THE FINAL PHASE OF THE AUGUSTAN CONQUEST OF ILLYRICUM

A SHORT OUTLINE OF THE CONQUEST OF ILLYRICUM PRIOR TO THE PANNONIAN-DALMATIAN REBELLION

Octavian’s Illyrian War in 35-33 BC was the first important step to conquer Illyricum. The military campaigns extended over a large area, and it is hard to agree with the opinion that they were aimed, as some kind of manoeuvres, at restoring discipline among the soldiers, and mainly represented a display of power, lacking systematic and strategically detailed plans. The latter certainly existed, and the war was also conducted with a view to subduing peoples who represented an immediate danger to Italy, implying future conquests. Furthermore, the previously existing treaties and alliances were reaffirmed, and the war provided Octavian with military glory based on victories won in battles, in which he had even been injured. Not least, he recovered legionary standards that had been lost by Gabinius in the war against the Delmatae. This memorable fact was emphasized by Augustus in the Res gestae (29.1: Signa militaria complur[a per] alios d[u]ces am[issa] devictis hostibus re[cipi] ex Hispania et [Gallia et a Dalm]ateis). And indeed, there is no doubt that Octavian considerably extended the Caesarian province of Illyricum; under Caesar, Illyricum had almost certainly not yet been organized as a Roman province in the administrative sense of the word. It may be assumed that the whole area between the Emona Basin and Siscia – the latter together with the adjacent territory – came firmly under Roman authority, as well as the coastal regions of the future Dalmatia, notably the whole of Liburnia with Iapodia in the hinterland, a coastal strip south of the Liburni together with large portions of the Delmatae's hinterland, as well as several minor Illyrian peoples to the south of the Delmatae. The exact legal position of these highly diversified regions within Illyricum is not known. The Emona basin, which had been included within Cisalpine Gaul most probably as early as Caesar’s proconsulate, may have been a part of Italy since ca. 42 BC.

Illyricum came more firmly under Roman authority after the Pannonian War, as it was called by Velleius Paterculus (2.96.2) and Suetonius (Tib. 9), although war had

---

1 SCHMITTENNER 1958.
2 SYME 1933a (= SYME 1971), correctly emphasized, contrary to SWOBODA 1932, that Bosnia and the main Pannonian peoples had not been subjugated in this war.
5 SARTORI 1994, particularly 18-21.
6 No name for the war is noted by Dio.
also been waged in the Dalmatian part of Illyricum, where uprisings of the Delmatae took place. It has recently been argued that the war lasted two years, between 12 and 11 BC \(^7\), and indeed the offensive war against the Pannonians, which was no doubt the most important in terms of conquering new territories, may have lasted two seasons. However, the quelling of several uprisings in the Dalmatian and Pannonian parts of Illyricum, which threatened the security of Italy, is documented between 14 and 8 BC \(^8\). Revolts broke out as a consequence of Roman rule in Illyricum that must have proved excessively repressive, causing resentment among the provincial inhabitants. Suetonius twice referred to the conquest of Pannonia, first in the *Life of Augustus*, where he says that “Augustus subdued, partly himself and partly by his legates, Cantabria, Aquitania, Pannonia, and Delmatia with the entire Illyricum” (*Aug.* 21). At first glance this formulation may seem unusual, since it could be asked what else would have been Illyricum if not Pannonia and Dalmatia. Probably it reflects some contemporary source, in which Delmatia had to be understood as the region of the Delmatae, such as in Cicero’s correspondence with the governor of Illyricum, Vatinius (*Ad fam.*, 5.9 = 255), and not the future province of Dalmatia. The province was of course much larger and comprised the entire original Illyricum, which had developed out of various Illyrian kingdoms and subsequent Roman conquests. In the *Life of Tiberius*, Suetonius mentioned among the wars waged by Tiberius also a Pannonian war, in which he subdued the Breuci and Dalmatae (*Tib.* 9). Here, the Dalmatae are not called Delmatae as they should have been, which may indicate a different source. In any case, however, the subjugation of Pannonia was much more important than quelling some uprisings in Dalmatia, hence the war was termed ‘Pannonian’.

Illyricum, then the name of the undivided province, extended as far as the Danube. This was emphasized by Augustus in the *Res gestae*: “I subjected to Roman rule, through Tiberius Nero who was then my stepson and legate, certain Pannonian tribes that had not been reached by a Roman army before my reign, thereby extending the frontier of Illyricum as far as the Danube” (*Mon. Ancyr.* 30) \(^9\). However, not all of the later Pannonia was subdued during the Pannonian War, and it is not quite clear how these famous words, *protulique fines Illyrici ad ripam fluminis Danuvii*, should correctly be understood. Augustus most probably referred to the Pannonian peoples, of whom the Andizetes are known to have been the northernmost, and not to the Celtic population of the later Pannonia living north of the Dravus River \(^10\). Some of these Celtic peoples may have been more or less dependent on the Norican kingdom and consequently not hostile to the Romans; some of their regions may have been peacefully annexed. The Roman frontier in Pannonia shifted along with new conquests, treaties, and annexations, and it may well be that the entire course of the Danube was not firmly in Roman hands before Claudius.

---

\(^7\) **Domić Klinč 2006.**

\(^8\) **Šašel Kos 1986, 154-162; Džino 2010, 129-134.**

\(^9\) **Tóth 1977.**

\(^10\) **Tóth 1977; Fitz 1993, 13-14; Fitz 1998; Wilkes 2005, 138; Dizdar 2012.**
In AD 6, the Romans began a great offensive against Maroboduus with 12 legions and a great number of auxiliary troops, dividing their forces into two armies. One attacked the Marcomanni from the Rhine under C. Sentius Saturninus, the other, under the command of Tiberius, from Carnuntum, then in the Norican kingdom (Vell. 2.109.5) 11. Various war preparations, most of all the recruitment of soldiers in Illyricum, triggered the outbreak of the rebellion in Illyricum, stopping forever the Roman expansion across the Danube into free Germany. Tiberius had to conclude hastily a peace treaty with Maroboduus, who consented to become amicus and an ally of the Romans 12.

The reconstruction of the Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion is based on the combined narrative of Velleius Paterculus, whose account is biased in favour of Tiberius (2.110.3 ff.), and Cassius Dio, who presented the Augustan age as a model monarchy for subsequent eras, particularly for his own times (55.28.7 ff.; 56.11 ff.) 13. The revolt was called “the most serious of all wars after the Punic” by Suetonius, with good reason (Tib. 16) 14; Florus and Orosius, too, briefly reported on it. Florus refers to C. Vibius Postumus, who was sent to deal with the Delmatae (2.25), while Orosius, citing Suetonius, mentioned fifteen legions and the fact that the war had lasted three years and was maximum et formidulosissimum (6.21.25).

The focal points of the rebellion as described by Velleius Paterculus

Velleius noted the numbers and the strategic plan of the enemy. The collective strength of the rebels would have amounted to 800,000, consisting, among others, of 200,000 infantrymen and 9000 cavalry 15. The experienced commanders of this army planned to use part of it to attack Italy, which was connected to their territory by the border areas of Nauportus and Tergeste, and part of it to invade Macedonia, while the third part was intended to defend their own territories. Their leaders, both Batos and Pinnes, enjoyed great authority, the army was disciplined, some even knew Latin and were acquainted with Roman culture. They attacked Roman citizens, killing merchants...
and many veterans, who were settled at some distance from the Roman garrisons. They occupied (parts of) Macedonia, causing much damage everywhere 16.

In chapter 111, Velleius described Roman preparations for this war, which broke out because a long period of peace made the Pannonians keen to rebel. Augustus declared in the senate that the enemy could reach Rome in ten days, if no precautions were taken, which reflected the genuine panic in the capital, regardless of whether it was justified or not 17. General recruitment was carried out and part of the army was taken from Rome to Tiberius by Velleius himself. In chapter 112, Velleius mentioned the victory of the praepositus of Illyricum M. Valerius Messalla Messallinus, who had been trapped by the enemy with half of the XXth legion, but succeeded in defeating them, for which he was awarded triumphal insignia. The rebels occupied Mons Claudius, while part of them attacked and almost defeated the army brought from the transmarine provinces by A. Caecina Severus and M. Plautius Silvanus, consisting of five legions with auxiliary soldiers, accompanied by a detachment of horsemen under the Thracian king Rhoemetalces. After that, ten legions, more than seventy cohorts, ten alae, over ten thousand veterans, as well as many volunteers and royal Thracian cavalry were all stationed at Siscia for a short time in the late autumn. However, the newly arrived legions were already escorted back to their provinces after a few days (ch. 113), since it was not possible to control such a huge concentration of army units. The next summer the rebels deposited their arms at the Bathinus River. In the autumn, the Roman army was taken back to the winter camp, and the command over all the troops in Pannonia was given to M. Aemilius Lepidus (ch. 114).

Attention was then directed to the war in Dalmatia. The special merits of Velleius’ brother, the legate Magius Celer Velleianus, were emphasized, as well as the dangerous march of the army under the command of Lepidus at the beginning of the summer, from Siscia to Dalmatia to join Tiberius (fig. 1). This summer saw the end of the war; the Perustae (sic!), Desitiates, and Delmatae were defeated (ch. 115) 18. The military successes of Germanicus and the praepositus of Dalmatia C. Vibius Postumus are briefly mentioned (ch. 116), without any detail; the latter, too, was awarded triumphal insignia. The ‘Pannonian and Dalmatian war’ was finished, but the victory was overshadowed by the defeat of P. Quinctilius Varus in Germany (ch. 117).

**The account of Cassius Dio**

AD 6: Dio mentions Tiberius’ advance against the Germans (whom he calls the Celts) 19, and the march of the governor of the Delmatae and Pannonians, Valerius

16 Chapter 110.
17 Cf. DZINO 2010, 148-149.
Messallinus, from his province to Germany. Dio noted that the Delmatae were oppressed by high tributes and when they gathered for recruitment and became aware of their strength, they rebelled under the leader of the Daesitiae, Bato. After the defeat of some Roman troops, they were joined by the Pannonian Breuci under another Bato, who attacked Sirmium. However, the governor of Moesia, Caecina Severus defeated them on the Drava, preventing them from taking the town. The army of the Delmataean Bato, who had been injured during the siege of Salonae, plundered the coast as far as Apollonia, where the Romans were defeated.

20 Possibly an error for the Sava, since Sirmium is on the Sava? See the commentary infra.
Tiberius feared an invasion of Italy and sent Messallinus ahead to Illyricum; Bato attacked him, but was defeated. Both Batos took Mt. Alma, but were defeated by the Thracian Rhoemetalces, who had been sent ahead by Caecina Severus. Severus, however, could not conquer them, and had to return to Moesia, which was invaded in his absence by the Dacians and Sarmatians. While Tiberius and Messallinus were stationed in Siscia, the rebels invaded the allied territories, winning some to their side, plundering the country, and causing much damage. Their invasion of Macedonia was checked by Rhoemetalces and his brother Rascuporis (55.28.7-31.2).

AD 7: The next season the Romans attacked the rebels who were not aided by their allies and had to withdraw to their hillforts, occasionally attacking the Romans. Augustus sent young Germanicus with new recruits (even freedmen) to Pannonia (the name Pannonia is used by Dio partly anachronistically, partly to define the area of Illyricum more precisely), suspecting that the war could be finished sooner. Caecina Severus defeated both Batos at the Volcaean Marshes, and Germanicus conquered the Maezaei, one of the Delmatian peoples.

AD 8: The Delmatae and Pannonians, who suffered from hunger and diseases wanted to negotiate for peace; one Scenobardus, under a pretext of defecting to the Romans, sent for Manius Ennius, the commander in Siscia...; the account is cut short by a lacuna of four sheets in the manuscript (55.32.3-33). The Breucan Bato betrayed Pinnen, was rewarded with the command over the Breuci, but the other Bato had him killed. Silvanus defeated the Breuci, winning some other rebels without fighting; soon the other Pannonian peoples also surrendered (55.34.3-7).

AD 9: Germanicus conquered Splonum and some other Delmatian fortresses and advanced towards Raetinium. Seretium, previously besieged by Tiberius, was also conquered. Because the war did not stop and hunger broke out in Rome, Tiberius was again sent to Delmatia (Dio uses the name ‘Delmatia’ for more usual Dalmatia). He divided the army into three units; one was commanded by Silvanus, one by Marcus Lepidus, while he and Germanicus advanced against Bato with the third. Dio described in detail the difficult conquest of Andetrium. After its fall, Tiberius began to administer the affairs of the defeated peoples and tribes, while Germanicus still had to fight the indigenous inhabitants, among whom fugitives took refuge, preventing them from surrendering. He conquered Arduba, surrounded by a river 21, as well as certain other strongholds after its fall. Postumius ended the war, while Germanicus joined Tiberius; Bato surrendered, reproaching the Romans for having sent wolves to the province instead of shepherd dogs (56.11-17.2) 22.
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21 PERIŠA 2008, 513, tentatively located it at the Delmataean hillfort of Puljane on the left bank of the Krka River, directly opposite Burnum. However, it is generally believed that pre-Roman Burnum should be sought there, ČACE 1989, 74-87. MESIHOVIĆ 2011a, 407-410; 408 n. 899, with citations on earlier attempts at Arduba’s location.

22 The speech as it is reproduced by Dio (56.16.3) is fictitious, but it has its deeper meaning, cf. SWAN 2004, 247; MATERN 1999, 135.
Velleius' account is abridged and contains more detailed data only about those episodes that he himself experienced; however, much information is lacking, due to his intention to devote a special work to this uprising. He referred to his planned monograph just before he mentioned the deposition of the weapons of the defeated enemies at the Bathinus River (the Bosna) 23. Thus he has little to say about the exploits of the army from Moesia and from the east, or about Germanicus' military victories. A senator (he was appointed quaestor in AD 6, after the completion of equestrian militia, 2.111.3), he was commissioned by Augustus to bring part of the relief army from Rome to Tiberius in Siscia. Back in Rome, he assumed the office of quaestor and was then sent back to Tiberius as a legatus Augusti (2.111.4). He must have later served under M. Aemilius Lepidus, who had been appointed a commander-in-chief of the army at Siscia by Tiberius. Velleius' eyewitness account is quite precious and should be regarded as reliable 24. Dio's narrative, on the other hand, is more exhaustive and more balanced, but where they disagree, Velleius' version should probably be preferred. However, Dio's account is unfortunately in part fragmentary, and it may have been biased in favour of the senatorial party (to which Ovid may also have been attached) 25 around both Julias, and L. Aemilius Paullus (cos. AD 1), married to the younger Julia (Augustus’ granddaughter), and accused of conspiring against the princeps 26. Furthermore, a party around Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus, may have spread rumours against Tiberius' loyalty to Augustus; for this part of his narrative Dio may perhaps have used the Historiae of Pliny the Elder 27.

It must be emphasized, however, that it is not possible to reconstruct the exact course of the events on the basis of the narratives of Velleius and Dio, not even in terms of chronology, and any attempt should be regarded as approximate 28.

As is clear from both sources, the uprising started under the leadership of Bato among the Daesitiates in central Illyricum, settled in the broad region of Sarajevo and central Bosnia, the future province of Dalmatia 29. They were joined by the Pannonian Breuci under Pinnes and another Bato, as well as by several other peoples. The fact that Dio called Bato Delmataean (55.29.4) indicates that the Pannonian Daesitiates (Strabo 7.5.3 C. 314) belonged to the Dalmatian part of Illyricum after the province had

23 2.114.4. See Saria 1933; last on the rebellion Mesihovic 2014, 32-43.
25 Sordi 2004-05.
26 Syme 1986, 118-127.
27 Sordi 2004, 226-227; for the subsequent books on Tiberius, Dio may have used Servilius Nonianus.
29 According to Dzino 2009, the Daesitiates should be regarded as a political alliance, formed from various local communities, rather than a ‘people’.
been divided, but also that the Delmatae were close allies of Bato, who was eventually captured in the Delmataean fortress of Andetrium. According to Dio, one of the main reasons for the uprising was the ruthless collection of tributes, as well as compulsory recruitment for the German war. The reasons noted by Dio are certainly more plausible than those mentioned by Velleius, but they should be regarded rather as immediate motives. The real causes were more complex and should be explained in terms of new administrative measures introduced in the province, as well as other features of the ‘Romanization’, which had caused deep resentment of Roman rule and sharpened awareness of the peoples’ own indigenous cultures and identities, leading – in the next step – to supra-regional alliances. The collective strength of the rebellious army as noted by Velleius – even if it was not well organized and with much exaggerated numbers – no doubt represented a great threat to the Romans. Moreover, the very early acculturation of some tribal leaders and officers, who had served in the Roman army and were acquainted with the Latin language and Roman warfare, contributed much to their strategic planning, described only by Velleius. He must have been personally acquainted with the Tergeste and Nauportus regions; if rebels succeeded in blocking the Ocra Pass, this would be fatal for providing supplies for the Roman army. It does not seem likely that Velleius incorrectly reported the plans of the rebels, which had been conceived with great insight into the possibilities of the Roman army at that particular moment, but it seems reasonable to assume that changes of plans occurred in the course of the war, most probably due to some unexpected turn of events. As has been emphasized, the extant narratives are not sufficient to plausibly reconstruct military movements and the progress of the war.

Dio did not refer to any original plan of the rebels, but only mentioned that Bato of the Daesidates invaded the Dalmatian coast and unsuccessfully besieged Salonae, where he was even severely injured. The rest of his army, however, plundered the eastern Adriatic coast down to Apollonia and overpowered the Romans. From his account it may be inferred that the rebels were too late to conquer Siscia; obviously their original plans were soon partly thwarted. Since Dyrrhachium and Apollonia had belonged to Macedonia at least since Caesar, Velleius’ words that the enemy invaded Macedonia and caused much damage could refer to these military actions. Most probably the rebels attempted to control the via Egnatia, since Dyrrhachium and Apollonia were not only two important Adriatic ports worth invading (particularly the former),
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30 The complex problem of ‘Romanization’ of Illyricum on the eve of the rebellion has last been discussed by DZINO 2010, 142-153. See, generally on Romanization, also ALFOLDY 2005.
31 DZINO 2006; DZINO 2010, 146-147.
32 MÖCSY 1983.
33 HORVAT, BAVDEK 2009.
34 ISTENIČ 2009; the first known Roman temporary military camp from that period was at Obrežje near the modern border between Slovenia and Croatia, MASON 2008; chronology: MIŠKEC 2009.
36 CULHAM 2013, 246, claims that their purpose was not clear.
37 ŠASEL KOS 2005, 367.
but also the points of departure for this most significant Roman military route. But the insurgents might later have also attacked Macedonia from the east, since Dio mentioned that their repeated attacks were checked by Rhoemetalces.

Both historians mention M. Valerius Messalla Messallinus (cos. 3 BC), whom Velleius correctly calls praepositus of Illyricum, while he is imprecisely termed by Dio the governor (archon) of Delmatia and Pannonia. Messallinus’ decisive victory, which prevented the planned invasion into Italy, is more explicitly narrated by Velleius. However, the accounts of Velleius and Dio are discrepant, and hence it is not possible to reconstruct the circumstances in which the battle took place. According to Velleius, Messallinus would have been in the province at the outbreak of the rebellion, thus the battle could have taken place somewhere near Burnum, the legion’s camp. If, as Dio has it, Messallinus with his army accompanied Tiberius to Germany, and was sent ahead back to Pannonia at the start of the revolt, he could have defeated Bato in Pannonia. Some early interpreters ascribed the cognomen of the XXth legion, Valeria victrix, to its bravery under Valerius Messallinus, which is not impossible but cannot be proven.

Both Batos joined forces to attack Sirmium, having established their headquarters on Mt. Alma (or Almus, present-day Fruška Gora south of Novi Sad in Serbia), only mentioned by Dio. Mt. Alma is situated to the north of Sirmium and to the northwest of Singidunum in Moesia, and was strategically no doubt well located for an attack on the important stronghold of Sirmium. A siege of Sirmium by the Breuci had earlier been prevented by A. Caecina Severus (cos. suff. 1 BC), who was at that time either the governor in the neighbouring Moesia (called archon by Dio, perhaps anachronistically), or the legate commanding the Moesian army (legatus Augusti pro praetore exercitus Moesiae). Dio mentioned that Severus defeated the rebels on the Drava River, which is not near Sirmium; perhaps after having broken the siege he pursued the Breuci as far as that river. At the second attempt on Sirmium, the rebellious army with its base on Mt. Alma was again defeated, according to Dio, by the Thracian prince Rhoemetalces (also mentioned by Velleius), the commander of cavalry in the army of Severus. However, Severus himself could not defeat the rebels and had to return to Moesia because of an incursion by the Dacians and Sarmatians. The Breuci were one of the most dangerous enemies during this war, which is also reflected in the fact that eight cohorts of the Breuci are documented in the first century in the Roman army, which were mainly sent to Germany, Britannia, Mauretania Caesariensis, and Noricum.

---

38 Vell. 2.112.1-2; Dio 55.29.1; JAGENTEUFEL 1958, c. 2 (p. 9); THOMASSON 1984, 88 no. 9; MESIHOVIĆ 2014, 28-32.
39 WOODMAN 1977, 166-167; KOESTERMANN 1953, favours Velleius’ version; DZINO 2010, 149-150.
40 According to McPAKE 1981, the legion earned this title in Britain in AD 60, after the revolt of Boudicca, due – as he supposed – to the lack of it in the inscriptions before that year, but see GUIDO 2009, 648-650; 656.
41 THOMASSON 1984, 121 no. 6.
42 Plausibly hypothesized by RADMAN-LIVAJA, DIZDAR 2009.
Velleius, on the other hand, mentions that the rebels occupied Mt. Claudius (present-day Moslavačka Gora near Varaždin or Požeška Brda) 44, to the east of Siscia, which in any case has nothing to do with Mt. Alma. Clearly, he referred to another, and later, scene of warfare. This must have happened at the time when Severus again came from Moesia as far as the Volcaean Marshes, situated between Cornacum (present-day Vukovar) and Cibalae (Vinkovci) and eventually, after hard fighting, defeated both Batos. According to Velleius, he and M. Plautius Silvanus brought the army from the overseas provinces, that is, Severus brought three legions from Moesia, Silvanus two from Asia Minor (Galatia-Pamphylia), with auxiliary troops and royal Thracian cavalry under Rhometalces, all encircled by the enemy. Despite the most precarious military situation, both strategically most important fortified towns on the Sava River, Siscia and Sirmium, could never have been captured by the rebels. At that time Germanicus defeated the Maezaci.

Siscia was the main legionary winter camp in this war, as can be inferred from Velleius when he recounted that Tiberius, upon having escorted back (part of) the newly arrived army of Severus and Silvanus, returned to Siscia (2.113.3) 45. Silvanus’ troops almost certainly marched only as far as Sirmium and remained there 46. Since it was most difficult to control ten legions with the corresponding auxiliaries in one camp, the note in Suetonius that Tiberius commanded fifteen legions and auxiliary troops is no doubt exaggerated (Tib. 16.1) 47. The following five legions were most probably stationed in Illyricum in AD 6, before the outbreak of the great rebellion: IX Hispana, XIII and XIV Gemina, XV Apollinaris, and XX. Caecina very likely took back to Moesia the two legions that had been brought by Silvanus from the East, probably IV Scythica and V Macedonica, then representing the garrison of the province. Silvanus remained at Sirmium during the winter AD 7-8, commanding, as it seems, the previously Moesian legions, VII, VIII Augusta, and XI 48. Without a strong military base at Sirmium it would not have been possible to conquer the Pannonians 49.

Hypothetically, M. Plautius Silvanus (cos. 2 BC), who was awarded ornamenta triumphalia by the senate for his victories in Illyricum (ob res in Il(lyrico bene gestas, CIL XIV 3605 and 3606 = ILS 921 = “Année Épigraphique”, 1998, 405, from Tibur), may have been the first governor in the Dalmatian part of Illyricum, while M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. AD 6) may have been the first governor in the Pannonian part of the province 50; however, due to the war, this does not seem plausible, and they should

44 DOMIĆ KUNIĆ 2003; MESIHOVIĆ 2014, 37.
45 RADMAN-LJAVA 2010; a camp in the heartland of the Breucian territory, as suggested by SWAN 2004, 211, does not seem likely.
46 SYME 1933b, 27; WOODMAN 1977, 173.
47 SYME 1933b, 27-28; COLOMBO 2009, 98; 113.
48 WILKES 1969, 92-93; SWAN 2004, 211; which of the five noted legions came from Moesia and which from the East is not entirely clear.
49 SYME 1933b, 27.
50 REIDINGER 1956, 23-24; THOMASSON 1984, 88 no. 10; FITZ 1993, 67-69, no. 11 (Silvanus); 69-70, no. 12 (Lepidus).
primarily be regarded as military commanders. During the winter of AD 7-8, Manius Ennius, who was a garrison commander (phrourarchos) in Siscia, conducted negotiations with Scenobardus (most likely one of the leaders of the rebels), mentioned in Dio’s fragmentary text (55.33.2). Scenobardus is otherwise unknown; his name (transmitted as such in manuscripts) should perhaps be emended to Scenobarbus, which is epigraphically attested several times, as for example for a soldier of the cohort I Belgarum, Victorius Scenobarbi from Narona (CIL III 8437) or for a Dalmatian soldier from the Misenum fleet, C. Ravonius Celer, qui et Bato Scenobarbi (CIL X 3618 = ILS 2901). Manius Ennius is probably identical with a praefectus castrorum in Lower Germany, known from Tacitus, where in AD 14 he put down an insurrection among the Chauci, begun by some veterans of mutinous legions on garrison duty (Ann. 1.38) 51.
The victory of M. Plautius Silvanus over Bato, after the latter had the Breucian Bato killed, is probably commemorated in the Fasti (Ti. Aug. <in> Inlyrico vic(it)) 52.

Of the fortresses captured in AD 9, some can be identified and some not, thus for Splonum either Šipovo in the Pliva Valley near Jajce in central Bosnia, or Plevlja in the very north of present-day Montenegro have been proposed 53. The former seems more likely, since Bosnia was an important centre of the rebellion. Raetinium has been located at Golubić near Bihać since E. Koestermann 54. Seretium was not captured by Germanicus, as has wrongly been assumed 55, because this would have been mentioned by Dio, who had used a source written from the senatorial point of view and favourable to Germanicus 56. The fortress must have rather been taken by the army under the command of M. Aemilius Lepidus, since it should be sought somewhere in the region between the Dinaric divide and the Sava. This can be inferred from the fact that earlier it had been unsuccessfully besieged by Tiberius, whose military operations were limited to the Pannonian part of Illyricum in the first two years of the war 57.

A plague broke out in Rome and famine oppressed the population in Italy (Pliny, N. h. 7.149); Tiberius returned to Dalmatia in order to finish the war as soon as possible. When he divided the army into three parts (which had perhaps occurred even before his departure, as could be inferred from Velleius’ narrative), he and Germanicus went south to Dalmatia to fight the rebels there. Silvanus (who is no longer mentioned in the sources) and Lepidus operated in the north, but Lepidus then undertook a most difficult march from Siscia across the hinterland to join Tiberius in Dalmatia.

C. Vibius Postumus, who ended the resistance among the Daesitiae and Pirustae, was called praepositus Dalmatiae by Velleius (2.116.2), indicating that Illyricum was probably de facto (but not de iure, since it was still war-time) divided into two prov-

51 PIR², E 62; SWAN 2004, 215.
52 Inscr. It. XIII, 2 p. 208; EHRENBERG, JONES 1955, p. 50, on 3 August, probably AD 8 (fasti Antic-
ates).
53 ALFÒLDY 1962 (Šipovo); WILKES 1965 (Plevlja).
55 WILKES 1969, 74.
56 This has justly been stressed also by SORDI 2004, 222.
inces before the end of the rebellion, perhaps in the summer or autumn of AD 9, when Vibius was given the mandate by Augustus to conquer the Delmatae. Officially, however, the province was called *superius Illyricum* after the revolt. It should be noted that the rebellion is called *bellum Batonianum* in a fragmentary inscription from Verona, commemorating a Roman high officer (*praefectus*), who administered the regions of Iapudia and Liburnia, perhaps already during the rebellion or immediately afterwards, and whose name has not been preserved. The Liburni were Roman allies of a long standing, the Taurisci and the Iapodes probably since Octavian’s Illyrian war; none of them seem to have joined the rebellion, except the ‘transalpine’ Iapodes in the Una valley, since it is reported that Raetinium (Golubić near Bihać), one of their strongholds, was taken by force. The Liburni and the Iapodes were later, too, administered together, for after the Roman victory and administrative organization of the divided Illyricum, the towns and *civitates* of both the Iapodes and the Liburni belonged to the *conventus* at Scardona.

### The significance of the Roman victory and its epilogue

Tiberius’ victory in Illyricum, which first of all signified the pacification of a dangerous neighbour and reorganization of the province, as well as establishing an overland connection between Italy, Macedonia, and the East, was overshadowed by the annihilation of three Roman legions in Germany, in the *saltus Teutoburgiensis*, under the command of P. Quinctilius Varus. This happened almost at the same time, and as Tiberius was immediately sent to Germany, Augustus and he celebrated the triumph as late as AD 12, on 23 October. The Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion, as well as Varus’ loss of three legions, caused a change to Augustus’ political plans, cutting short
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58 Florus 2.25; thus Nagy 1970; Nagy 1991; Mesić 2011a, 446-448; differently Fitz 1988; Fitz 2000, who ascribed the division to the time of the second mission of Drusus in Illyricum in AD 20, or even to Claudius. Important is a short commentary in Šašel 1989 (= Šašel 1992), who dated the organization of the province Pannonia with a stable inner settlement to the reign of Vespasian. See now Kovács 2008, who linked the division either with Tiberius’ mission in AD 14, or Drusus’ second mission between AD 17 and 20.


63 Most important also subsequently, see Mitchell 1983.

64 Wiegels 2007.
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the ambitious expansionism of the previous years. These two ill-fated events exposed the limitations of the Roman army and induced Augustus to recommend to Tiberius to keep the empire within the existing boundaries (Tacitus, Ann. 1.11.4: consilium coercendi intra terminos imperii; cf. Dio, 56.33.5-6). Caesar’s plans of conquering the Dacians and the Parthians had to be abandoned and a more conservative and defensive foreign policy was adopted; anachronistically, it was ascribed to Augustus by Dio for an earlier period (for 20 BC: 54.9.1) 66.

Ovid in his second Epistula ex Ponto, addressed to Germanicus, in which he mentioned the triumphal procession, also referred to the captive Bato (2.1.46) 67. How to assess a figure such as Bato correctly is a complex problem, since the sources at our disposal are limited; the ancient historical narratives are mainly biased, as also are – in one way or another – some modern accounts 68. A (modern) statue in the Tirana Historical Museum represents Bato as a hero of the Illyrians (fig. 2), since the revolt broke out in Illyricum; hence, Bato had been presented under the communist government as one of the national heroes of the Albanians, the presumed descendants of the Illyrians 69. As can be recapitulated from the literary sources that have just been analyzed, and as could be inferred from them between the lines, Bato must have been a ‘Romanized’ member of an upper class leading gens of the Daesitiates, ‘Romanized’ in terms of the lately much emphasized reciprocity and specific identities, which developed when indigenous cultures collided with Roman civilization 70. Clearly, indigenous societies were

![Fig. 2. Statue of Bato in the National Historical Museum in Tirana (http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baton_1).](http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baton_1)
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66 Mattern 1999, 89 ff.
67 Mesić 2008.
68 Džino 2009; Mesić 2011b, 10-12.
70 Džino 2009; cf. also Revel 2009, 191-193 and passim, and Haeussler 2013, for ‘diverging identities’ in northern Italy.
socially more or less stratified, depending on natural and other resources at their disposal, which had given rise to local elites. The progress of acculturation was complex, but little light is shed on the internal structure of the various peoples and tribes in Illyricum; the process of ‘becoming Roman’ must have only recently started in the Pannonian part of Illyricum. As is well known, socio-cultural changes were not only a reaction to external factors, but internal motives were equally important; some native aristocracies probably made use of the support of the Romans, while others rejected it.

Certain indigenous inhabitants of the Dalmatian part of early ‘Romanized’ Illyricum must have fought in the war against the insurgents, as may have been the case of a certain C. Iulius Aetor, an aedile, who was awarded a large torques for his bravery in the ‘Dalmatian War’, which – early under Tiberius – can hardly be any other war but the Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion. Internal dissensions must have often caused upheavals, as, for example, among the Segestani during Octavian’s Illyrian war. When in 35 BC Octavian arrived in Segesta/Siscia in order to station a garrison in it and use it as a base against the Dacians and Bastarnae, he demanded a hundred hostages and as much food as they could supply. In Appian’s words “the chieftains agreed to his demands, but the common people were furious, although not on account of the hostages, since they were not their children but those of the notables” (Illyr. 23.67). Resistance, however, was suppressed by the Romans in a month.

It is most significant that Bato was spared by Tiberius after the rebellion had been put down, and was interned at the Roman naval base of Ravenna (Suet., Tib. 20), where Maroboduus was also confined (Tac., Ann. 2.63.4). This indicates that at some point Bato must have collaborated with the Romans, and indeed, according to Suetonius, he allowed Tiberius to retreat with his army from a trap in a narrow passage (ibid.). The data perhaps shed some light on a possibly ambiguous role he may have played during the last phase of the rebellion, when its imminent failure had already become clear.

A desire to accumulate power and rule over one’s own and neighbouring peoples is indicated by the case of Bato of the Breuci, who negotiated with the Romans after having betrayed Pinnes and hence also Bato of the Deasitiates. The latter must have acquired his Romanitas most probably through having served in the Roman army; this may be true also of other insurgent leaders. Whether Bato was an auxiliary officer or not remains unclear. The Deasitiates may or may not have been Appian’s Daesii (Daisioi), an important enemy during Octavian’s Illyrian war in 35–33 BC. In any case, they were one of the most powerful Pannonian peoples living in present-day central Bosnia. Thus Bato’s identity was first of all Daesitiatic, then in a broader sense perhaps ‘Pannonian’ or rather ‘Illyrian’ (in the sense of belonging to Roman
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72 ŠAŠEL KOS 2005, 437-442.
73 Illyr. 17.49. Cf. ŠAŠEL KOS 2005, 408.
74 MESIHOVIĆ 2011a, 76-126.
Illyricum). And finally, since he was almost certainly a member of an influential gens familiar with Roman civilisation, also ‘Romanized’. This is well illustrated by an elaborate strategy (mentioned supra) conceived by him and other leaders of the rebellion at its outbreak; he must have been well acquainted with the region that was most crucial for the safety of Italy: the Nauportus-Tergeste area. Bato’s interregional connections were even more complex, since he acted in close concert with the most powerful people of Dalmatia, the Delmatae. The last phase of the war was being carried out entirely on their territory: the last to fall were the Delmataean strongholds of Andetrium and Arduba.

Under Augustus, the Pannonian peoples were administratively divided between Upper and Lower Illyricum, the future provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia. Two triumphal arches were erected in Pannonia (i.e. Lower Illyricum at the time) and the tropaeum was set up at Tilurium in Dalmatia, fitting very well into the iconography of the Augustan building programmes and honorific monuments in the western provinces of the Empire, celebrating Augustus’ many victories. No doubt many precious objects commemorated the Roman victory in Illyricum, vital for the geopolitical stability of the Empire, of which the Gemma Augustea has been preserved to date. A new interpretation has recently been offered for the figures it contains, whereby the missing togatus has been interpreted as Tiberius. Of the two captives, one has been identified as Bato and the other as Pinnes, while the two captive women would have represented the conquered Dalmatia and Pannonia.

Much has been written about the division of Illyricum. As has been seen, two separate provinces, the Dalmatian and the Pannonian parts of the former great Illyricum, had no doubt been conceived in the course of the rebellion. It was important to split the military command over five legions by establishing two separate commands, not only for an overall easier control of newly conquered regions, but also to prevent concentration of military (and hence political) power in the hands of one legate, which could imperil the imperium of the princeps. Three legions were henceforward stationed in Pannonia closer to the Danube limes (VIII Augusta at Poetovio, IX Hispana perhaps at Sirmium, XV Apollinaris probably at Siscia), and two in Dalmatia (XX at Burnum, replaced in 9 AD by XI; VII at Tilurium). The large province of Illyricum can be regarded in many aspects as a strategic failure. The province

75 Dio 56.17.2; perhaps one for Augustus and one for Tiberius, see De Maria 1995, 300. Or, more likely, each dedicated to both, but erected at two military camps and/or towns in Pannonia (Illyricum).
76 Cambi 1984; Cambi 2007, p. 99 fig. 89; Sanader, Töncinić 2009, 199-200.
77 Mierse 1990; however, it is not likely that a male figure in a tunic with a Phrygian cap on the arch from Carpentorate (Carpentras) would have been a captive Dalmatian, cf. p. 319.
78 Dzino 2010, 153-155.
80 See most recently Kovács 2008.
82 See, e.g., Wilkes 2000, 102; 108-112 (however, XV Apollinaris was not stationed at Emona, which became a colony before 14/15 AD, cf. Šašel Kos 2012 and Gaspari 2010).
was too diverse, reaching from the ‘civilised’ and urbanized coastal part, the heir to the Illyrian kingdoms, and Liburnia with its own specific culture, to the Iapodian and Delmataean hinterlands, as well as the central and northeastern Pannonian peoples, living in villages, some of whom even lacked centralised rule. The name Illyricum, however, persisted for quite a long time in the official documents; in the Res gestae, which Augustus composed towards the end of his life, he claimed that he extended the boundaries of Illyricum as far as the Danube. This statement may refer to the time of the Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion – if not Tiberius’ Pannonian war – but in any case it indicates that by the time when Augustus wrote the Res gestae, the last version perhaps in AD 13, Illyricum was still known under that name and was only divided into an upper and lower province.

Most important for an easier administration of the vast area of Illyricum was the construction of roads in Dalmatia under the governor P. Cornelius Dolabella, and indeed, one of his building inscriptions is closely related to the problem of the division of Illyricum. It mentions the road leading from Salonae to the borders of Illyricum, built by the soldiers of the Dalmatian legions VII and XI and measuring 167 miles. As has been suggested, this road could have reached the border between Dalmatia (Liburnia) and Italy (Histria), but the noted distance (ca. 250 km) is too short. According to the general opinion, however, it reached the border between Dalmatia and Pannonia somewhere near the course of the Sava, either along the road noted in the Itinerarium Antonini, or along that noted in the Peutinger Map. Ivo Bojanovski in his fundamental book about the roads constructed by Dolabella argued for the latter. Any road leading towards the Sava, south of which was the boundary between the Pannonian and Dalmatian parts of Illyricum, would imply a division of Illyricum. Since the inscribed slab is broken in the middle, perhaps the word Superius should be supplied in the inscription, referring to the boundary of Illyricum Superius, that is, Dalmatia.

Before Dolabella (cos. AD 10), L. Aelius Lamia (cos. AD 3) governed Illyricum sometime in the years 12 to 14. Lamia was perhaps preceded by M. Servilius, who was consul in the same year as Lamia. Servilius is known from a short inscription from Posuški Grac (near Posušje in Herzegovina, in the region of Narona). The inscription is not dated, therefore it cannot be excluded that Servilius may have governed Illyricum even before the rebellion, before M. Valerius Messalla, in the years between AD 4 and 6, as has been postulated by the author. Posuški Grac must
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83 TÖTH 1977.
84 CIL III 3198a + CIL III 3200 = 10158; both parts = ILJug 262 = HD018010 (with other citations); BOJANOVSKI 1974, 125-127.
85 WILKES 1969, 452-453.
86 BOJANOVSKI 1974, 125-127; cf. SCHMIDT 2006, 425-426 (“no clearly defined end”); he defines the Tabulae Dolabellae as a memorial commemorating the Illyrian War.
88 JAGENTEUFEL 1958, c. 9-11 (p. 13-14); THOMASSON 1984, 89 no. 13.
89 ČOVIĆ 1988, 264 no. 23.93.
have been an important military stronghold and perhaps M. Aemilius Lepidus might also have been attested in an inscription found there (CIL III 13885) \(^91\). Dolabella was actually the first governor under Tiberius, but he must have been appointed by Augustus, shortly before his death, since in an honorific inscription from Epidaurum (Cavtat near Dubrovnik) he bears the title legatus pro praetore divi Augusti et Ti. Caesaris Augusti \(^92\). The monument was erected to him by the civitates of Upper Illyricum \(^93\), and indeed, he is referred to by Velleius Paterculus as a governor in the littoral part of Illyricum \(^94\). In this same passage Velleius also mentioned the revolt of the three Pannonian legions in the autumn of AD 14, after Augustus’ death, and the helpful role of Q. Iunius Blaesus, under whose command the legions were stationed in the summer camp. If not governor de iure, Blaesus was certainly de facto responsible for the Pannonian part of the province. More on this insurrection is reported by Tacitus and Cassius Dio \(^95\); Drusus the Younger was sent to Illyricum to help quell the revolt. Dolabella, who remained in office until AD 20, was also honorary quattuorvir quinquennalis of Salona, which was at least from that time onwards the capital of Upper Illyricum \(^96\). Earlier – and also under Caesar – the main administrative centre was located at Narona, which, however, retained an important administrative and religious role, since the town was the seat of the third Dalmatian juridical conventus and the centre of the imperial cult \(^97\).

In the years AD 17 to 20 Tiberius’ son Drusus was sent to Illyricum with imperium maius; he also attended to matters along the Pannonian part of the Danubian frontier facing the Marcomanni after the fall of Maroboduus. This was his second mission to Illyricum, which indicates that the political and economic situation in the province was still precarious and must have demanded particular attention and administrative measures, and it is not impossible to suggest that Drusus had been appointed to supervise the more formal division of Illyricum and to cope with the resulting military and administrative consequences \(^98\). As is known from a building inscription from Issa (Vis), he was also active in Dalmatia; during the governorship of Dolabella he gave the city a camp for sports activities \(^99\). In the senatus consultum of 10 December AD 20, about Cn. Calpurnius Piso pater, his estate in Illyricum is mentioned \(^100\), and in a military diploma recently discovered in Vukovar (Cornacum), of 2 July AD 61, auxiliary units are mentioned as having been stationed in Illyricum under L. Salvidienus Salvianus.
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\(^{91}\) Wilkes 1969, 75 and n. 2; Meshić 2014, 27-28.

\(^{92}\) Jagenteufel 1958, c. 11-17 (p. 14-17); Thomasson 1984, 89.

\(^{93}\) CIL III 1741 = ILS 938. See Bojanovski 1988; cf. Wilkes 2005, 140.

\(^{94}\) 2.125.5: in maritima parte Illyrici.

\(^{95}\) Tac., Ann. 1.16.1-2; Dio 57.4.1-2; Reidinger 1956, 32-34; Thomasson 1984, 99.

\(^{96}\) The city was the starting point for various roads leading into the interior of the province, see Bojanovski 1974 and Schmidt 2006.


\(^{98}\) Fitz 1993, 73-76 no. 15; Fitz 2000, 65. See now Kovács 2008.

\(^{99}\) ILIlug 257; cf. Tac., Ann. 2.44: 2.53.1; Thomasson 1984, 100.

\(^{100}\) Caballos, Eck, Fernández 1996, 130.
Rufus, who was actually the governor in Pannonia. It was only under Claudius, or more probably under Vespasian, that the provinces were officially called Dalmatia and Pannonia; unofficially, however, they were termed with these names ever since the great Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion.
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RIASSUNTO: LA FASE FINALE DELLA CONQUISTA AUGUSTEA DELL’ILLIRICO

Nel corso delle sue campagne militari nell’area balcanica (35-33 a.C.) Ottaviano vinse (oltre ad alcuni nemici meno importanti) i Giapidi e i Dalmati, e conquistò parte della Pannonia intorno a Segestica/Siscia, ma la maggior parte della futura Pannonia e Dalmazia fu sottomessa da Tiberio durante la guerra pannonica (12-9 a.C.) e la rivolta dalmata-pannonica (6-9 d.C.), innescata dai preparativi di guerra contro Maroboduo, in particolare dai preparativi di reclutamento di soldati nell’Illirico. Il confronto tra i due principali racconti della rivolta, quelli di Velleio Patercolo e Cassio Dione porta a concludere che non è possibile ricostruire l’esatto corso degli eventi sulla base delle loro narrazioni, nemmeno in termini cronologici e qualsiasi tentativo si dovrebbe ritenere approssimativo. Un breve commento accompagna i protagonisti principali, così come alcuni luoghi ed eventi menzionati in ciascun racconto.

Parole chiave: Ottaviano/Augusto; Tiberio; Illirico; rivolta dalmato-pannonica (6-9 d.C.).

SUMMARY

In the course of his Illyrian war (35-33 BC), Octavian conquered (in addition to some less serious foes) the Iapodes, parts of Pannonia around Segestica/Siscia, as well as the Delmatae. However, most of the future Pannonia and Dalmatia was subdued by Tiberius in his Pannonian war (12-9 BC) and Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion (AD 6-9), triggered by war preparations against Maroboduo, particularly by the recruitment of soldiers in Illyricum. The comparison of the two main accounts of the revolt, that of Velleius Paterculus and Cassius Dio, led to the conclusion that it is not possible to reconstruct the exact course of the events on the basis of their narratives, not even in terms of chronology, and any attempt should be regarded as approximate. A short commentary accompanies the main protagonists, as well as certain places and events mentioned in both accounts.

Keywords: Octavian/Augustus; Tiberius; Illyricum; Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion (AD 6-9).
IZVLEČEK: ZAKLJUČNA FAZA AVGUSTEJSKE ZASEDBE ILIRIKA


Ključne besede: Oktavijan/Avgust; Tiberij; Ilirik; panonsko-dalmatinski upor (6-9 po Kr.).