Augustus (43 BC–14 AD): 8; 3) by Julius Caesar or during

⁹¹ Termer (2019), p. 133.

the reign of Octavian Augustus (before 44 BC–14 AD): 1; 4) during the reign of Tiberius (14–37 AD): 7; 5) during the reign of Claudius (41–54 AD): 4; 5) during the reign of Tiberius or Claudius (14–37 AD; 41–54 AD): 1; 6) during the reign of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, without further specification (43 BC–68 AD): 3; 7) during the reign of the Flavian dynasty (69–96 AD): 8; 8) during the reign of Hadrian (117–138 AD): 5; 9) during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180 AD): 6; 10) during the reign of Hadrian or Marcus Aurelius (117–138 AD; 161–180 AD): 1; 11) during the reign of the Severan dynasty (193–235 AD): 2.

The above data conclusively prove that the Romanisation in the province of Dalmatia happened in the I c. AD. Thus, its flourishing falls within the same period. Thirty-two out of 54 (59.25%) arose by the end of the reign of the Julio-Claudian dynasty (68 AD), and 40 *municipia* and colonies by the end of the I c. AD (74,07 %). If we add the five *municipia* Emperor Hadrian founded, we should conclude that by the middle of the second century AD, 83.3% of all *municipia* within the province arose. These findings thus evidently support a fact seen across the Roman Empire, that the time of prosperity culminated over the II c. AD, while the decline of the ancient Roman civilisation likewise began after this time.

The two *municipia* arisen under the Severan dynasty are Domavia and Metulum. Both towns lay inland, which is a terrain scarcely explored archaeologically. The date of their foundation is uncertain. We can assume that the foundation of both cities was not later than 212 AD, that is, before the publication of the *constitutionis Antoniniana de civitate*. After this date, the establishment of new *municipia* is improbable.

QUOTED LITERATURE

Alföldy, G. *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*. Budapest. Akadémiai Kiado, 1965.

Alföldy, G. *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia*. Heidelberg. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1969.

Bartošek, M. *Encyclopaedia of Roman Law*. Prague, Panorama, 1981.

Edmondson, J. Cities and Urban life in the Western provinces of the Roman Empire, 30 BCE – 250 CE. *Potter, D. S. A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Oxford. Blackwell, 2006, p. 250.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Later Roman Empire*. Oxford. Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Kurilič, A. Recent epigraphic finds from the Roman province Dalmatia. *Davison, D., and Gaffney, V., and Marin, E. (ed.). Dalmatia. Research in the*

Roman Province 1970 – 2001. Papers in Honour of J. J. Wilkes. Oxford, 2006.

Margetič, L. O natpisu o gradni krčkih gradskih bedema sredinom 1. st. pr. n.e. *Arheološki radovi i rasprave* 10 (1987), pp. 171 – 183.

Mirkovič, M. *Municipium S.* Belgrade. Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu, 2013.

Sitek, B. *Tabula Heracleensis (Lex Iulia municipalis).* Olsztyn. Uniwersytet Warmińsko-Mazurski, 2006.

Starac, A. The countryside in Liburnia. *Davison, D., and Gaffney, V., and Marin, E. (ed.). Dalmatia. Research in the Roman Province 1970 - 2001. Papers in Honour of J. J. Wilkes.* Oxford, 2006.

Termer, D. Premunicipal Administration of Curictae, Liburnie. *Právněhistorické studie* 48, 2 (2018), pp. 131 – 142 (<https://doi.org/10.14712/2464689X.2018.44>).

Termer, D. *Provincial and municipal administration in the Roman province of Dalmatia. Dissertation.* Univerzita Karlova, Právnická fakulta, 2019 (<https://dspace.cuni.cz/handle/20.500.11956/111658>).

Whittaker, C. R. Roman Africa: Augustus to Vespasian. *Bowman, A., and Champlin, E., and Lintott, A. (ed.). The Cambridge Ancient History. V. X. 2nd rev. ed.* Cambridge, CUP, 2010, pp. 586.

Wilkes, J. J. *Dalmatia.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1969.

Wilkes, J. J. The Danubian and Balkan provinces. *Bowman, A., and Champlin, E., and Lintott, A. (ed.). The Cambridge Ancient History. V. X. 2nd rev. ed.* Cambridge, CUP, 2010, p. 545.

Ziegler, K., und Gärtner, H. (Hrsg.). *Paulys Realenzyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Part 22.2.* Stuttgart. Metzler, 1954.