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The End of the Norican Kingdom and the Formation of the Provinces of Noricum and Pannonia

Marjeta Šašel Kos

The Chronicle of the Counts of Celje was written in the second half of the 15th century. A few sentences in the first chapter concerning the ancient remains of Celeia may be of interest to scholars studying Norican stone monuments: «... It may even nowadays be seen from the powerful walls and huge pieces of marble how very mighty the town of Celje had been at that time. These were found especially at the public well where a hall was once located. If such a large piece of stone could have been discovered at that place, which could not be transported on any wooden cart, as has already been the case, this certainly indicates how much power and wealth was involved. These people wanted to create an eternal memory of themselves by having their signs and their names carved in the hard marble with large letters. However, these people will be entirely and utterly forgotten when the few still legible stones are broken to pieces; yet nonetheless, no one knows anything about these people.» (Translation of the text of the Chronicle published by Krones [n. 1], p. 62-63). To continue in the words of the Chronicle, there was actually much wealth in Celeia, as well as in other Norican towns, and it was their wealth, particularly in minerals, which mainly caused the Romans to establish the legendary friendly relationship with the Norican kingdom. There are enormous gaps in our knowledge of the development of this relationship and about the subsequent history of the provinces of Noricum and Pannonia, yet we may feel more confident in terms of the possibilities of reconstructing the history of the towns and some of their inhabitants than the writer of the Chronicle did; however, any such attempt is bound to remain largely incomplete.

The beginnings of the known history of the Norican kingdom coincide with the decision, taken in 183 BC, to found Aquileia, which was a reaction to an attempt of the Galli transalpini three years earlier to build an oppidum in the future Aquileian region. Livy reported, in three often cited passages, that in 186 BC certain Galli transalpini (12,000 armed men, Livy 39 54. 3; cf. Dio 19, Zon. 9. 21. 6 [Boiss. I 293]: Γαλάται τινες) peacefully crossed over to Venetia, with no intention of plundering or waging war (sine populatione aut bello, Livy 39. 22. 6), to found an oppidum in the region of the future Aquileian territory. Livy added that they had descended along hitherto unknown paths leading through narrow mountainous and wooded passages (per saltus ignotae antea viae, 39. 45. 6). Pliny (N. h. III 131, citing the author of the Annales Piso) additionally noted that the site of the oppidum was located 12 miles from the future Aquileia, and briefly stated that it was destroyed on the orders of M. Claudius Marcellus, against the will of the Senate.

---

I would very much like to thank Prof. Dr. Dénes Gabler and Manfred Kandler for having kindly read this paper and offered useful comments, as well as Dr. Ranko Matasović and Prof. Dr. Carlo de Simone for their linguistic observations, and Barbara Smith-Demo for having helped me with my English.

1 Franz KRONES/R. v. MARCHLAND, Die Freien von Saneck und ihre Chronik als Grafen von Cilli. II. Teil: Die Cilliier Chronik (Graz 1883).
(etiam invito senatu). These last words probably refer only to Marcellus’ too harsh treatment of the Gauls, whose property was given over to the consul’s soldiers to plunder, although Dobesch noted that Pliny’s statement does not correspond to the known course of events, since it cannot be denied that the Senate did not want the Celtic oppidum to exist. Pliny must no doubt have distorted the meaning of the original text by having drastically shortened it.

An embassy was sent by the Senate across the Alps, and received the answer that the emigrants had gone to Italy without the permission or knowledge of the tribal leaders (… neque profectos ex auctoritate gentis ... Livy 39. 22. 7). In 183 BC, at least two Roman legions were sent to Venetia by orders of M. Claudius Marcellus, one under the proconsul L. Porcius Licinus, who destroyed the oppidum of the Gauls and confiscated their arms along with other property, although the Gauls had surrendered upon the legion’s arrival (39. 54. 2-4). The Gauls complained in the Senate through the mediation of the praetor peregrinus C. Valerius Flaccus, explaining that they had left their country because of overpopulation and scarcity of farming land, and intended to settle in a desolate region without causing any harm to anyone. The Senate made clear to them that it had been an error to settle in a foreign land without asking permission of the Roman magistrates in charge of the province (… cum in Italian venerint oppidumque in alieno agro, nullius Romani magistratus, qui ei provinciae praesesset, permisso aedificare conati sint ..., 39. 54. 10). To what extent the Roman state was juridically justified in claiming a right over the region in question may partly be indicated by the fact that the Senate ordered the property of the Gauls to be restored under the supervision of a prestigious embassy of two ex-consuls, L. Furius Purpurio and Q. Minucius Rufus, as well as a former praetor, L. Manlius Acidinus Fulvianus, who had military and diplomatic experience in the Celtic world. In Càssola’s opinion, the land was most probably una terra di nessuno, but it was certainly controlled by the Romans. The same embassy further accompanied the Gauls back to their homeland, where it was hospitably received by the »elders« (= seniores), who showed surprise (perhaps feigned?) upon hearing how mildly the Romans had treated the secessionists of a Celtic tribe under the authority of the »elders«. Exchanging gifts, both parties agreed that the Alps should be regarded as a barrier not to be penetrated (… Alpes prope inessuperabilem finem in medio esse ... 39. 54. 12: the formulation is that of the Senate’s answer to the Gauls in Rome). No king is mentioned in this context, which does not necessarily mean that he did not exist; it may merely signify that his role within society had not yet been sufficiently distinguished.

Although Livy noted several details of this story, which in broad outline hardly presents any difficulties in explanation, he did not define these Galli transalpini more precisely — obviously their name was not cited in his sources — which has resulted in several hypotheses about their identity. One of the widely accepted ones was formulated by Sartori, who argued that these Galli had actually been the Taurisci settled in present-day Slovenia, who wished to dominate trade across the Ocra pass on both sides of the Alps. Zippel, too, considered the Taurisci, although he

---

3 For the problem populi gens see DOBESCH (n. 2) 52-57; in his study he examined all the details of Livy’s passages and set the episode in a broader historical context, 14-80; 367-370.
5 BROUGHTON (n. 4) 379.
6 BROUGHTON (n. 4) 379; G. ZIPPEL, Die römische Herrschaft in Illyrien bis auf Augustus (Leipzig 1877) 110-111.
7 F. CÀSSOLA, La politica romana nell’alto Adriatico in: Aquileia e l’alto Adriatico. Antichità Altoadr. 2 (Udine 1972) 56. For the Romanization of this area and Histria see also R. F. ROSSI, La romanizzazione dell’Istria in: Aquileia e l’alto Adriatico, ib., 65 ff.
9 Thus DOBESCH (n. 2) 182-236, passim.
11 SARTORI (n. 8), 1-40. See ALFÖLDY (n. 10) 28-38; cf. J. ŠAŠEL, Keltisches portorum in den Ostalpen (zu Plin.
ascribed to the Tauriscan tribal federation — in accordance with earlier opinions — a greater ethnic and geographic significance than it had ever actually had, as well as a leading role in the Norican kingdom.13

It is a general assumption that the Senate’s negotiations with the »elders« of a transalpine people reflect the first contacts between the Roman state and the Regnum Noricum. Dobesch, who exhaustively analyzed various possibilities concerning the homeland of the Galli,14 returned to an earlier thesis of Egger — which the latter rettracted at a later date in favour of the Taurisci in Slovenia — to seek it in Carinthia. The Alps, defined in Livy as an almost inaccessible barrier, would, in Dobesch’s opinion best suit the Carnic Alps and the Karavanke Mts., while the unknown, or rather, less known passes would have either been Pöckenpaß, or the road through Pontebba and Tarvisio. Dobesch interpreted the emigrants of the Galli sociologically, i.e. as representing a kind of antagonism between the seniores and younger men of the gens,16 rather than in terms of different peoples living in loose confederation, with possible antagonism among various tribes, yet the latter explanation seems to me to fit better the known data in Livy’s narrative. It could hardly be imagined how the »elders« of a gens, settled somewhere in Carinthia, could have denied any knowledge of the emigration of a large number of their people, politically organized in one and the same unit. A more likely explanation may be that the emigrants belonged to one or several of the tribes of a people living at the edge of the postulated confederation, which may have been represented by a council of noblemen, probably of several tribes of the leading people, as well as of minor dynasts of other peoples included in the confederation, perhaps headed by a king, despite the fact that such is not mentioned in the sources.

Livy’s text certainly suggests that the Galli did not come from very far away and it may further be deduced that they were rather well acquainted with the political and military situation of the Roman state, and had made a correct estimate of its potential force and acknowledged its geo-political aspirations. A certain degree of diplomacy and acculturation may be indicated by the fact that they surrendered without resistance, pleaded their cause in the Senate, and retreated, although they were 12,000 armed men who could have attempted to fight for their rights. Overpopulation and a scarcity of fertile land, given as the main reason for their crossing, could correspond to the regions of several tribes living in the hinterland of Aquileia, yet the unknown roads along which they descended to Italy — unless they should be understood in terms of microtopography — could hardly refer to the Taurisci, who dominated trade along the Sava and Ljubljanica rivers via Nauporitus in the direction of the Carnic village of Tergeste (Strabo VII 5.2 C 314). Accepting the localization of the Ambisontes along the valley of the river Aesontius (the present-day Soća or Isonzo),17 a hypothesis may be ventured that the Galli transalpini transgressi in Venetiam could have been the Ambisontes (Fig. 1). This would be well in accordance with the

n.h. III 128). In: Corolla memoriae Erich Swoboda dedicata (Graz, Köln 1966) 199 and n. 3 (= Opera selecta. 501); WINKLER, Noricum und Rom in: ANRW II 6 (Berlin, New York 1977), 183-187, who did not identify the tribe; M. ŠASEL KOS, Zgodovinska podoba prostora med Akvilejo, Jadranom in Sirmijem pri Kasiju Dionu in Herodijanu. A Historical Outline of the Region between Aquileia, the Adriatic, and Sirmium in Cassius Dio and Herodian (Ljubljana 1986) 96.

13 ZIPPEL (n. 6) 113 ff.; 121; cf. 110.
14 DOBESCH (n. 2) 57-73.
16 DOBESCH (n. 2) 52 ff.
known facts of their history and would particularly well match the suggestion that the seniores, mentioned by Livy as having received the senatorial embassy, would represent the nucleus of the Norican kingdom beyond the Karavanke Mts. In the Augustan period the Ambisontes, who are archaeologically defined by the La Tène period Idrija Culture, are known to have been one of the rebellious Alpine tribes, and they are the only hostile Norican tribe mentioned on the inscription at La Turbie among the gentes Alpinae devictae. They are the only people for whom it is expressly known that they had opposed the central authority of the Norican king; they are mentioned among the eight Norican peoples on the inscription from Magdalensberg honouring Livia and both Iulias, Augustus’ daughter and granddaughter, as well as in Ptolemaeus (Geogr. II 13. 2), who placed them in the south of the province (Κατεχόσε δὲ τὰ μὲν δυσμικότερα τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἀπ’ ἀρκτον ἄρχομένοις Σεόβαχες καὶ Ἀλανοί καὶ Ἀμβισόντιοι, τὰ δ’ ἀντισυλκότερα Νορικοί, καὶ Ἀμβιδραμοί καὶ Ἀμβιλικοί). Their hostility to the central Norican authority which, given the inaccessibility and difficulty of communication between most of the Norican regions, must have always been a more or less loosely cohesive power, could perhaps be projected well back to the first half of the 2nd century BC. It may further be supposed that the relative proximity of Italy and its economic resources, different from those on which central Noricum based its power, may have conditioned the relations of the Ambisontes with the Roman state in a different way that cannot be compared to the relations formed between the Romans and the central Norican kingdom. If, however, the identification with the Ambisontes is not accepted, these Galli may well have been those

---

**Fig. 1 Norican tribes and towns. Black dots denote Claudian foundations.**


\[\text{SAŠEL (n. 17), 135 (= Opera selecta. 288).}\]

Norici, who, according to Strabo (IV 6. 8-9 C 206), were settled in the hinterland of the northern Adriatic.

II

The relationship between the Norici and Taurisci, however, is far less well defined and it is not at all clear how to explain it within and/or outside the Norican kingdom, despite several more or less recent studies and attempts to define the Taurisci geographically and chronologically.20 The Taurisci must be located where the literary sources in which they are mentioned situate them. These few data would indicate the regions of their settlement as mainly present-day Slovenia, notably the valleys of the Ljubljanička and Sava rivers, parts of Upper Carniola, Lower Carniola, and southern Styria, extending in the period of their expansion within the coalition with the Boii as far as western Croatia and Lake Balaton. Archaeologically they seem to be well defined by the La Tène period Mokronog Culture.21 Their relations both to the Norici and to the Romans seem to have been antagonistic, which is well illustrated by the episode of gold having been discovered in their region in Polybius’ time (Strabo IV 6. 12 C 208: ‘Ετών φησὶ Πολύβιος ἔφη ἐκεῖνο κατ’ Ἀκυληίαν μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς Ταυρίσκοις τοῖς Νορίκοις ἐφρεθήναι χρυσεῖν οὕτως εὐφυές...’).22 Gold was extracted first in collaboration with the Roman entrepreneurs in such large quantities that its price dropped by one third throughout Italy. The Romans were consequently expelled by the Taurisci, who wanted to monopolize the extraction and processing of gold, as well as trade in it. It is questionable whether in the 2nd century and in the first part of the 1st century BC they at all recognized the authority of the Norican king, although undoubtedly the Norican kingdom had always endeavoured to gain influence over the regions of the Taurisci.

Aquileia was founded as a Latin colony in 181 BC, two years after the departure of the Galli transalpini. Although it was founded within the Venetic region, the site of the city itself was not actually Venetic, as is expressly emphasized by Strabo (V 1. 8 C 214: ‘Εξό δέ ἔστι τῶν ἑν τοις Εὐνακίκην δρόμον ἐν Ἀκυληίᾳ). The Celts living north and northeast of the Adriatic were influenced by the proximity of the Veneti, with whom they must have undoubtedly had trade connections; individual Roman merchants, too, had certainly been exploring the possibilities of Celtic markets even before Aquileia was founded, thus it is understandable that the Celts, especially tribes living in the less fertile Alpine valleys, were attracted to the south. The Galli transalpini are mentioned again by Livy in 179 BC in circumstances similar to those in 186. 3000 men had crossed over to Italy to ask the consuls and the Senate for permission to settle on Roman soil, under Roman authority (... sub imperio populi Romani ..., 40. 53. 5-6). However, they were banished from the country under the consul Q. Fulvius Flaccus, who punished the instigators of the movement. Analysing the similarity of the situation, Dobesch came to the conclusion that they may well have been the same people who had been expelled from the Aquileian area five years earlier.21 Most probably the mentioned Celts were not actually the same people who had been expressly denied the possibility to settle in Italy, but certainly they must have come from — roughly speaking — the same milieu, from a Celtic area close to Italy, since their having asked for permission to settle on

23 DOBESCH (n. 2), 91-97.
Italic soil would indicate that they were acquainted with the situation which had occurred in the previous years. The opinion of Zippel and Alföldy holding that the mention of these Celts referred to the Ligurian Alps seems less likely.\textsuperscript{24}

III

Three Celtic royal names, reported by Livy, are generally connected to the eastern Alpine regions,\textsuperscript{25} or even more specifically to the Norican kingdom,\textsuperscript{26} although the name of the Norici itself is not (yet) mentioned. In 178 BC, Catmelus, who commanded troops instead of a king, fought at the head of 3000 Celtic soldiers on the side of the Roman consul against the Histri, who were subdued in 177 (\textit{Ab eadem regione milie ferme passuum castra erant Gallorum; Catmelus pro regulo erat tribus haud amplius milibus armatorum...}, Livy 41. 1. 8). It is somewhat interesting that in this passage Livy does not speak of the \textit{Galli transalpini}, but only of the \textit{Galli}. These may well have been Celtic tribes who were directly affected by the Histrian war, such as the Carni, as proposed by Dobesch,\textsuperscript{27} of whom it is further known that in 171 BC they had already been involved with the Romans in some kind of agreement, since they complained in the Senate against the criminal conduct of the consul C. Cassius Longinus (Livy 43. 5. 3), expecting due justice.

The kingdom of Cincibilus and his brother (171-170) may well be identified with the Norican kingdom,\textsuperscript{28} although Cincibilus is termed only as \textit{rex Gallorum} (Livy 43. 5. 1). His brother, who is not named, intervened in the Senate in 170 BC as his ambassador on behalf of his \textit{socii}, the Alpine peoples (\textit{Alpini populi, ib. 2}), who were treated like enemies by the consular army of C. Cassius Longinus, no less than the Carni, Histri and Iapodes, who in their turn sent envoys to the Senate about the same matter. A year earlier, after the outbreak of the Macedonian war under Perseus, command in Macedonia was assigned by lot to P. Licinius Crassus, while C. Cassius Longinus, against his expectations and wishes, received Italy with Cisalpina, where he saw no possibilities of glory and enrichment. Having arrived in northern Italy, he nonetheless decided to leave without the Senate’s permission for Macedonia across Illyricum. The story is highly interesting both for the history of the Celtic transalpine kingdoms and for the Balkans and southeastern Alpine region and their contacts with the Romans, as it illuminates from different angles the strategic and geo-political significance of the regions along the ancient trade route related to the legend of the Argonauts. Obviously the point of departure of C. Cassius Longinus was Aquelea, which he left unprotected, taking provisions for 30 days for his legions, as well as demanding guides who knew the roads leading from Italy to Macedonia, whom he had ordered to be sought out among the natives, the Carni, Histri, and Iapodes (cf. Livy 43. 5. 3). The Senate was informed about his departure by the envoys from Aquelea who diplomatically explained that their colony had remained insufficiently protected against possible attacks of the hostile Histrian and Illyrian nations, not daring to directly accuse the consul. The senators referred them to the latter and could hardly believe that he had left his province, assuming that he might have decided for a campaign against the Carni or Histri. The interesting detail that the Aqueleans feared the incursions of the Histri and Illyrians should be noted, while the Senate — at a certain distance and perhaps less well acquainted with the changing current situation — would have expected a war against the Histri or Carni (Livy 43. 1. 7-8), which may, however, also mean that some of the Carnic tribes (those

\textsuperscript{24} ZIPPEL (n. 6) 109; ALFÖLDY (n. 10) 30.

\textsuperscript{25} WINKLER (n. 11) 188-190.

\textsuperscript{26} ALFÖLDY (n. 10) 31-35.

\textsuperscript{27} DOBESCH (n. 2) 98-108.

\textsuperscript{28} ZIPPEL (n. 6) 108 ff.; ALFÖLDY (n. 10) 32; WINKLER (n. 11) 188-189; S. L. DYSON, \textit{The Creation of the Roman Frontier} (Princeton 1985) 69-72; DOBESCH (n. 2) 108-157.
around Carnium? — if they ever existed)²⁹ were hostile to the Romans. Three senatorial envoys were dispatched on the same day to persuade the consul and stop him from starting war against any nation without the decision of the Senate. Any measures to protect Aquileia were postponed for fear of what might happen to the consul and the army. Thus Livy (ib., 12).

The Senate’s fears were more than justified since at the time Illyricum was to a large extent a terra incognita. Not only did Longinus march through rough and barely passable areas, he had plunged himself and the army in the midst of unknown nations and tribes whose reactions could not have been foreseen, and may have well been hostile. Further fears were no less justified: by acting thus Cassius Longinus might disclose the way to Italy to all the peoples settled along his line of march (… viam tot nationibus in Italian aperiret, Livy 43. 1. 9). Trade routes which combined tracks and river traffic had functioned for centuries, and goods as well as information may have travelled with a perhaps unexpected velocity. This is well illustrated by a story of how an embassy of the Celts living in the Adriatic area (perhaps the northern Adriatic) came in 335 BC to Alexander the Great, when he was waging war against the Triballi, to offer him their friendship because of his great glory (Ptolem., FGrHist 138 F 2 = Strabo VII 3. 8 C 301 f.; cf. Arr. I. 4. 6-8; Ptolemaeus [in Strabo] called them Κελτούς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἀδριανόν; Αρχ. πορὰ Κελτῶν δὲ τῶν ἐπί τῷ Ἰονίῳ κόλπῳ ὕκισσαν, and in any case πόρρω … φρονεῖν Ἀλεξάνδρου). The data are too scarce to allow an identification of these Celts, but it is implied in the story that they must have been informed of Alexander’s war against the Triballi surprisingly quick. However, these routes functioned on a more or less individual basis: individual merchants only, and/or small caravans of merchants travelled along them for long distances. The traffic on shorter distances, along shorter sections of the long route connecting the Black Sea coast with Italy, must have been more lively. Thus in terms of broad geographical orientation these huge distances seem not to have been estimated correctly. Philip V sought allies among the barbaric nations settled along the Danube with the intention of persuading them to invade Italy (Livy 39. 35. 4: … missis ad accolas Histri fluminis barbaros, ut in Italian irramperent, sollicitandos), probably the Bastarnae (cf. 40. 57. 6-7; Pomp. Trog. (lust.) prolog. 32: … concitatique ab eo Basternae transire conati in Italian), to which Livy elsewhere added that it is only possible to lead an army to Italy across the region of the Scordisci (40. 57. 7: per Scordiscos ite esse [from Dardania] ad mare Hadraticum Italianam; alia via traduci exercitum non posse). But how erroneous Philip’s conception of the length of Illyricum actually was, is indicated by the story that in the region of the Maedi he climbed to the top of Mount Haemus in order to see at the same time the Black Sea, the Adriatic, the Danube and the Alps, which would be of great help to him in planning the war against the Romans (Livy 40. 21. 2: … quia vulgatae opinio crediderat Ponticum simul et Hadraticum mare et Histirum annem et Alpes conspersi posse: subjecta oculis ea haud parvi sibi momenti futura ad cogitationem Romani belli). This, however, was a general estimation of the distance, noted also by Polybius (24. 4), and criticised by Strabo (VII 5. 1 C 313: Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τὸ Πόντον τὸ Αἰμιὺν ἐστιν ὤρος, μέγιστον τῶν τούτην καὶ ὑπηλότατον, μεσὴν πάντως διαμέρου τὴν Ἐρυμένην ὥρον φερα Πολύμην ἄμφοτέρας καθαρότατοι, τὰς θαλάσσας. οὐκ ἀληθῆ λέγον τὸ διαστήμα μέγα τὸ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδριανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐπισκοπεύοντα πολλά; cf. Pomp. Mela, II 2. 17-18 e quis Haemos in tantum altitudinis abit, ut Euxinum et Hadratium ex summo vertice ostendat). Perseus may have not entirely abandoned plans of attacking the Romans,³⁰ of which the Senate was informed by Eumenes of Pergamum (42. 11. 2 ff.; 42. 11. 4: Bastarnarum gentem excitat sedibus suis, quorum auxilii frentis in Italian transiret; cf. Livy 40. 5. 9-10; 44. 26. 2: … et tum Gallorum effusorum per Illyricum ingens oblatus <auxilium> avaritia dimissum est, meaning the Bastarnae; Plutarch, Aemil. IX 7). Possible attacks across Illyricum were also planned by Hannibal and Antiochus of

²⁹ V. VEDALDI IASBEZ, La Veneto orientale e l’Hisperia. Le fonti letterarie greche e latine fino alla caduta dell’Impero Romano d’Occidente. Studi e ricerche sulla Gallia cisalpina 5 (Roma 1994) 229-239.

Syria towards the end of Hannibal’s life (Livy 34. 60; App., Syr. 7; Iust. 31. 3. 5-10), as well as by Mithridates VI Eupator in 64 BC (App., Mithr. 109; Plut., Pomp. 41. 2; Strabo VII 4. 3; Dio 37. 11).31

Although the southeastern Alpine region was strategically highly important for Italy, since across the Ocre pass the route to the Apennine peninsula was easily crossable and totally unprotected, at the time it was not yet — and not in the least — controlled by the Romans. This is confirmed by the fact that the army of C. Cassius Longinus had to be led by foreign guides. It is questionable how far the consul managed to get, but most probably he did not reach the Pannonian regions beyond Siscia. Upon his recall, he devastated on his way back various regions of the Iapodes, Histri, and Carni, as well as those of the Alpine peoples, taking large numbers of slaves, which was one of the main accusations of Cincibilus’ brother. The Alpine peoples must most probably be identified with the various Tauriscan tribes, and it is known from other sources that the transalpine Celtic kingdom, i.e. most probably the Norican kingdom, had endeavoured to gain authority over them; some of the Tauriscan peoples must obviously have been in some kind of dependence on the kingdom of Cincibilus. His brother could achieve no restitution of any kind for damage done to his socii, since the Senate did not want to condemn Cassius (who at the time was acting in the inferior capacity of a tribunus militum under A. Hostilius Mancinus in Macedonia) in his absence. The envoys of the other three injured nations also had no success. Envoys were sent by the Senate to inform them of its decision. Cincibilus’ kingdom was the only party to gain advantage from the tragic affair. In order to silence them, the Senate sent to Cincibilus and his brother an embassy of two consular diplomats of the highest esteem and experience, C. Laelius, a friend of Scipio Africanus (cos. 190), proconsul in 189 with command over the Cisalpina, and M. Aemilius Lepidus, one of the most important senators of his time, twice consul, both times in Liguria, with great experience in dealing with Celtic affairs, founding colonies, the division of the Ligurian lands, and restoring relations with the Cenomani after they had been illegally disarmed by M. Furius Crassipes.32 They bestowed upon the royal brothers princely gifts of the highest value, including the right to export horses.33 Economic and political interests at the highest level were mutual, and Rome wanted to maintain the best possible contacts with the kingdom across the Alps, which were at the time regarded as the most opportune frontier to protect Italy. The economically prosperous kingdom, which may have been organized under the leadership of two kings-brothers: duo fratres reguli (Livy 43. 5. 8),34 was situated suitably outside the main communication routes which connected the Apennine and Balkan peninsulas. Hospitium publicum, which is known to have existed between Rome and Noricum in the time of the Cimbric invasion (App., Kelt. 13. 2), may well have dated from the reign of Cincibilus.35

There may have been several other small kingdoms besides this one which was of greater significance,36 and which was represented first by the seniores, and later by Cincibilus.

One of the minor kings was perhaps Balanos who sent envoys to Rome in 169 BC to offer military aid for the Macedonian war (Livy 44. 14. 1: dum bellum in Macedonia geritur, legati transalpini

33 Analyses and comparative material for gifts of similar kind in DOBESCH (n. 2) 137-146.
34 See DOBESCH (n. 2) 146-151.
37 DOBESCH (n. 2) 179.
ab regulo Gallorum — Balanos ipsius traditur nomen, gentis ex qua fuerit, non traditur — Romam venerunt pollicentes ad Macedonicum bellum auxilia). The Senate, however, did not accept the king’s offer, although the latter was highly rewarded with costly gifts. The mere one year difference between Cincibillus and Balanos would indicate the existence of another small kingdom, rather than suggest that Balanos would have been the successor of Cincibillus.38 An additional indication of two different political structures could be Livy’s claim that the name of Balanos’ gens had not been recorded — as if he wanted to say that these were not the usual well-known Galli transalpini.

IV

It may or may not be claimed that the hundred and fifty years of Roman occupation in the Venetic-Carnic area prior to Caesar should be considered primarily as social history,39 and it is questionable to what extent this was »the story of a rapid Romanization taking place behind a relatively calm frontier«.40 Much more fighting must have been involved in conquering new lands and gradually extending the northeastern frontiers of the Cisalpina than is reflected in the extant sources. The evidence is scattered, scarce, and indecisive. Dyson wrongly noted that in 156 BC, C. Marciius Figulus set out from Aquileia for his campaign against the Pannonians.41 He is known to have fought against the Delmatae and no doubt led his army to Dalmatia across the sea. There is also the mysterious Cornelius, briefly mentioned by Appian (Illyr. 14) — and only by him — as having unsuccessfully fought against the Pannonians. His total defeat echoed throughout Italy and spread such fear of the Pannonians among the Italians that in future no consul dared start a campaign in Pannonia. Zippel identified him as Cn. Dolabella (cos. 159), or L. Lentulus Lupus (cos. 156), as the only two Cornelli who could have possibly fought in Pannonia before 119 BC,42 the date of the campaign against the Segestani of L. Metellus and L. Aurelius Cotta (App., Illyr. 10. 30),43 although there is no mention in their careers of any such action. The year 156 is usually noted as the first encounter of the Romans with the Pannonians, which would have occurred in the context of the Roman war with the Scordisci.44 Dobiáš supposed that Appian used a Greek source for this episode, since an utter defeat of the Romans was admitted without being veiled, and the consul was only noted by his family name; in his opinion it is impossible to date it.45 Although in strictly linguistic terms the text does not say that Cornelius was a consul, the internal logic of the sentence seems to suggest that Appian’s Cornelius was a consul. Gwyn Morgan’s tentative proposals to identify him with the praetor in Macedonia, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, and the Pannonians with the Scordisci, are based entirely on hypothetical premises; thus his study cannot offer sound historical conclusions. It could hardly be argued that Appian would name the Scordisci as Pannonians, since he specifically distinguished between these two peoples. If anything, Appian would have used for the Scordisci the general name of the Illyrians, and the only nation with which they could theoretically have been confused would have been the Thracians.46

38 DOBESCH (n. 2) 158-165.
40 DYSON (n. 28) 74.
41 DYSON (n. 28) 74, citing MRR I 447.
42 ZIPPPEL (n. 6) 133 ff.
43 M. GWYN MORGAN, »Lucius Cotta and Metellus«: Roman Campaigns in Illyria during the late second century. Athenaeum 49, 1971, 271-301, who identified L. Metellus not as cos. 119, but 117.
45 J. DOBIÁŠ, Studie k Appianově knize illyrské. Études sur le livre illyrien d’Appien (Pragae 1930) 176-178 (285).
46 PAPAZOGLU (n. 30) 345-354.
Thus 119 BC remains the first certain date in the history of the conquest of Pannonia, although Appian reported — the data derived from Augustus’ Memoirs — that twice before Octavian the Romans had fought against the Segestani (Illyr. 22). It should be noted in passing that the unidentified military action in the territory of the Segestani, possibly under a Cornelius, may perhaps be identified with a war against the Pannonians mentioned by Polybius in his frg. 64, which is unfortunately preserved without context, and in which, however, the Romans are not explicitly named. Aquileia, whose inhabitants must have been very much interested in gaining influence and creating a stable situation in their hinterland, must have been a starting point for any military actions in the direction of Siscia. It is therefore not surprising to hear of earlier military campaigns against the Taurisci, Carni, Histri and Iapodes in 129 BC under C. Sempronius Tuditanus,47 and in 115 BC against the Carni under Aemilius Scaurus (CIL I, 1, 2nd ed. p. 49 = In. It. 13, 1, p. 84-85 frg. 36).48

In the hundred years before the accession of Caesar, the economic development of the Norican kingdom and its strategic role as a protector of Roman interests in the Alpine and Transalpine regions were only briefly troubled by the invasion of the Cimbri in 113 BC. The general prosperity and economic importance of the Norican kingdom is best reflected in the growth of the oppidum at Magdalensberg, which in the late 2nd century BC became the most important native centre and Roman trading settlement, compared — mutatis mutandis — to the settlement of Italian merchants on Delos.49 Interesting light is shed by such scattered evidence as the tombstone of Popiaus Senator, if it is both genuine and correctly dated to ca. 100 BC.50

During the Republic, the Romans were not at all interested in conquering the Norican kingdom, rather it was convenient for them to control it by maintaining a good relationship with the Norican king. However, it was vital for them to closely supervise and gradually subdue the dangerous transitional area which connected the Balkans with Italy and led through the Emona basin and Nauporus across the Ocra pass to Tergeste and Aquileia. There are several indications to suggest that Cisalpina (a province from 89? to 42 BC, afterwards part of Italy, App., Bell. civ. V 3; 22; III 30; Dio 48. 12),51 gradually extended over the Ocra pass to include not only the Karst hinterland of Tergeste, but also the Postojna gates and Nauporus with the Emona basin.52 By the time of Caesar’s proconsulate in Gallia Cisalpina and Illyricum (the provinces were assigned to him in 59 BC), Nauporus was organized as a Roman vicus governed by two magistri vici, of whom four are known by name, all four being freedmen, most probably of trading families from Aquileia (the Annaei, Fabii, Petronii, and Fulginates, whose ultimate provenience is not quite clear, probably Fulginace).53 In Emona, too, Italian settlers are documented as early as perhaps the

48 For both campaigns also see ŠAŠEL (n. 20) 79-81 (= 416-422).
52 ŠAŠEL (n. 20) 81 (= 422); idem, Zur Frühgeschichte der XV. Legion und zur Nordostgrenze der Cisalpina zur Zeit Caesars in: Römische Geschichte, Altertumskunde und Epigraphik. Festschrift für Artur Betz zur Vollendung seines 80. Lebensjahres = Archäologisch-epigraphische Studien 1 (Wien 1985) 547-555 (= Opera selecta, 469-477); neutral considered by FITZ (n. 51) 11-12, but ultimately not accepted, see p. 19.
period of Caesar (the Caesernii).\textsuperscript{54} It is difficult to say to what extent this area had been occupied in the course of Caesar’s proconsulate, as some of it may have been controlled and/or conquered even earlier. There is no doubt, however, that Caesar planned to campaign against the Dacian state ruled by Burebista, who had dangerously extended it as far as the later Pannonia, and by having crushed the coalition of the Boii and the Taurisci, seriously threatened both the Norician kingdom and the Roman state.\textsuperscript{55}

The Roman extension of Cisalpina in the northeastern direction is also well documented archaeologically. The earliest finds of Graeco-Roman amphorae of the 2nd century BC were discovered at Sermin (the region of Capris, present-day Koper/Capodistria), an important settlement in northern Histria not far from Tergeste. Towards the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st centuries BC, up to the Augustan period, Italic black slipped pottery and amphorae of Lamboglia 2 type were further found in the Razdrito area (Mandra and Preval), in the region of the Ocra pass. Italic pottery typical of the mid 1st century BC was discovered together with native La Tène pottery at Nauportus and Émona.\textsuperscript{56}

V

Octavian’s military campaigns in Illyricum may be considered as the next, and perhaps decisive, phase in the conquest of the future provinces of Pannonia and Dalmatia, decisive not so much in the sense of conquering extensive new territories, such as the Pannonian hinterland of the future province of Dalmatia, the regions of the Dacitectae, Maezaei, Ditiones, Breuci, and others, but rather more in the sense of a continuation of Caesar’s frontier policy in Cisalpina and Illyricum, the protection of northern Italy, and perhaps already in the sense of a systematic conquest of Illyricum. Important and major Pannonian peoples had most probably not been directly attacked and conquered at that time, despite the analyses of Svoboda and Vulić, who ascribed to Octavian the military conquest of much of present-day Bosnia.\textsuperscript{57}

It is not entirely clear how to assess correctly Octavian’s achievements in Illyricum because it is not known to what extent the military conquest should be ascribed to Octavian and how much was achieved by Tiberius during his Pannonian war (12-9 BC, although the uprisings had already begun in 14 BC), after which most of the territory of the subsequent provinces of Pannonia and Dalmatia came under Roman authority, and Illyricum (then the name of the province governed by a legatus Augusti pro praetore, commanding five legions) extended as far as the Danube (Mon. Ancyr. 30: Pannoniorum gentes, qu[a[s] a]nte me principem populi Romani exercitus munquam adit, devictas per Ti. [Ne]ronem, qui tunc erat privignus et legatus meus, imperio populi

---


Romani s(ubie)ci protulique fines Illyrici ad ripam fluminis Danuvii). \(^{58}\) The text may imply that there were some Pannonian peoples which had not been conquered before Tiberius.

Just before the outbreak of the Pannonian war, Dio reported for the year 16 BC that the Pannonians together with the Norici invaded Histria and were subdued by Silius and his legates (P. Silius Nerva, cos. 20 BC, proconsul of Illyricum in 17 and 16 BC, cf. CIL III 2973 from Aenona in which he is called *patronus*), adding that the Pannonian incursion caused the Norici to fall into the same dependence that had earlier overtaken the Pannonians (... καὶ τοῖς Ναρίκοις σάττιον τῆς οὐσίας δουλείας ἐγένετο: 54. 20. 2). Appian, who must have overlooked these data in the historical literature he used, or possibly did not use the right sources, stated that in his opinion the Raeti and Norici were conquered either by Julius Caesar in the course of his Gallic wars, or else by Augustus during the war against the Pannonians, since they are situated between the two. He could find no information concerning separate campaigns against the two mentioned peoples (29. 84: Ῥαιτοῦς μὲν οὖν καὶ Ναρίκοις ἤγομαι Γάιον Καίσαρα πολεμοῦντα Κελτοῖς ἐπιλαβέν, ἢ τὸν Σεβαστὸν χειρῳδίμενον Παλίνος· ἐν μέσῳ γὰρ εἰσὶν ἀµφοτέρως, καὶ οὐδὲν ἤδην ἢδον ἢ Ῥαιτοῦς ἢ Ναρίκοις χειρῳδίμενον). The data in Dio and Appian are supplemented by Strabo (IV 6. 8-9 C 206), who mentioned among several other peoples certain Norici who dwelt in the districts round about Aquileia, and the Taurisci, who also belonged to the Norici; these were all stopped by Tiberius and Drusus from making incursions into Italy. Velleadius, too, specifically stated that Tiberius subdued the Norici in addition to the Raeti, Vindelici, Pannonians, and Scordisci (II 39. 3: Rætiam autem et Vindelicos ac Noricos Pannoniamque et Scordiscos novas imperio nostro subiuxit provincias ...; but see II 104. 5; II 95. 2, where the Norici are not mentioned; cf. also Festus, *brev.* 7: *sub Iulio Octaviano Caesaris Auguste per Alpes iter factum est, Alpinis omnibus victis Noricorum provinciae accessorunt*; Florus' account of the *bellum Noricum* in which he described the subjugation of the Raetia and the Vindelici, II 22 [IV 22]). These data combined with scattered evidence from other ancient sources make it perfectly clear that on the one hand the formerly independent Norican kingdom lost its independence, and on the other that this most probably occurred without war having been waged against it, but rather in a form of annexation which should most probably be dated to 15 BC. \(^{59}\) The invading Norici must have been a people who were settled in close proximity to Histria, most probably the Ambisontes — if their location along the Aesontius is accepted — \(^{60}\) which figured as the only one of the Norican peoples among the *gentes Alpinae devictae* on the inscription of La Turbie, set up in 7 or 6 BC, \(^{61}\) probably offering a welcome pretext to the Romans for the annexation of the kingdom in its entirety. Independent minting of Norican tetradrachmas ended ca. 16-15 BC. \(^{62}\) A kind of annexation may also be assumed for those districts of northern and western Pannonia which were more or less dependent on the Norican kingdom, or under its strong influence after the defeat inflicted upon the Boii and Taurisci by the Dacians. Fitz has very plausibly argued that these areas could not have been considered as being inhabited by *Pannonia* in the broad sense of the word, \(^{63}\) but were actually Celtic. \(^{64}\)

The arguments of Kneissl, who attempted to elaborate an old thesis of Zippel's and prove that the kingdom had remained more or less independent until it was organized as a province.

---


\(^{59}\) DOBESCH (n. 17).

\(^{60}\) See n. 17.

\(^{61}\) ŠAŠEL (n. 17).


\(^{64}\) FITZ (n. 51) 14; see also *idem*, Noricum und Pannonien zur Zeit der römischen Okkupation. *Röm. Österreich* 17-18, 1989-1990, 79-86.
under Claudius, are untenable, being contradicted by the extant literary evidence, strategic reasons, as well as epigraphic data. *Immunitas*, awarded to C. Iulius Vepo from Celeia along with citizenship (*CIL III 5232*), no doubt for special merits during the Augustan conquest of the southeastern Alpine area, would not have had much sense in an independent Noric region. His tombstone, erected by himself during his lifetime in an entirely Romanized manner, presupposes the existence of a stonemasonry workshop, an already developed stone-cutting craft and sufficient knowledge and distribution of Latin. It can further be concluded that measured grave parcels existed outside the town of Celeia, which would require some organization to provide such services, i.e. a local government that oversaw the affairs of the already Romanized society, who respected privileges and knew how to appreciate them.\(^6\)\(^5\)

Furthermore, a small vexillation of the Pannonian legion VIII Augusta was stationed in the Augustan period at Magdalensberg (*CIL III 4858 = ILS 2466*) which, together with a detachment of the cohors Montanorum prima (*CIL III 4847; R. Egger, Carinthia I 143, 1953, 928-929, probably raised in Noricum under Augustus*),\(^6\)\(^6\) constituted perhaps the most important garrison in the country; the presence of Roman soldiers is attested elsewhere in Noricum.\(^6\)\(^7\) Evidence proving beyond all doubt that Noricum had actually been annexed before Claudius, i.e. most probably under Augustus, are the two moulds recently discovered at Magdalensberg, carved into marble slabs, large enough to produce gold bars weighing 5.60 and 14.50 kilos (17 and 44 *librae* respectively), manufactured in the name of Caius Caesar (Caligula: *aurum* C(aii) Caesaris Aug(usti) Germanici imp(eratoris) ex Noric(is metallis)).\(^6\)\(^8\)

### VI

In AD 6-9, the great Pannonian-Dalmatian rebellion once again totally shattered Roman authority in Illyricum. It was quelled by Tiberius and it seems not at all to have affected Noricum, except perhaps some of those parts which were later attached to Pannonia. While life in Noricum developed in tranquility, Illyricum was a devastated land which had to recover under massive military supervision. However, both Noricum and the Pannonian part of Illyricum (the future province of Dalmatia will not be considered in this study) were more or less densely settled prior to the arrival of the Romans. How old and how important were the pre-existing settlements and which of them deserved the designation of a town, cannot be established with certainty, since many factors played a role in the more or less successful development of a settlement. Besides the obvious economic conditions, there were extraordinary factors which are only rarely taken into account, such as various natural catastrophes and epidemics. The latter may have enormously affected either animals or people, or both, and may have caused major depopulations not unlike the devastations due to pestilence in the middle ages. The *deserta regna pastorum* mentioned by Virgil (*Georg.* 470-481) may be interpreted as large deserted areas within some of the Norician eastern Alpine regions in the hinterland of the Timavus, caused by an (animal) plague at the end of the 5th or in the 4th centuries BC.\(^6\)\(^9\) This is further confirmed by a total lack of pre-Celtic names in
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\(^{65}\) J. ŠAŠEL, C. Iulius Vepo (*CIL III 5232* Celeia, Nor.). *Ziva antika* 4, 1954, 346-363 (= *Opera selecta*. 31-43); quotation *ibid.*, 43.


\(^{67}\) ALFÖLDY (n. 10) 64-66.

\(^{68}\) G. PICCOTTINI, Gold und Kristall am Magdalensberg. *Germania* 72, 1994, 467-477.

\(^{69}\) J. ŠAŠEL, Deserta regna pastorum (Verg., *Georg.* 3.476-477). *Gabrovčev zbornik* = Sutra 20-21 (Ljubljana 1980) 421-430 (= *Opera selecta*. 514-521); explained largely as fictitious by H. GRASSL, Zur »norischen Viehseuche» bei Vergil. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 125, 1982, 67-77; however, an outbreak of a devastating plague may well be postulated for the prehistoric period, even if it cannot be identified with the disease mentioned by Virgil.
certain areas where these could be expected, such as Upper Carniola, several areas in the region of the Norici and their neighbours, the Taurisci (Poetovio), in the region of Savaria, the Latobici, Colapiani, and others. A desolation could have also been caused by wars, such as was the case of deserta Boiorum.

Factors of an economic nature, related to the exploitation of natural resources and to trade, were undoubtedly the most important for the development of settlements, as well as those of a geo-political nature, determining the location of a settlement at an important crossroads, at a confluence of two rivers, or only along an ancient trade route or a navigable river, or both. Roads and caravan tracks that were important at an earlier period may have lost their significance in changed political situation, but certain vital lines of communication retained their importance throughout antiquity. One such was undoubtedly the route across Illyricum, connecting the Black Sea regions with Italy, which was largely a riparian route along the rivers Danube, Sava and Ljubljanica — and thence by land to Histria and Italy — mentioned by Strabo (IV 6. 10 C 207) and reflected in the legend of the Argonauts (Pliny, N. h. III 128). The prehistoric trade along these rivers may certainly be regarded as the historical kernel of the legend.

Settlements along these rivers, such as Sirmium, Siscia, Andautonia, Emona, and Nauportus, had all been ancient prehistoric settlements, as is indicated by their names, even if the archaeological finds do not always directly confirm their importance (Fig. 2). Sirmium lay at the confluence of the rivers Savus (Sava) and Bacuntius (= Bosut, Plin., N. h. III 148: Alter annmis Bacuntius in Savum Sirmio oppido influit, ubi civitas Sirmiensium et Amanitornum. Bacuntius may be a corrupted reading: perhaps more correctly Bas(s)untius?). Graf wrongly noted a legend allegedly reported by Plutarch (Alex. 11) that Sirmium received its name from the Triballian king Syrmos, who would have had it built. Actually Plutarch (ib., 11.5) only mentioned Alexander’s campaign against Syrmos, whom Alexander defeated at the Danube. It seems that nothing remained of the story but the coincidental similarity of both names, which, however, may not be totally coincidental. The epichoric village of Sirmium must have borne an ancient name, defined as Illyrian by Mayer, but it may well be Thracian, since a toponym Sermulia is undoubtedly attested in Thrace, as is in general the well documented element ser-/ str-. Its prehistoric phase is not well defined archaeologically. A larger prehistoric settlement for which Sirmium would have been a port and a trade station may have been situated at an elevated, better protected locality. By the time of the Pannonian-Dalmanthian revolt Sirmium was already an important Roman stronghold (Cass. Dio 55. 29. 3: καὶ μετὰ τούτο καὶ Βρεσκοί Πανθρωπον χθύνα, Βεσετία καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐτερον προσπαθήμανοι, ἐπὶ τὸ Σίρμιον καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῶν Ῥωμαίους ὥρμησαν ...), which is surprising since it could be expected that the insurgent military headquarters would have been based in it. It is an indication of how limited our knowledge is, since the military and political events that had led to such a historical situation are entirely unknown to us.

Siscia = Segest(i)ca was one of the most important Hallstatt period and Celtic trading centres and harbours, as it was located at the confluence of the rivers Savus (Sava) and Colapis (Kupa). It was the centre of the region of the Segestani, also known as Sisciani, and closely connected with the Colapiani, who must have extended west of Siscia. The name Segestica, which is

60 ŠAŠEL, ib.
61 Thus RE, s.v., and linguists in general.
62 A. GRAF, Übersicht der antiken Geographie von Pannonien. Diss. Pann. ser. 1, 5 (Budapest 1936) 55; he noted the name erroneously as Syrmios.
63 A. MAYER, Die Sprache der alten Illyrier I (Wien 1957); 307; II (Wien 1959) 103-104; cf. GRAF (n. 72).
64 I am indebted to Dr. R. Matasović, who drew my attention to it; see D. DETSCHEW, Die thrakischen Sprachreste = Schr. Balkankomm., Lingu. Abt. 14 (Wien 1957) 432-433.
66 M. MIRKOVIĆ, Sirmium - its History from the 1 Century A.D. to 582 A.D. In: Sirmium I (Beograd 1971) 6, 8-10.
the adjective derived from Segesta, has been variously defined as Illyrian,\textsuperscript{78} Latin,\textsuperscript{79} and Celtic (or Ligurian),\textsuperscript{80} of which the last mentioned option seems to me to correspond better than the other two to the historical development. The ancient »Illyrian« (that is to say: Pannonian) settlement may have developed at Pogorelec on the river Colapis where Hallstatt period remains have recently been discovered,\textsuperscript{81} but it must have mainly flourished during the La Tène period, while Siscia may be a Pannonian or a Celtic toponym,\textsuperscript{82} referring to a different site within the same area; this latter name was directly taken over by the Romans and later by the Slavs. Šašel placed the original Siscia closer to the river Sava, where it developed as a settlement that was conditioned by the ancient river traffic along this river.\textsuperscript{83} Strabo’s text, however, may be misleading since it is implied in it that both settlements lay at a certain distance from one another (VII 5. 2 C 314: 'Εγγύς δὲ τῆς Σεγεστικῆς ἐστι καὶ Η Σισκία φρούριον καὶ Σίρμιον, ἐν ὅδε κεῖμαι τῆ ἐις 'Ἰταλίαν).
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\textsuperscript{78} MAYER (n. 73) I 308.

\textsuperscript{79} A. ERNOUT/ A. MEILLET, Dictionnaire étimologique de la langue latine (Paris 1932) 880, s.v. seges.

\textsuperscript{80} A. HOLDER, Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz II (Leipzig 1904; repr. 1962) 1439-1440.

\textsuperscript{81} A. DURMAN, O geostrateškom položaju Siscije. On Geostrategic Location of Siscia. Opuscula archaeologica 16, 1992, 120.

\textsuperscript{82} MAYER (n. 78); HOLDER (n. 80) II 1584-1587, s.v.

\textsuperscript{83} ŠAŠEL (n. 77) 704-707: in his opinion the linguistic interpretation of both names should be exactly the opposite.
Andautonia (present-day Ščitarjevo) was a less important settlement, a harbour, re-loading and raft-station on the Sava, situated on the road connecting Siscia with Poetovio and not on the land route Sirmium - Emona. It must have undoubtedly been at least of a limited significance in the prehistoric period, as is testified by its name and location, although this does not seem to be confirmed by the archaeological finds. A prehistoric Andautonia, a centre of the Varciani, must have been located elsewhere, less exposed to inundations, but no such site has so far been discovered. Its name is noted in It. Ant. (266. 2) as Dautonia, but the given distances correspond well to Ščitarjevo and the possibility of the existence of two settlements, situated opposite the other on the two banks of the Sava has rightly been rejected. The name may be Pannonian, pre-Celtic (cf. Andetrium near Salonae, the Andizetes?); it was defined as Illyrian by Mayer, but it is listed as Celtic by Holder. A hypothesis has cautiously been put forward that the name may have been Venetic; personal names with the element *and-* are actually attested in the Venetic regions.

Emona was an important settlement from the period of the Umfied Culture onwards, as is indicated by a large cemetery in the courtyard of the Academy of Sciences and Arts. The corresponding settlement was discovered some years ago on Castle Hill, and traces of the subsequent La Tène settlement have recently been excavated in the area of Gornji trg (Upper Market) on the right bank of the Ljubljanica River (the ancient name of this river was either Emona or Nauportus), opposite the site of the later Roman city. Its name is of a northern Adriatic type, such as the names of towns with the suffix -ona, like Verona, Cremona, Fianona, Alvona, Promea (but also Narona and salonae further south). Its La Tène period settlers must have been the Taurisci, as was the case at Nauportus, which as late as the Augustan period was a much more important settlement in the region, almost at the level of a town (municipii instar, Tac., Ann. I 20. 1). The variae lectiones of its name, preserved in the different Strabonic manuscripts are Pamporton and Nauponton: they may indicate that the name Nauportus had not been accurately taken over by the Romans; they seem to have partly adapted the pre-Celtic name according to their linguistic feeling, as is seen in the second part of the word, portus. The settlement, which gained its fame as a reloading station (goods coming from Aquileia on wagons were reloaded there onto boats and transported to the Danubian regions: Strabo IV 6. 10 C 207), and may have been a Tauriscan customs post, was expressly mentioned in a late version of the Argonauts' legend reported by Pliny (N. h. III 128). The importance of both Emona and Nauportus in the prehistoric period is further reflected in the worship of the local goddess Acquorna, who may have been of Etruscan origin.

All the mentioned settlements along the Savus and Emona Rivers retained their importance during the Roman Empire, with the exception of Nauportus which was entirely overshadowed by the proximity of Emona, probably also due to the fact that the latter was included within Italy, additionally diminishing the significance of the geo-political position of Nauportus.

---

84 ŠAŠEL (n. 84) 73; cf., however, GRAF (n. 72) 62.
85 MAYER (n. 73) I 43; II 36: interpreted from the root daut- with the meaning of a stream, a river, to flow, which, however, is highly hypothetical.
86 HOLDER (n. 80) I 139; R. MATASOVIĆ (in a letter) would also suggest a Celtic origin of the name.
87 ŠAŠEL (n. 84) 72.
88 J. UNTERMANN, Die venetischen Personennamen (Wiesbaden 1961) § 167, and n. 201; § 197; § 208; Virgil's birthplace Andes?
90 ŠAŠEL (n. 11).
91 Cf. ŠAŠEL KOS (n. 53) 149-148.
Another internationally important — if we may say so — prehistoric trade communication was the old Amber Route along which, again, Nauportus and Emona were stations of some importance, and which further led through Celeia, Poetovio, Savaria, and Scabarantia to Carnuntum, and across the Danube further to the north (Fig. 2).\(^8^4\) These settlements must have originally all belonged to the Norican kingdom: that Carnuntum belonged to Noricum is specifically attested by Velleius Paterculus (II 109. 5: *A Carnunto, qui locus Norici regni ...*). For Poetovio this is assumed indirectly, since after the reforms of Diocletian it belonged administratively to Noricum Mediterraneum; for Savaria and Scabarantia, however, it has been assumed on the basis of Pliny's formulation: *Noricis iunguntur lacus Peiso, deserta Boiorum, iam tamen colonia divi Claudi Sabaria et oppido Scabarantia Iulia habitantur* (N. h. III 146).\(^8^5\) They all retained their importance under the Empire. Celeia, its name being almost certainly pre-Celtic,\(^8^6\) like Noraea, had been one of the centres of the Norican kingdom, with its own mint,\(^8^7\) most probably situated at Miklavžski hrib. Poetovio, too, bears a pre-Celtic name, like other »Illyrian« toponyms ending in -avio,\(^8^9\) while Holder’s classification of the name among Celtic toponyms seems less likely.\(^9^0\) In the La Tène period it must have been a Tauriscan settlement,\(^1^0^0\) probably situated at Panorama and Grajski grič, since many Norican settlements were located on elevated positions (*Noricum ... castella in tumulis, Virg., Georg. III 474-475*); the names of its known epichoric inhabitants, however, are mainly Celtic.\(^1^0^1\) Whether or not Poetovio was located in the region of the Serretes and Sirapilli, for whom it is only known that they were settled along the river Dravus (Pliny, *N. h.* III 147), remains uncertain.

The name of Savaria is listed as »Illyrian« (i.e. pre-Celtic) by Mayer,\(^1^0^2\) and related to the names of the rivers Savus and Saouarias, the latter mentioned by Ptolemaeus (II 15. 1) as the name of the river which flows past Savaria. The name of a village known from the Savaria region, Voleucini (*CIL VI 3300 = Speidel, Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter — Equites singulares Augusti*, 1994, no. 658),\(^1^0^3\) may also indicate a former pre-Celtic settlement of the region which is archaeologically best defined by the Hallstatt period settlement at Velem-Szentvid, a flourishing Celtic oppidum with its own mint in the first three centuries BC.\(^1^0^4\) Part of the region was settled by the Boii,\(^1^0^5\) its development was greatly advanced by the alliance between them and the Taurisci, under the leadership of the former.\(^1^0^6\) Archaeological investigations have not revealed any traces

---

\(^8^4\) *Lungo la via dell'Ambra. Apporti altodriatici alla romanizzazione dei territori del Medio Danubio* (1 sec. a. C. - I sec. d.C.) Atti del Convegno di Studio, Udine-Aquileia 16-17 settembre 1994, ed. M. Buora (Udine 1996). This reference has been added just before the article went to press.

\(^8^5\) See A. ALFÖLDY, *CAH XI*, 540-541, where Savaria and Scabarantia are also noted; and FITZ, *Röm. Österreich* (n. 63) 82-84.

\(^8^6\) ŠAŠEL, Celeia. In: RE Suppl. XII (1970) 139 (= Opera selecta. 583).

\(^8^7\) KOS (n. 62), 35 ff.

\(^8^9\) Thus according to H. KRAHE, *Die alten bakanilitryschen geographischen Namen* (Heidelberg 1925) 75, and MAYER (n. 73) I 277; cf. GRAF (n. 72) 60.

\(^9^0\) HOLDER (n. 80) II 1026; cf. SARIA, RE XXI 1, 1168.

\(^1^0^0\) D. BOŽIĆ, O latenskih najdbah na območju Ptuja. Concerning the La Tène Finds in the Ptuj Area. In: *Ptuijski arheološki zbornik* (Ptuj 1993) 189-204.

\(^1^0^1\) M. LOVENJAK, *Arh. Vestnik* 45, 1994, 139-140.

\(^1^0^2\) MAYER (n. 73) I 296-297; II 101-102.

\(^1^0^3\) MAYER (n. 73) I 361.


\(^1^0^5\) MÖCSY (n. 77) 31-39.

of a previous Celtic settlement at the site of the Roman Savaria; nonetheless the Roman town retained the earlier name of one of the nearby epichoric settlements. Romanization must have already progressed rather quickly during the late Augustan and early Tiberian periods, since the more distant Scarbantia bore the title Iulia, testifying to a colonization of veterans at the latest under Tiberius. In Savaria itself, the Emontenses qui consistunt finibus Savariae (Die röm. Steinedenmüller von Savaria, 70; cf. nos. 107 and 109) most probably settled in the town before it was elevated to the rank of a Roman colony under Claudius.

The name of Scarbantia was defined as »Illyrian« by Krahe, containing the root bunt-, such as Buntia in Lucania and Arribantia in Dardania. The Celtic word scara (with presumed meanings of »scattered« or »separate« — a »scattered« or a »separate« settlement?) would have been added later; however, the explanation of the toponym is quite uncertain. Recent excavations have revealed that the pre-Roman Celtic oppidum which must have borne the name of Scarbantia had been located two km southeast of the Celtic village, on the hills between the Ikva and Bánfalvi streams, surrounded by marshes.

The name Carnuntum may well have been pre-Celtic, defined as »Illyrian« by Krahe and Mayer. It is explained as being derived from the root kar- (a stone, a rock, rough), and the suffix »-nt«, such as is also observed in the name of Aguntum and which is characteristic of the earliest attested toponyms in the Balkans (cf. Carnuntem munitam urbe rum in Illyria, Liv. 47. 1. 2). Less likely are the explanations according to which the name would be related to the Carni who are noted uniquely by the Dimensuratio provinciarum to have been settled next to the Boii in the neighbourhood of Carnuntum ([Hieronymi Presbyteri] 18 in: Geogr. Lat. min., ed. Riese, p. 12: Illyricum et Panonia <finitur> ab oriente flumine Drino, ab occidente desertis, in quibus habitabant Boi et Carni, a septentrione flumine Danubio, a meridie mari Adriatico.). The toponym may have been taken over from a prehistoric settlement at Braunberg near Hainburg, or, more probably, from Devin across the Danube. As is indicated by the archaeological evidence, Braunberg was destroyed in the course of the war between the Boii and Dacians ca. 40 BC; it is not entirely clear how to interpret the presumed discontinuity. In 6 AD the site of Carnuntum was adopted as a military base by Tiberius, who had the first military camp built there during his preparations for the war against Maroboduus (Vell. Pat. II 109; 110. 1.).

As has just been shown, a number of toponyms and hydronyms seem to be pre-Celtic, notably all those situated along the ancient route along the rivers Savus and Emona — with the exception of Andautonia, the name of which may have also been Celtic — as well as those along the Amber Route. Another two that may be considered among towns with administrative autonomy (since research has been limited to these only) as being pre-Celtic in the province of Noricum are Aguntum and Norcia, the latter included here on account of its importance for denotations.

107 KRAHE (n. 98) 82, 111.
108 See also MAYER (n. 73) 1 309-310.
111 KRAHE (n. 98) 89; MAYER (n. 73) II 179-180; II 57-58.
113 O. H. URBAN, Keltische Höhensiedlungen an der mittleren Donau vom Linzer Becken bis zur Porta Hungarica. 2. Der Braunberg = Linzer Arch. Forsch. 23 (Linz 1995) 516; for the Boii in the Carnuntum area see E. SWOBODA, Carnuntum. Seine Geschichte und seine Denkmäler (Graz, Köln 1964) 21-31; MÖCZY (n. 77) 49-52.
ing the kingdom and its inhabitants. The Celtic oppidum of Aguntum, which was founded in the region of the Laianci, is probably located at Breitegg, north of the church in Untermüllendorf.\textsuperscript{115} Certain names in the Lavant region, such as Clevvo, Veitor, Voltisema, Volusia (A. Gerstl, \textit{Supplementum epigraphicum zu CIL III für Kärnten und Osttirol, 1902-1961}, 301; E. Weber, \textit{Römisches Österreich} 3, 1975, 280-281; cf. \textit{ILLPRON Indices, s.v.}), may indicate Venetic influence; certainly they belong to the northern Adriatic group of personal names as defined by Katičić.\textsuperscript{116}

In the province of Noricum, however, the Celtic element is well attested not merely among personal names, but also in the toponomy. Among the towns with administrative autonomy, only Celeia and Aguntum may be classified as pre-Celtic, while all the others may be attributed to the Celtic newcomers, thus Teurnia, Virunum, Solva, Iuvavum, Ovilava, Lauriacum, and Cetium. None of the autonomous towns bore a Latin name.

Despite the fact that Noreia (as the toponym and the name of a deity) is listed among Celtic names by Holder,\textsuperscript{117} and is not included by Mayer, it should rather be classified as pre-Celtic. Problems connected with the location of the main settlement thus named are complicated.\textsuperscript{118} It should only be remarked in passing that the few references we have concerning its geographic position (Strabo V 1.8 C 214, who mentioned a navigable river flowing from Aquileia to Noreia where the battle of Cn. Papirius Carbo against the Cimbri took place: he may well have had in mind the ancient river trade route on the Ljubljanica, Sava, and Danube, always associated with Aquileia; Pliny, \textit{N. h.} III 131, who noted that among the Taurisci, Noreia had fallen to ruins; Caesar, \textit{Bell. Gall.} I 5.4, who mentioned that the Boii had besieged Noreia; cf. Sempronius Asellio V fig. 9, \textit{HRR}, ed. Peter, p. 183) indicate that the eponymous oppidum should not be sought in Carinthia, but in the territory of the Taurisci south of the Norici. It seems highly unlikely that Magdalensberg would have borne this name; if the oppidum had ceased to exist at the time when Virunum was newly built in the area of Zollfeld where no previous site has been attested, the natural conclusion would be that the name of the oppidum was transferred to the new town in the plain.\textsuperscript{119} Minor or major shifts of settlement have been observed for almost all the Roman towns so far discussed in both provinces.

Towns with pre-Celtic names predominate in the province of Pannonia. From among those with municipal autonomy that have not yet been mentioned Salla, Aquae Balizae, Sopianae,\textsuperscript{120} Cibalae,\textsuperscript{121} Mursa and Mursella,\textsuperscript{122} as well as Bassianae,\textsuperscript{123} seem to have been pre-Celtic foundations, and probably also Aquincum,\textsuperscript{124} and perhaps Iovia,\textsuperscript{125} which, however, may also be Celtic. The name of Iovia, referring to another locality (= possibly the raft station of Kapos near Tüskępuszta or Kapospula - Heténypuszta),\textsuperscript{126} has been interpreted as indicating an eventual renaming of the town in the Tetrarchic period,\textsuperscript{127} yet several further similar place-names, which may have been

\textsuperscript{115} The name contains the ancient -nt- suffix, cf. W. ALZINGER, \textit{Das Municipium Claudiae Aguntum. Vom keltischen Oppidum zum frühchristlichen Bischofssitz.} In: ANRW II 6 (Berlin, New York 1977) 381-382; on the location of the oppidum, see ib., 385.


\textsuperscript{117} HOLDER (n. 80) II 760-761, citing the opinion of Zeuß.

\textsuperscript{118} ALFÖLDY (n. 10) 47-51; a smaller road-station named Noreia is also documented between Maticaunium and Ad Pontem in St Margarethen am Silberberg.


\textsuperscript{120} MAYER (n. 73) I 290 (Salla); I 74 (Aquae Balizae); I 318 (Sopianae).

\textsuperscript{121} MAYER (n. 73) I 188-189; II 60-61, from *kebala, head, designating small elevations above the level of a marshland.

\textsuperscript{122} MAYER (n. 73) I 235-236; II 80-81, from *murs-, marshes.

\textsuperscript{123} MAYER (n. 73) I 79; II 22-23, from *baz-, to flow.

\textsuperscript{124} The territory of the Eravisci, MAYER (n. 73) I 54.

\textsuperscript{125} MAYER (n. 73) I 173-174; II 54-55.

\textsuperscript{126} I thank Dr. D. GABLIER for the identification.

\textsuperscript{127} FITZ, RE Suppl. IX, 104.
related in meaning to one another (the root *iov- meaning young, new), must be noted. The same element *iov- with the same meaning, however, is also well attested in Celtic languages, thus the problem of the linguistic identity of these toponyms must remain unsolved. There is another Iovia on the Mursa - Aqua Viva road, for which the name Botivo (abl.) is attested on the Tabula Peutingeriana and in the Anonymous Geographer of Ravenna, and further Iovista (also classified as an “Illyrian” name in Krahe), and Iovalia, all of which may belong to autochthonous toponymy.

The name of Bassianae is most probably »Illyrian« (better Pannonian), since it has parallels in Illyricum, such as the river Basuntius and a place-name south of Lissus, Bassania. Much less convincing is the hypothesis suggesting that this toponym would be derived from the personal name Bassius or Bassus and would presuppose an appellative such as villae. Aquae Balizae, another name for the municipium lasorum (present-day Daruvar), bear an “Illyrian” (= Pannonian) name, which is further indicated by the epichoric toponyms Iovista, a pagus in its territory, and Cocconae, one of the vici of Iovista, both attested on an inscription from Rome of an eques singularis Ulpius Cocceius (CIL VI 3297 = Speidel, Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter — Equites singulares Augusti, 1994, no. 657).

Brigetio, Lusssionum, Moge(n)itiana, Neviodunum, and Vindobona may be classified as Celtic names. The name of Mogetiana (less correctly Mogentiana) is derived from the Celtic gentilicium Mogetius, which in its turn may be a theophoric name, formed from the name of the Celtic deity Marmogius, identified with Mars. Neviodunum is an older formation derived from nevio-, new, and not from the more recent novio—; it may be possible that the first element of the name would have been pre-Celtic, such as in Singi-dunum.

Only one Pannonian municipium bears a Latin name, namely municipium Faustinianum, which clearly indicates that in terms of towns with municipal status in both provinces, the Romans barely influenced the settlement pattern. Their intervention was limited on one side to the limes areas and their immediate hinterland where they established a number of new fortresses that at a later date developed into small towns, and on the other to the main roads along which several new road-stations were built to facilitate traffic in all its aspects.

VIII

The founding of towns and the creation of provinces went hand in hand. The former regnum was possibly organized as a procuratorial province during the reign of Caligula, but most probably under Claudius, and five important Celtic oppida became Roman municipia Claudia: Celeia, Virunum, Teurnia, Aguntum, and Iuvavum (Pliny, N. h. III 146; see Fig. 1),

---

128 MAYER (n. 73) II 54-55.
129 I am indebted to Dr. R. Matasović for this observation; cf. HOLDER (n. 80) II 68-69.
130 KRAHE (n. 98) 70; 110.
131 MAYER (n. 123).
133 MAYER, I 73 (Iovista); I 194 (Cocconae); the text of the inscription: Ulpius Cocceius eq(ues) s(ingularis) d(omicili) n(ostri), casiris nov(is), t(urma) Kast, ex Pan(nonia) superiore natus ad Aquas Balizas, pago lovista, vic(o) Coc[co]netibis.
134 HOLDER (n. 80) I 540-541; from brig-., a mountain, a hill, 533-534.
135 HOLDER (n. 80) II 351 (Lusssionum); II 608 (Mogetiana); 740 (Neviodunum); III 344-345 (Vindobona).
136 HOLDER (n. 80) II 740; cf. GRAF (n. 72) 47.
139 See, however, WEBER (n. 17) 611 ff.
enrolled in the tribe Claudia. The native Claudii are attested in the hitherto poorly Romanized areas such as north of Zollfeld, in the upper Mur valley, and even north of the Alps. Solva became a municipium under Vespasian, Ovilava and Cetium under Hadrian (municipia Aelia); the process of urbanization was finished under Caracalla, under whom the civil settlement outside the legionary fortress of Lauriacum was raised to municipal rank, and Ovilava to the status of a Roman colony. Pag(i) magn(i) are known from the sanctuary of Latobius near St. Margarethen in Lavanttal in eastern Carinthia, probably within the territory of Virunum. Native inhabitants were partly organized in civitates peregrinae, of which nine are known by names (the Norici, Ambilini, Ambidravi, Uperaci, Saevates, Laianci, Ambisontes, Elveti, Alai). Urbanization in Pannonia began under Vespasian, who founded the first municipia, which all coincide — as expected — with settlements along the two main communication lines, the old Amber Route and the river route across Illyricum, connected with the legend of the Argonauts (Neviodunum, Andautonia, Siscia, Sirmium, Scarbantia, see Fig. 3). It may be assumed that the

---

Fig. 3 Roman towns and fortresses in the province of Pannonia. Black dots denote Flavian foundations.

---


\[141\] ALFÖLDY (n. 17) 50-54.
province of Pannonia, based on civil self-government, was not established earlier than the reign of Vespasian. Until then Pannonia seems to have been a province in terms of a military district, known in official texts under the name of Illyricum (Agrippa, Dimens. 18; Mon. Ancyr. 30; CIL X 5182 = ILS 972: leg. divi Claudi in Ill. ex s.c., ca. 43-51 AD; CIL XVI 2 and 4, even as late as ca. 60 AD), and placed under the command of a military legate. The first Roman municipal foundation was Savaria, which became a colony under Claudius, no doubt at the same time when the Norican oppida became Claudian municipia. It should perhaps not be excluded that the town had still belonged to Noricum at the time when it was awarded colonial rights, as may be true of other settlements along the section of the Amber Route between Savaria and Carnuntum, which would have been detached from Noricum under Vespasian to be included in the newly organized province of Pannonia.

---