



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 13, 1998

1998

WOLFFENBÜTTEL



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 13

1998


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

In Zusammenarbeit mit:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Johannes Diethart, Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme
Georg Rehrenböck, Hans Taeuber

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Disketten in MAC- und DOS-Formaten sind willkommen.

Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgeschickt werden.

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1998 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.

Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.

e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@oeaw.ac.at

Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg. GmbH, Kandlgasse 19–21, A-1070 Wien.

Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Géza A l f ö l d y (Heidelberg): Die Ostalpenländer im Altertum. Regionalgeschichte und europäische Geschichte	1
Giuseppina A z z a r e l l o (Köln): Einbruchsanzeige an einen <i>procurator</i> (Tafel 1)	19
Ronald B i l i k (Wien): Stammen P.Oxy. XI 1364 + LII 3647 und XV 1797 aus der 'Αλήθεια des Antiphon?	29
Giovanna D a v e r i o R o c c h i (Mailand): Formen der politischen Betätigung des athenischen Bürgers in der klassischen Zeit	51
Gerhard D o b e s c h (Wien): Forschungsreferat zur Germania des Tacitus: Dieter Timpe, <i>Romano-Germanica. Gesammelte Studien zur Germania des Tacitus</i>	61
Dieter H a g e d o r n (Heidelberg), Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): VBP IV 87: <i>translatio in cohortem</i>	107
Klaus H a l l o f (Berlin): Das Kollegium der samischen Neopoiiai (Tafel 2)	111
Ulrike H o r a k (Wien): Antike Farbenpracht. Zwei Farblisten aus der Papyrussammlung d. Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Tafel 3–4)	115
Vasile L i c a (Galați): Pompeius and Oroles, <i>Dacorum rex</i>	135
Stefan L i n k (Paderborn): Zur Aussetzung neugeborener Kinder in Sparta	153
Federico M o r e l l i (Wien): Legname, palazzi e moschee. P.Vindob. G 31 e il contributo dell'Egitto alla prima architettura islamica (Tafel 5)	165
Johannes N o l l é (München): Eine Losplakette aus Abydos am Hellespont (Tafel 5)	191
Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s (Wien): Ein neues Zeugnis frühchristlicher griechischer Kondolenzepistolographie (Tafel 6)	195
Marjeta P . Š a š e l K o s (Ljubljana): The Tauriscan Gold Mine. Remarks Concerning the Settlement of the Taurisci	207
Nikolaus S c h i n d e l (Wien): Zwei neue Militärdiplome aus der Provinz Moesia superior (Tafel 7–11)	221
Alexandru S u c e v e a n u (Bukarest): Πρώτος καὶ μέγιστος (βασιλεὺς) τῶν ἐπὶ Θράκης βασιλέων: IGB I ² , 13, Z. 22–23	229
Franz W i n t e r (Salzburg): Zum Psalmenzitat auf O.Eleph. 165	249
Klaas A. W o r p (Amsterdam): Ein neuer Atias-Papyrus (Tafel 12)	253
Constantine Z u c k e r m a n (Paris): <i>Constantiniani</i> — <i>Constantiniaci</i> from Pylai. A Rejoinder	255
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XI (<Korr. Tyche> 250–312)	259
Druckfehlerberichtigung	274

Buchbesprechungen	275
<p>Thomas B a i e r, <i>Werk und Wirkung Varros im Spiegel seiner Zeitgenossen von Cicero bis Ovid</i>. Stuttgart 1997 (G. Dobesch: 275) — Loreta De L i b e r o, <i>Die archaische Tyranis</i>. Stuttgart 1996 (P. Amann: 277) — Alexander D e m a n d t, <i>Die Kelten</i>. München 1998 (K. Tomaschitz: 281) — Mogens Herman H a n s e n, <i>The Trial of Sokrates — from the Athenian Point of View</i>. Kopenhagen 1995 (H. Heftner: 282) — H e r o d i a n, <i>Geschichte des Kaisertums nach Marc Aurel</i>. Griechisch und deutsch mit Einleitung, Anmerkungen und Namenindex von Friedhelm L. MÜLLER. Stuttgart 1996 (G. Dobesch: 284) — I a t r u s - K r i v i n a, <i>Spätantike Befestigung und frühmittelalterliche Siedlung an der unteren Donau</i>. Hg. v. d. Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Bd. V: Studien zur Geschichte des Kastells Iatrus (Forschungsstand 1989). Berlin 1995 (E. Kettenhofen: 286) — I s o k r a t e s, <i>Sämtliche Werke. Reden IX–XXI, Briefe, Fragmente</i>. Übers. v. Christine L e y - H u t t o n, eingel. u. erl. von Kai B r o d e r s e n. Stuttgart 1997 (G. Dobesch: 288) — Martin J e h n e (Hrsg.), <i>Demokratie in Rom? Die Rolle des Volkes in der Politik der römischen Republik</i>. Stuttgart 1995 (G. Dobesch: 290) — Tadeusz K o t u l a, <i>Aurélien et Zénobie. L'unité ou la division de l'Empire?</i> Wrocław 1997 (E. Kettenhofen: 294) — Martin L e u t z s c h, <i>Die Bewährung der Wahrheit: Der dritte Johannesbrief als Dokument urchristlichen Alltags</i>. Trier 1994 (H. Förster: 296) — Jerzy L i n d e r s k i (Hrsg.), <i>Imperium sine fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic</i>. Stuttgart 1996 (G. Dobesch: 297) — R. A. C o l e s, M. W. H a s l a m, P. J. P a r s o n s et alii, <i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LX, Nos. 4009–4092</i>. London 1994 (B. Palme: 299) — T. G a g o s, M. W. H a s l a m, N. L e w i s et alii, <i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Volume LXI, Nos. 4093–4300</i>. London 1995 (B. Palme: 301) — Amphilochios P a p a t h o m a s, <i>Fünfundzwanzig griechische Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg, Wien und Kairo (P.Heid. VII)</i>. Heidelberg 1996 (M. Grünbart: 302) — Dorothy P i k h a u s, <i>Répertoire des inscriptions latines versifiées de l'Afrique romaine (I^{er}–VI^e siècle), I. Tripolitaine, Byzacène, Afrique proconsulaire</i>. Brüssel 1994 (H. Grassl: 303) — Tanja Susanne S c h e e r, <i>Mythische Vorväter</i>. München 1993 (G. Dobesch: 303) — A. J. B. S i r k s, P. J. S i j p e s t e i j n, K. A. W o r p (Hrsg.): <i>Ein frühbyzantinisches Szenario für die Amtswechslung in der Sionie. Die griechischen Papyri aus Pommersfelden (PPG) mit einem Anhang über die Pommersfeldener Digestenfragmente und die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Digesten</i>. München 1996 (J. D. Thomas: 305)</p>	
Indices (Johannes Diethart)	307
Tafeln 1–12	

VASILE LICA

Pompeius and Oroles, *Dacorum rex*

Prof. Vladimir Iliescu septuagenario

The first decades of the 1st century B.C. of the Dacian history are a shadowy period, still insufficiently clarified. For a group of scholars that was initially restricted in number but has become more numerous, the facts have acquired a clearer outline by being integrated into a new historical reconstruction, focused on King Oroles, who is mentioned by Justin XXXII 3, 16.

King Oroles' chronology, name and „biography“ are all highly controversial questions. A resumé of the controversy may help to clarify a major question in the political history of the Dacians and Getae in the 1st century B.C. It is also capable of placing their relations with Rome in a different light.

For this attempt at reconstruction it is essential to discuss some fundamental elements referring to the „Dacian digression“ in the *Prol.* of Book XXXII of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* and in Book XXXII 3, 16 of Justin's *Epitoma*.

The *Historiae Philippicae* are the first world history in Latin and were written during Augustus' reign, at the end of the 1st century B.C.¹. The author of this monu-

Abbreviations:

- Babeş, *Beitrag* = M. Babeş, *Die Poieneşti-Lukaşevka-Kultur. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte im Raum östlich der Karpaten in den letzten Jahrhunderten vor Christi Geburt*, Bonn 1993.
Bessell, *Getae* = W. Bessell, *De rebus Geticis*, Göttingen 1854.
Brandis, *Dacia* = C. Brandis, RE IV 2 (1906) 1948–1976, s. v. Dacia.
Crişan, *Burebista* = I. H. Crişan, *Burebista şi epoca sa*, Bucharest² 1977.
C. Daicoviciu, *Dacica* = C. Daicoviciu, *Dacica*, Cluj 1969.
H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* = H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană* Cluj 1972.
Gostar, *La résidence* = N. Gostar, *La résidence du roi dace Burebista*, *Analele ştiinţifice ale Universităţii „Al. I. Cuza“ din Iaşi* 16.1 (1970) 57–67 (= AUI).
Gostar-Lica, *Societatea* = N. Gostar, V. Lica, *Societatea geto-dacică de la Burebista la Decebal*, Iaşi 1984.
Iliescu, *Alexander* = Vl. Iliescu, *Alexander der Große und Dromichaites*, in: *Studia in honorem B. Gerov*, Sofia 1990, 101–113.
Iliescu, *Burobostes* = Vl. Iliescu, *Rubobostes oder Burobostes?*, *StudCl* 10 (1968) 115–122.
Iliescu, *Oroles* = Vl. Iliescu, *Pînă cînd a trăit regele Oroles*, *Arheologia Moldovei* 7 (1972) 378–381.
Lica, *Oroles* = V. Lica, *Oroles = Rholes?*, *AUI* 33 (1987) 1–8.
Mommsen, *RG* = Th. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte* I–III; V, Berlin 1854–1856; 1885.
Patsch, *Beiträge* = C. Patsch, *Beiträge zur Völkerkunde von Südosteuropa* V.1, Wien, Leipzig 1932.
Pârvan, *Getica* = V. Pârvan, *Getica. O protoistorie a Daciei*, Bucharest 1926.
Reinach, *Mithradates* = Th. Reinach, *Mithradates VI. Eupator, König von Pontos*, German translation by A. Goetz, Leipzig 1895.

mental work in 44 books was Pompeius Trogus, who, according to his epitomist, Justin XLIII 5, 11. 12, *in postremo libro ... ait maiores suos a Vocontiiis originem ducere ... patrem quoque sub C. Caesare militasse, epistularumque et legationum, simul et anuli curam habuisse*. This information is extremely valuable from at least two points of view: 1. Pompeius Trogus was a Gaul by origin, which accounts for his support of the Celts and other barbarians; 2. His father's being Caesar's private secretary is a precious guarantee for the good quality of much of the information supplied by the historian for the 1st century B.C. Of this extensive history only the prologues of the 44 books have been preserved. Nobody knows who wrote them or when and why they were detached from the rest of his work and circulated separately. They are extremely important as, being a genuine „analytical table of contents“, they permit one to gain an impression of what the monumental work included, of the way it was written and of its author's outlook. At the same time the Prologues make it possible to appreciate the value of the summary made by Justin, in the late 2nd and the early 3rd century A.D., or perhaps later², and entitled *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. It is well-known that Justin did not fully stick to the conception of Pompeius Trogus' work. He substantially summarized it in a moralizing spirit, wishing not only to delight, but also to educate his readers. He himself confesses this in *Praef.* 4, where he selected *cognitione quaeque dignissima excerpsi et omissi his, quae nec cognoscendi voluptate iucunda nec exemplo erant necessaria, breve veluti florum corpusculum feci*. This is, to a historian, a very important warning and the prelude to a serious disappointment, for he will find detailed descriptions of insignificant facts, whereas many which have real historical value will be deleted from the epitomist's presentation. Long ago outstanding philologists and historians pointed to Justin's procedure and one of them even stated rather persuasively that the entire epitome is „una costellazione di aneddoti“³. Therefore, Justin's *Epitoma* has to be used as cautiously as possible: one must constantly bear in mind the author's criterion for selecting facts as well as the comparison with the „analytical table of contents“, the Prologues. These too have to be critically examined.

The well-known information about King Oroles is to be found in Justin XXXII 3, 16: *Daci quoque suboles Getarum sunt, qui, cum Orole rege, adversum Bastarnas*

Suceveanu, *Arcidava* = Al. Suceveanu, *Sur une nouvelle inscription romaine*, *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* 14 (1975) 111–118.

R. Vulpe, *Studia* = R. Vulpe, *Studia Thracologica*, Bucharest 1976.

White, *Appian* = *Appian's Roman History*. With an English translation by H. White, London 1955 sq. (Loeb Classical Library).

Wirth, *Pompeius* = G. Wirth, *Pompeius-Armenien-Parthien. Mutmaßungen zur Bewältigung einer Krisensituation*, *BJb* 183 (1983) 1–61.

Wirth, *Osten* = G. Wirth, *Der Großmächtige Osten. Zum Problem der römisch-persischen Auseinandersetzung in der Kaiserzeit*, *Arheologia Moldovei* 17 (1994) 85–101.

¹ A. Klotz, *RE XXI* 2 (1952) 2300–2313, s. v. Pompeius (Trogus) nr. 142; P.-L. Schmidt, *KIP IV* (1975) 1031–1033; Iliescu, *Oroles* 377, n. 2.

² *Ibidem*; W. Kroll, *RE X* 1 (1918) 958, s. v. Iunianus nr. 4; R. Syme, *Roman Papers VI* (ed. by A. R. Birley), Oxford 1991, 358 sq. with interesting remarks and recent literature.

³ G. Forni, *Valore storico e fonti di Pompeo Trogo*, I. *Per la guerra greco-persiana*, Urbino 1958, 126. Cf. also Kroll (note 2) 958.

male pugnassent ad ultionem segnitiae, capturi somnum capita loco pedum ponere iussu regis cogebantur ministeriaque uxoribus, quae ipsis ante fieri solebant, facere. Neque haec ante mutata sunt quam ignominiam bello acceptam virtute delerent. The *Prol.* of Book XXXII does not refer to a King Oroles, but we see that, after a few data on the history of Macedonia during Philip V's reign, Pompeius Trogus deals in *excessu* with the *res Illyricae* and mentions the *incrementa Dacorum per Burobosten regem*.

As early as 1659 the learned Dutch philologist Is. Vossius noticed the close connection between the narrative of *Prol.* 32 about the *incrementa Dacorum* and the one given by Justin XXXII 3, 16, about King Oroles. Under *qui cum Orole rege adversum Bastarnas male pugnassent*, Vossius wrote: *mirum quam turpiter depravatum fit nomen hoc Dacici regis. In minore epitome Trogi dicitur Rubobostes. Et hoc male. Legendum: cum Barebista rege, etc. Vide Strabonem, lib. VII cui est Βοιρεβίστα*⁴. If one cannot accept the identification of Oroles with Rubobostes-Burobostes suggested by Vossius, on the other hand quite remarkable is the certainty with which he established the relationship between Justin's *Epitoma* and the „minor epitomes“, the Prologues, and discovered the mistake made by copyists in transcribing the barbarian names in the case of Rubobostes. It is well-known that the manuscripts do not contain the reading Burobostes, which was suggested by Vossius followed by most scholars. They read Rubobosten, Rubobusten, Ruboboten, under which one can find the name of the king during whose reign the *incrementa Dacorum* occurred. The correction made by the Dutch philologist was accepted without reserves by Bessell, who classified the change from Burobostes into Rubobostes with the typical cases of palaeographic errors by metathesis, such as Zalmoxis-Zamolxis, that are to be ascribed to mediaeval copyists⁵. Shortly afterwards A. von Gutschmid⁶ took up this question again and the reading Burobostes, as updated by him, was accepted by the principal editors of Pompeius Trogus and Justin, Ruehl⁷ and Seel⁸, who took over the edition of the Prologues made by v. Gutschmid. The form Burobostes is also accepted by most critics of Pompeius Trogus and Justin, such as Ferrero⁹, Forni¹⁰, and Iliescu¹¹.

A particular interpretation was adopted by C. Brandis, who accepts the relationship between Pompeius Trogus's Prologues and Justin's *Epitoma*, arguing that Rubobostes

⁴ In an edition entitled *Iustinus, Vartorum ...*, which contains Bongarsius', Vossius', etc., notes, Amsterdam 1659, 408, n. 16 and republished as *Iustini Historiarum ex Trogo Pompeo*, containing Is. Vossius' notes, Amsterdam 1664, 323. Cf. also D. Cantemir, *Opere* IX 1 (ed. Dan Slusanschi), Bucharest 1983, 148–149, 156–157.

⁵ Bessell, *Getae* 46, 70.

⁶ A. von Gutschmid, *Über die Fragmente des Trogus Pompeius*, *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 2. Suppl. (1856–1857) 201.

⁷ *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi. Accedunt Prologi in Pompeium Trogum*, ed. Fr. Ruehl, Leipzig 1886 (Teubner).

⁸ *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma ...*; post Fr. Ruehl ed. O. Seel, Leipzig 1935 (Teubner); *Pompeii Trogi fragmenta*, ed. O. Seel, Stuttgart 1956 (Teubner).

⁹ L. Ferrero, *Struttura e metodo dell'epitome di Giustino*, Torino 1957, 114.

¹⁰ Forni, *Valore storico* (n. 3) 58.

¹¹ Iliescu, *Burobostes* 116 sq.

of the Prologue and Oroles of the *Epitoma* are one and the same king¹², as Vossius also believed. But to contradict him and v. Gutschmid, Brandis strongly asserts that Rubobostes and Burebista are two different persons¹³. It is strange that the German scholar, though considering that Oroles and Rubobostes are one and the same person, does not accept the fact that Burobostes was changed into Rubobostes by a minor palaeographic mistake¹⁴. Following Jordanes, on the other hand, he suggests the form Burbista for Burebista¹⁵.

Brandis' strange philological construction has to some extent found support. C. Daicoviciu rejects the identification of Oroles and Rubobostes, but agrees that Rubobostes and Burobostes are two different dynasts separated by a long span of time¹⁶. The Brandis-Daicoviciu hypothesis was accepted by a number of Romanian¹⁷ and non-Romanian¹⁸ historians; but it was also rejected by some others¹⁹. This reserve was answered by C. Daicoviciu too, with resort, in particular, to archaeological rather than philological arguments. He thinks that, in the present case, the relationship between the *Prolog.* XXXII and the *Epitoma* is not relevant, as the *res Illyricae* of *Prolog.* 32 might not be included in Book XXXII of Justin's *Epitoma*²⁰. This interpretation, with some archaeological addition, has been accepted by other Romanian scholars²¹.

Competent commentators on Pompeius Trogus' and Justin's work have pointed to the unquestionable fact that the narrative about King Oroles (Justin XXXII 3, 18) is a fragment from the digression on the *incrementa Dacorum per Burobosten regem* (Pompeius Trogus, *Prolog.* XXXII). King Oroles was remembered by Justin for what L. Ferrero calls „la strana punizione“, applied to his soldiers after their defeat by the Bastarnae. Examining the Dacian and Pannonian digressions in *Prolog.* XXXII and their reflection in the *Epitoma*, Ferrero concludes that, by emphasizing the anecdotic element too much, Justin removed the far-reaching historical perspective of Pompeius Trogus, a fact which is quite obvious for the Dacian digression in particular²². As early as 1854, Bessell showed that the presence of the Dacian digression after the Pannonian one in *Prolog.* XXXII is accounted for by the development of the Dacians at

¹² Brandis, *Dacia* 1956. In an edition of Justin (*Iustini historici ...*, Venetia 1503, f. 30) the editor replaces „Orole“ by „Olore“. This reading works better than Vossius' in Burebista, since Oloros is a well-known, even famous Thracian anthroponym: Kimon's grandfather and Thukydides' father also had this name (Herodotus VI 39; Plutarch, *Kimón* IV 1; Thukydides IV 104).

¹³ Brandis, *Dacia* 1956; idem, RE III 2 (1899) 2903, s. v. Burbista; idem, RE Suppl. I (1903) 261–264 s. v. Burebista.

¹⁴ As Bessell believed, *Getae* 46; 70.

¹⁵ This reading was also adopted by A. von Premerstein, JÖAI 7 (1904) 228 (Beiblatt).

¹⁶ C. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 53–54.

¹⁷ E. g., the latest monographs by H. Daicoviciu and Crişan.

¹⁸ R. Werner, *Abriß der Geschichte antiker Randkulturen*, München 1961, 124; G. Dobesch, *Zur Chronologie des Dakerkönigs Burebista*, in: R. Göbl, *Die Hexadrachmenprägung der Groß-Boier. Ablauf, Chronologie und historische Relevanz für Noricum und Nachbargebiete*, Wien 1994, 54, n. 88, supposes that „Iust. prol. 32 ist entweder sinnlos oder meint einen viel früheren — *incrementa Dacorum* — König (Rubobostes?)“.

¹⁹ Cf. Iliescu, *Burobostes* 116 sq. with literature.

²⁰ C. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 53.

²¹ Cf. I. Glodariu, *Bemerkungen über einen Dakerkönig*, ActaMN 7 (1970) 501–505.

²² Ferrero, *Struttura* (n. 9) 114.

the time of Pompeius Trogus. The German scholar also noticed that there was mention of the Dacians before Burebista²³. An extensive demonstration in this respect is also due to Iliescu, whose viewpoint we have followed. He is actually the trailblazer for the debates on this question in Romanian historiography²⁴.

These two demonstrations, like many others, either forgotten or insufficiently examined, have not been given the place they deserve in the literature on this question, which sometimes, when referring to them, offers them further indirect support. The resumption of this question makes it imperative to give a comparative analysis of the incriminated fragment of *Prol.* 32²⁵ and of Chapter 3 in Book XXXII of the *Epitoma* by Justin. This chapter sums up all the facts which were mentioned in the quoted fragment of *Prol.* XXXII as being part of Book XXXII of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*. Before the analysis proper mention should be made again of the „mechanism“ of the organisation of the subject matter in *Historiae Philippicae*: when his narrative comes to a new people that is related to the one which he has been telling readers about so far, Pompeius Trogus (and Justin too) immediately starts telling the history of this people²⁶. One can appreciate this point when reading the Prologues and the *Epitome*, which show that this procedure was usually achieved through digressions²⁷. Clearly this applies to this case too. The digression of *Prol.* XXXII was written not because of the Bastarnae, who were mentioned immediately before the phrase *inde in excessu*²⁸, as they previously attracted Pompeius Trogus' attention: he deals with them in *Prol.* XXVIII, *in excessu Basternici motus*. When reading Chapter 3 of Book XXXII of the *Epitoma* carefully, one can realize that Philip V had made an anti-Roman alliance with the Scordisci (XXXII 3, 5). Hence, the starting point of the digression about *res Illyricae* is not Bastarnae, but the Scordisci and then the Tectosagi, who had not been mentioned before. The Illyrian digression can be divided into three „micro“-digressions. 1. Scordiscan-Tectosagian (XXXII 3, 6–12); 2. Pannonian

²³ Bessell, *Getae* 70.

²⁴ On the same line ideas can be found in C. Jullian, *Histoire de la Gaule* III, Paris 1914, 428, n. 2; É. Cavaignac, *Histoire de l'Antiquité* III, Paris 1914, 428, n. 2; J. Boerma, *Historischer Kommentar zu Iustinus Epit. Hist. Phil. des Pompeius Trogus, XXVII–XXXVIII und zu den Prologi dieser Bücher*, Hague 1937, 106, arguing that Oroles was a Dacian king from the 1st century B. C.

²⁵ *Regis Philippi propter ablatas sibi civitates alienatus in Romanos animus, et ob hos alter filiorum Demetrius occisus, concitatusque ab eo Basternae transire conati in Italiam. Inde in excessu dictae res Illyricae: originesque Pannoniorum et incrementa Dacorum per Burobosten regem.*

²⁶ Cf. Bessell, *Getae* 70: „Atque quum saepissime Pomp. Trogus posteriorum temporum facta passim historiis suis inseret, sane fieri poterat, ut incrementa Dacorum, quae gens maxime florebat ipsius Trogi temporibus, hoc loco afferret, occasione oblata in describendis originibus Pannoniorum“.

²⁷ Identified as *in excessu dicti* (*Prol.* 1, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 28, 32, 36, 37, 41) or as *inde repetitae* (*Prol.* 2, 3, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 24, 36, 38, 42).

²⁸ The account about the Bastarnae urged by Philip V to move to Italy and about their actions in the Balkans was not related by Justin in Book XXXII where he fully describes the significant and moralizing circumstances (cf. *Praef.* 4) in which Philopomen, Antiochus the Great and Demetrius, Philip V's son, found their death (XXXII 1–3). See Polybius XXVI 9, 2–3; Livy XXXIX 35, 4; XL 57, 2–9; XL 58, 1–8; XLI 19, 4–8; XLI 23, 12; XLII 11, 4 for the presence of the Bastarnae in the Balkans.

(XXXII 3, 13–15); 3. Dacian (XXXII 3, 16). To resume: Pompeius Trogus mentions Philip V's alliance with the Scordisci and he describes *in excessu* their deeds in Illyricum — after Hellas was plundered — and then the return from Gaul and settlement of the Tectosagi in Pannonia. Obviously there had to follow a „history“ of the Pannonians, and as Burebista fought²⁹ in Pannonia it was but natural that readers should be offered some information, briefly indicated in *Prol.* XXXII by the *incrementa Dacorum per Burobosten regem*.

The way the historical matter was organized by Pompeius Trogus and Justin, which was previously exemplified in a concrete manner, confirms that fact that the Kings Burebista and Oroles were contemporaries and emphasizes the reasons for the presence of the latter in the Epitome too³⁰.

Accepting the hypothesis that Oroles is a Dacian king of the 1st century B.C. brings other questions into the picture too and, implicitly, other historical sources, making it possible to draw a picture different from the traditional one of Dacia's history before Burebista.

Undoubtedly, one of the most important documents on Dacia's political history and its foreign relations in the middle of the 1st century B.C. is the decree of Akornion, son of Dionysios of Dionysopolis³¹. One may summarize the contents of the psephisma as follows: Akornion makes a diplomatic journey to the son of a barbarian king; then another journey to the king himself, whom he met at Argedava or, maybe, Sargedava. Then the high-ranking citizen discharges the function of a priest of the Great God, of the god Serapis, of the god Dionysus, again of the god Dionysus when C. Antonius Hybrida, proconsul of Macedonia (62–61 B.C.), spent the winter in that city, his last sacerdotal dignity being that of a high priest of the gods of Samothrace. Finally, the most important services to his homeland are carried out by Akornion through his embassies to King Burebista and, while in his service, to Cn. Pompeius in 48 B.C.³². Akornion is considered to have gone on the first embassies between 70 and 62 B.C. or even earlier³³.

One of the most controversial topics is the name of the place where Akornion met the unknown dynast and, equally, its location. It is now generally accepted that the name of this city was probably Argedava, and since Pârvan's time it has been believed that it was to be located on the R. *Argesis = Argeș³⁴ and that it could be identified, according to R. Vulpe, with the *dava* discovered at Popești, on the Argeș³⁵.

²⁹ Cf. Strabo VII 3, 11.

³⁰ Cf. Justin, *Praef.* 4; Ferrero, *Struttura* (n. 9) 114.

³¹ Among the editions of the decree: E. Kalinka, *Antike Denkmäler in Bulgarien*, Wien 1906, 86–94; Syll.³ II 762; M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecque* I, Paris 1938, 285–287; G. Mihailov, *IGB I*² 51–56, nr. 13. For its literature, cf. Gostar, *La résidence* 57 sq.; Crișan, *Burebista* 89 sq.

³² For the dating of the decree, see Gostar, *La résidence* 59, n. 12.

³³ *Ibidem*; H. Daicovicu, *Dacia* 39.

³⁴ Pârvan, *Getica* 81.

³⁵ R. Vulpe, *Studia* 69–79.

Before the word APΓEΔAYON Kalinka noticed two horizontal hastae, which he reconstructed as Σ³⁶. The restoration was accepted and the editors of the inscription improved it to [... εἰ]ς Ἀργέδαυον³⁷. H. Daicoviciu thought that this might belong to the next word and, therefore, the toponym might be ΣΑΡΓEΔAYON³⁸. This idea was taken up again by Gostar, who brought to bear important arguments in the fields of epigraphy, philology and historical geography³⁹.

As is known, Ptolemy III 10, 8 mentions three localities bearing Dacian names on the left bank of the Siret-Hierasus (their order is from the south to the north): Piroboridava, Tamasidava, Zargidava. They were located in Moesia Inferior, that is in southern Moldavia. Starting from the information supplied by Ptolemy, Gostar suggested, with the necessary caution, identifying the toponym Sargedava-Zargedava in Akornion's decree with the Zargidava mentioned by the ancient author⁴⁰. He thought that „dans la ligne 6 de l'inscription, devant le mot APΓEΔAYON, où les éditeurs ont vu la moitié d'un Σ, celle-ci pourrait être aussi Ζ; et en ce cas la localité de l'inscription pouvait être aussi Zargedava, un nom assez rapproché de celui transmis par Ptolémée“⁴¹.

Subsequently H. Daicoviciu gave up the reading Sargedava, thinking that Akornion's messages to that unknown king and to his son might have not been outside the borders of the Dobrudja, hence that Argedava was somewhere in the Dobrudja⁴². Shortly afterwards Suceveanu discovered in Histria an inscription in which a vicus Arcidava pays homage to Marcus Aurelius about A.D. 166⁴³. The editor maintains that „la valeur particulière de notre inscription réside justement dans la possibilité d'une identité entre l'Argedava d'Acornion et la nouvelle Arcidava de Dobroudja, ce qui confirmerait de manière décisive la brillante hypothèse de H. Daicoviciu“.

The general comparison of the arguments invoked by these three hypotheses⁴⁴ shows that, in the long run, none of them has any decisive proof. On further inspection, it is clear that only the hypotheses of Gostar and H. Daicoviciu-Suceveanu

³⁶ Kalinka, *Antike Denkmäler* (n. 31) 90.

³⁷ Syll.³ 762; IGB I, 13.

³⁸ See H. Daicoviciu, *Dacii*, Bucharest 1965, 104–105, where Sargedava is located in the Orăștie Mountains; the River Sargetia is also mentioned there; later H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 34; 46, n. 150, would make no mention of his earlier suggestion.

³⁹ Gostar, *La résidence* 62–63, n. 29–36, argues that the reading ΣΑΡΓEΔAYON is valid from a philological and epigraphical point of view. Furthermore, Gostar made a complex, critical approach to different categories of sources. Thus he concluded that the ancient name of the River Argeș was Marisus and not *Argesis. He also showed that the Dacians did not form toponyms by adding the suffix *-dava* to hydronyms; idem, *La population de la Dacie avant la conquête romaine*, in: R. Vulpe (ed.) Actes du II^e Congrès International de Thracologie II, Bucharest 1980, 28–29. His hypothesis was also supported by Crișan, *Burebista* 98 sq.

⁴⁰ Gostar, *La résidence* 62, n. 28; 63.

⁴¹ Gostar, *La résidence* 63.

⁴² H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 30–47.

⁴³ Suceveanu, *Arcidava* 112 sq. Cf. also E. Condurachi, *AAntHung* 25.1–2 (1978) 7.

⁴⁴ Initially it was supposed that Akornion had reached Arcidava in Banat which was mentioned by Ptolemy III 4; Tabula Peutingeriana VIII 3; Geogr. Raven. 204, 4; Syll.³ 446. Cf. G. G. Mateescu, *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională* 4, Cluj 1926, 330; Patsch, *Beiträge* V.1, 46, n. 2; 59, n. 4; C. Daicoviciu, *SCIV* 1–2 (1955) 53, n. 1.

offer arguments worth consideration: either the information supplied by Ptolemy III 10, 8, that justifies the reading Zargedava in Akornion's decree, or an inscription testifying to the existence of a vicus Arcidava in the rural territory of Histria⁴⁵.

The decisive argument mentioned by Suceveanu is the honorary inscription of the *vicani* of Arcidava. Although the editor of this inscription assures us that Arcidava is the Latin form of Argedava, the presence of such names as Ἀρκίννα, Ἀρκοβάδαρα in Dacia or Ἀρκοῦνες in the Balkans⁴⁶ cannot remove methodological doubt at least. With good reason H. Daicoviciu⁴⁷ and Suceveanu⁴⁸ stress the fact that the relations between Dionysopolis and the unknown Dobrudjan dynast of Arcidava were similar to those between Histria and the dynast Zalmodegikos and Rhemaxos⁴⁹. Suceveanu considers in this context that the defeat of C. Antonius Hybrida⁵⁰ in 61 B.C. was not due to the Greek cities, which were too weak to try to revolt, but to the Getic dynasts of the Dobrudja, who were Rome's allies after M. Terentius Varro Lucullus' campaign and then rebelled against her⁵¹.

This hypothesis is of course quite attractive, but there are a few objections that cannot be ignored. Cassius Dio XXXVIII 10, 3, mentions the tyrannical behaviour of Hybrida to the „allies of Moesia“ (τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς ἐν τῇ Μυσίᾳ). Indeed, by „allies“ one could understand both the Greek cities and the dynasts between the Danube and the Balkans who had joined the Roman client-system after the campaigns of Macedonia's governors during the Mithridatic Wars, that is the Getic dynasts too⁵². But one must also not ignore the fact that the Getae are not mentioned by the well-informed Cassius Dio XXXVIII 10, 3 as participating in the coalition that defeated Hybrida near Histria. The participation of the Getae, side by side with the Bastarnae and the Greeks, is a modern historical reconstruction of Pârvan⁵³ which is based on the information by the same Cassius Dio LI 25, 5: this notes the justifications of M. Licinius Crassus'⁵⁴ action against Dapyx by the fact that he had heard that

⁴⁵ This hypothesis advanced by Pârvan was taken over and developed by R. Vulpe. It became the communis opinio in Romanian historiography although it cannot provide an argument of the same value because the shortcomings of the *Argesis-Argedava theory were reelevated by Gostar (cf. n. 39). This hypothesis can only put forward arguments from general history (concerning the Mithradatic Wars which also involved Pontic-Danubian Dacia) that can be used by other hypotheses, as actually happened. Besides these, R. Vulpe mentioned an „archaeological“ argument: the Popești settlement on the Arges River. Arguments of the same type or even more revealing can be made by those who contradicted him as well.

⁴⁶ As R. Vulpe, *Studia* 73 rightly noticed. Further examples can be found in D. Detschew, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*, Wien 1957, 25.

⁴⁷ H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 22 sq.

⁴⁸ Suceveanu, *Arcidava* 118.

⁴⁹ See D. M. Pippidi, *Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris* I, Bucharest 1983, nr. 15, 82–93, for texts of decrees, detailed commentaries and literature.

⁵⁰ Cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic II (99–31 B.C.)*, New York 1951–1952, 165–166; 175–176; E. Klebs, *RE* I 2 (1894) 2577–2582, s. v. Antonius, nr. 19.

⁵¹ Suceveanu, *Arcidava* 117.

⁵² V. Lica, *Das Foedus zwischen Rom und Kallatis*, *StudCl* 28–30 (1997) 27–38, with the literature of the subject from Mommsen to A. Avram.

⁵³ Pârvan, *Getica* 78–79; 90.

⁵⁴ E. Groag, *RE* XIII 1 (1926) 270–285, s. v. Licinius (Crassus), nr. 58.

the standards lost by Hybrida in 61 B.C. might be at Genucla — the city of the Getae⁵⁵. In this context the absence of the Getae from the anti-Roman coalition might be accounted for by their enmity with the Bastarnae, as they preferred to be faithful to the agreements concluded with the Romans⁵⁶. Similarly, perhaps one should not ignore the fact, already pointed out by R. Vulpe⁵⁷, that in the decree Akornion's journey to Zargedava is mentioned as being completed under special circumstances: „les termes συναποδημῶν ἐ ἀπήρατο nous font comprendre que cette localité (*scil.* Argedava) se trouvait loin de Dionysopolis“. Of course, to Akornion a „journey to a foreign country“ in practice meant any journey beyond the borders of his native polis. But it is quite significant that these words do not occur again in the text of the decree to qualify the other mission on which Akornion went to Burebista and, when in his service, to Pompeius (line 20 *sq.*).

On the other hand it must be emphasized, the attempt to identify Arcidava with [Z]argedava in Akornion's decree cannot account for an archaeological support as convincing as Gostar's hypothesis. The results of recent archaeological research clearly show that — south of the „frontier“ between the Getae, the Dacians and the Bastarnae⁵⁸ — there is remarkable continuity in the autochthonous civilization. The *davae* discovered at Bîtca-Doamnei, Brad, Răcățäu, Poiana, Bărboși, Orlovka⁵⁹, which reach the akmé of their development in the last century B.C., eloquently illustrate the evolution to well-consolidated, strong political and military forms of the Getae and the Dacians in the area between the Carpathians and the Dnjester⁶⁰. All

⁵⁵ Emphasis should again be placed on the idea that they were conquered by the Bastarnae.

⁵⁶ See also Pârvan, *Getica* 77: „Finally the Romans' war itself against Mithridates and Bastarnae enabled the rise of the Getic power. Actually on the one hand their Eastern rivals, the Bastarnae were wasting their forces as mercenaries in Mithridates' army; on the other hand the weakening power of the Bosporan Kingdom — mainly determined by Mithridates — allowed the Getae to advance slightly to the West and the North of the Black Sea in order to fight against the Sarmatians and the Scythians“. Mention should be made of the fact that Pârvan, *Getica*, passim, relying on the archaeological informations of his time believed that the centre of the Getic power was in Walachia.

⁵⁷ R. Vulpe, *Studia* 70.

⁵⁸ Cf. latest Babeș, *Beitrag* 122 *sq.*, with the literature on the topic.

⁵⁹ N. Gostar, *Cetățî dacice din Moldova*, Bucharest 1969, 9–22, 29 *sq.*; A. Vulpe, *Ptolemy and the ancient geography of Moldavia*, StudCl 6 (1964) 233 *sq.*; V. Ursachi, *Sanctuarul din cetatea dacică de la Brad (sec. I. a. Chr. – sec. I. p. Chr.)*, Memoria Antiquitatis 12–14 (1980–1982) 93–104; V. Căpitanu, V. Ursachi, *Brad und Răcățäu, zwei getisch-dakische befestigte Siedlungen*, Thraco-Dacica 1 (1976) 271–277; R. Vulpe, *Studia* 103–124; V. Ursachi, *Cetatea dacică de la Brad*, Thraco-Dacica 8.1–2 (1987) 100–127; Babeș, *Beitrag* 122: „In der Tat fehlen im P-L-Kultur Siedlungen vom *dava*-Typ (Oppida) aus der Zeit der Existenz wie übrigens auch nach dem Verschwinden der P-L-Kultur. Südlich dieses Gebietes, bezeugen diese natürlich oder künstlich befestigten Siedlungen — wie etwa die von Bîtca Doamnei, Brad, Răcățäu, Poiana, Bărboși und Orlovka — durch den Reichtum und die Vielfalt der Funde die normale Entwicklung der geto-dakischen Kultur in ihrer ‚klassischen‘ Phase“.

⁶⁰ This evolution is the continuation of a process supported by evidence for the previous centuries when great cities were built (*e. g.* Sîncești, Cotnari, Bunești, Arsura, Moșna, Butuceni, Mateuți, Zaharna, etc.). The significance of these cities is dealt with in Babeș, *Beitrag* 164–166, with literature on the topic. One should not neglect the fact that it is this area that was the target of Dareios, Alexander, through Zopyrion, or Lysimachos. This may stand as evidence for showing that in that region there were — Scythian and subsequently Getic — political and

leads led us to the conclusion, which is well-founded in our opinion, that in the first half of the 1st century B.C. there existed in this area a powerful kingdom capable of controlling the Greek cities⁶¹, so that Akornion's message to Zargedava was quite natural⁶². Gostar suggested locating this kingdom in the south of Moldavia⁶³, but he did not try to identify the „King of Zargedava“ with any of the dynasts mentioned by literary tradition.

Initially the first missions Akornion undertook were supposed to have been sent to Burebista, a hypothesis that may now be considered quite fragile⁶⁴. Can one still identify the dynast whom Dionysopolis repeatedly asked for help? Literary sources and archaeological research, which have previously been described and examined, show — quite convincingly in our opinion — that Akornion went on the first mission to King Oroles, the conqueror of the Bastarnae.

Of course, this suggestion of an identification, at first sight rather shocking, raises some chronological and historical questions, which are analysed below.

military centres which endangered any attempt of the right bank of the Danube. Cf. Herodotus IV 97 sq.; Diodorus XXI 2, 16–17; Curtius Rufus X 1, 43–44; Arrianus I 4, 1–5; Justin XXI 2, 16–17; Iliescu, *Alexander*, passim.

⁶¹ As king Rhemaxos and Zalmodegikos had dominated previously. Cf. I. I. Russu, *Zoltes și Rhemaxos. Thracii, sciții și Istria în sec. III–II î. e. n.*, Apulum 6 (1967) 133 sq.; Gostar, *La résidence* 65–66. According to Russu, *loc. cit.* 141 (Zusammenfassung) „Rhemaxos ein König aus den nördlich von der Donau gelegenen Gebieten, der von den meisten (vor allem den rumänischen) Forschern für einen Geten gehalten wird, ist in Wirklichkeit ein Skythe, möglicherweise ein Nachfahre des Ateas (aus dem 4. Jahrhundert), dessen Herrschaftsbereich zwischen dem Pruth, dem Dnjestr und dem Bug lag. Sein Name ist skythischer (nicht dakischer) Herkunft, ebenso wie der seines Sohnes, des Prinzen Phrad[...?]“. Undoubtedly, Russu's philological and onomastic remarks are correct, but it is not unlikely that a Getic or Dacian dynast should have had a name of a different origin. In support of this the latest archaeological research (cf. Babeș, *Beitrag* 121 sq.) demonstrates the active presence of the Getae in the region mentioned earlier.

⁶² Gostar, *La résidence* 61; Crișan, *Burebista* 113 sq. Another significant argument in this respect is provided by numismatics (see C. Preda, *Monedele geto-dacilor*, Bucharest 1973, 427–428). According to Preda Southern Moldavia and North Eastern Walachia were active monetary centres since the second half of 2nd century B. C. till the middle of 1st century B. C. This would point to „third great union Getic tribes at that time“.

⁶³ Cf. Gostar, *La résidence* 65–66, where he did not attempt to locate Zargedava mentioned by Ptolemy: „Toutes ces trois localités (*scil.* Piroboridava, Tamasidava, Zargedava), d'après les coordonnées de les Ptolémée, se trouvent au Sud de Moldavie, mais c'est difficile de les identifier sur place avec une certitude absolue“ (p. 63). Since Justin XXXII 3, 16 considers Oroles a *Dacorum rex*, it is admitted that the latter's kingdom also extended to the South East of Transylvania (cf. Babeș, *Beitrag* 168). It is certainly difficult to assert whether Oroles' kingdom included or not the region bordered by the Carpathians and the Dnjestr. This hypothesis would not be unlikely considering the Southern „frontier“ of the P-L-culture: a line starting from the North of Piatra-Neamț, crossing the Siret River between Bacău and Roman, then the River Pruth at Leovo to reach Tighina on the Dnjestr (see Babeș, *Beitrag* 116). The Bastarnae could not conquer the whole Moldavia precisely because of this kingdom's resistance.

⁶⁴ Cf. Gostar, *La résidence* 65 sq., with literature.

We believe that King Burebista starts his rise — in keeping with Strabo VII 3, 11 — about 60 B.C., but after 63 B.C.⁶⁵ Oroles' reign can only be chronologically defined very approximatively: the first half of the 1st century B.C. While the beginning of this reign is completely unknown, its end can be established with more probability, starting from Oroles' battles against the Bastarnae. The attempt to date these conflicts entails some other questions, among which mention should be made of Oroles' ethnic origin and his relations with Mithradates VI Eupator.

Oroles' ethnic origin was the focus of serious controversies, aimed at discovering whether he was a Getan⁶⁶ or *natione Dacus*⁶⁷: they began with the question whether Oroles and Rholes⁶⁸ were one and the same person or two different dynasts⁶⁹.

The examination of these hypotheses shows that the idea of identifying Oroles with Rholes arose because of the similarity of the two names, and, equally, because both were associated with the Bastarnae. On the philological and onomastic side, research into the critical editions of Justin and Cassius Dio shows that their manuscripts are unanimous in transmitting the names in their well-known form: Oroles⁷⁰ and Ῥωλής.

One could also answer this question by a passage in Lucan⁷¹ (*Pharsalia* III 200–202), where he mentions among Pompeius' barbarian allies: ... *barbara Cone, Sarmaticas ubi perdit aquas sparsamque profundo multifidi Peucen unum caput adluit Histri...* Gostar⁷² notes that: „Dans une des *scholiae* de *Pharsalia* on explique: *barbara Cone regio in ultimis Europae partibus et apud Sarmatas* (Adnotationes super Lucanum, III, 200) et dans la scholia du Codex Bernensis litt. 45, *Cone civitatis*

⁶⁵ Cf. V. Lica, *Pină cînd a trăit Deceneu?*, StudCl 22 (1984) 57–67, with the literature on the topic. See also Dobesch (n. 18) 54, n. 88, who maintains that „Die Hochdatierung bei Iordanes Get. 11, 67 ist natürlich falsch, wie so vieles bei ihm“. He also supposes (54) that: „Es erscheint als möglich, daß Burebista überhaupt erst in den Fünfzigerjahren groß wurde, eher erst gegen deren Ende“.

⁶⁶ K. Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde* III, Berlin 1906, 144; Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Hist. Rom. quae supersunt* II, Berlin 1898, 375 s. v. Ῥωλής, referring to *Getarum rex Oroles*, and Gr. Tocilescu, *Dacia înainte de romani*, Bucharest 1880, 722 with an ambivalent position; R. Roesler, *Romanische Studien. Untersuchungen zur älteren Geschichte Rumäniens*, Leipzig 1871, 23; Pârvan, *Getica* 67–68; Alföldi, CAH XI, 81. All these authors mistranslated the text in Justin XXXII 3, 16: *Daci quoque suboles Getarum sunt, qui, cum Orole rege ...*, by associating *qui* with *Getarum* and not with *Daci* as it is natural. Cf., for instance, Iliescu's remark (*Oroles* 380, n. 41). Similarly mention should be made of the topic of the digression in *Prologus* XXXII which concerns *incrementa Dacorum* and not *incrementa Getarum*.

⁶⁷ Brandis, *Dacia* 1965; C. Daicoviciu, in: *Istoria României* I, Bucharest 1960, 218, 318; Iliescu, *Oroles* 380–381; H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 26; Crişan, *Burebista* 30, etc.

⁶⁸ So believed Müllenhoff, Boissevain and Tocilescu (cf. n. 66).

⁶⁹ As it is admitted by most part of modern historiography. One should neglect the early assumptions concerning Oroles as one and the same person as Burebista (Is. Vossius), as Scorylo-Coryllus (Cantemir) or as the imaginary Rubobostes (Brandis).

⁷⁰ In one edition of Justin's *Epitoma* an unknown editor replaced Oroles by Oloros. See supra, n. 12.

⁷¹ Cf. M. Fuhrmann, KIP III (1969) 745–748, s. v. M. Annaeus Lucanus, with literature.

⁷² N. Gostar, *La population de la Dacie avant la conquête romaine (Ptolémée, Géogr., III, 8, 3)*, in: R. Vulpe (ed.), *Actes du II^e Congrès Internat. de Thracologie* II, Bucharest 1980, 28.

vel insula Histri fluminis (G. Cavajoni, *Acme* 28.1–2 [1975] 112). Il est plausible que la localité *Cote, d'où vient le nom des Κοτήνσιοι, soit la même que la *barbara Cone*. Nous pensons que le nom de la localité a été *Cote, tel qu'il existe dans le lexique dace, κοτιατα, plante médicinale (Dioscoride, IV, 29). On pourrait invoquer une parenté avec les anthroponymes thraco-mésiens: Cotis, Cotos, Cotus, Cotys ou avec l'anthroponyme dace Cotiso, ou avec le théonyme thrace Cotto, Cotytto⁷³. Who are the Κοτήνσιοι? Gostar⁷³ also notices that „Les Κοτήνσιοι apparaissant uniquement avec cette graphie dans les manuscrits de la Géographie de Ptolémée. Bien que les Κοτήνσιοι aient habité au sud de la Moldavie et au sud-est de la Transylvanie, donc en plein milieu dace (sur ce territoire se trouvaient, d'après les longitudes et les latitudes de Ptolémée, des sites à nom spécifiquement dace, comme Piroboridava, Tamasidava, Zargidava, Utidava et, probablement, Sangidava), on a déduit qu'ils sont des Celtes et cela, pour la seule ressemblance avec Cotini, peuple celtique bien connue sur le territoire de la Slovaquie. Mais la désinence -ηνσιοι nous oblige à admettre que l'ethnonyme vient d'une localité *Cote, non encore attesté. Il ne serait cependant pas exclu que la localité *Cote se retrouve dans la *Pharsalia* de Lucain (III, 200–202)⁷⁴. Was *barbara* *Cote used by Lucan as a label for all the Getic and Dacian tribes ruled by Burebista or does it name only the barbarians located around it? And could the latter be the Κοτήνσιοι, as Gostar argued? According to Ptolemy, these Κοτήνσιοι settled in the region where Oroles' kingdom can be located (cf. n. 74).

As for Rholes' relation with the Bastarnae — assuming that the information supplied by Cassius Dio is fairly accurate — things are clear enough: their conflict took place south of the Danube, in 29–28 B.C., under the circumstances of the Getic dynast's alliance with the Romans. Oroles' confrontation with the Bastarnae took place in the first half of the 1st century B.C. A supplementary argument can be inferred from the fact that Oroles is a *Dacorum rex*, whereas in the Prologues and the *Epitoma* the Getae are mentioned only once. Justin XXV 1, 2 mentions that the Gauls defeated the Triballi and the Getae at the time of Antigonos Gonatas. The event undoubtedly occurred south of the Danube. So one can conclude that, as he was Dacian or at least the king of some Dacians⁷⁴, Oroles cannot be identified with Rholes. They are two different dynasts, who both reigned in the 1st century B.C., the former in the first half and the latter in the second half⁷⁵.

⁷³ *Ibidem* 27.

⁷⁴ This led to the conclusion that Oroles' kingdom included the South-Eastern of Transylvania. Cf. Iliescu, *Oroles* 379; H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia* 26; Crişan, *Burebista* 30; Babeş, *Beitrag* 168: „Für eine Lokalisierung von Oroles „Königreich“ findet man keine Hinweise außer der Tatsache, daß hier ausdrücklich von Dakern und nicht von Geten die Rede ist und man daher vielleicht an den Innenkarpatenraum, genauer an Ostsiebenbürgen, denken könnte, wo übrigens die Entdeckung von Moreşti auf ein Eindringen der Poieneşti-Lukasevka-Kulturträger hindeutet. Da jedoch die geographische Abgrenzung zwischen Dakern und Geten in W-O-Richtung unscharf ist, darf man nicht die größere Wahrscheinlichkeit übersehen, daß Kämpfe zwischen Einwanderern und Einheimischen vor allem in dem von Bastarnen eroberten Gebiet, also östlich der Karpaten, stattgefunden haben könnten“.

⁷⁵ Cf., for a comprehensive discussion, Lica, *Oroles*, passim.

Undoubtedly one of the most provocative issues is to ascertain Oroles' attitude to Mithridates VI Eupator⁷⁶, who was at war with Rome⁷⁷. Appian, *Mithr.* 17, enumerates the size of the Pontic king's imposing army in the first war against Rome: „Mithridates had in his own army 250,000 foot and 40,000 horse, 300 ships with decks, 100 with two banks of oars each and other equipement in proportion“⁷⁸. According to Appian, *Mithr.* 15, Mithridates „has allies also ready to obey his very command, Scythians, Taurians, Bastarnae, Thracians, Sarmatians, and all those who dwell in the region of the Don and the Danube and the sea of Azov“⁷⁹. The same Appian, *Mithr.* 69, says that during the preparations for the Third Mithridatic War, „in Europe he (*scil.* Mithradates) drew from the Sarmatian tribes, both the Basilidae and the Iazyges, the Coralli, and those Thracians who dwelt among the Danube and on the Rhodope and the Bastarnae, the bravest nation of all“⁸⁰.

Did the Getae and the Dacians hurry to fight under the banner of Mithradates, as Mommsen put it⁸¹, like the other *gentes* from the Caucasus to the Danube? Judging by analogy with other historical situations, it is not impossible that Getae and Dacians should have taken part in Mithradates' campaigns, at least those between the Danube and the Balkans. But one must not ignore the fact that Mithradates' expansion to the western coast of the Black Sea created a political and military situation that was probably difficult for Oroles and maybe for his predecessor. On the one hand, the natural tendency of the rulers north of the Danube to dominate — at least partially — the Dobrudja and the Greek cities is now hindered by the extension of Mithradates' effective protectorate over this region⁸². On the other hand, the position of the rivals of the

⁷⁶ Among the rich literature about the king of Pontus, see the basic monograph by Reinach, *Mithradates, passim*, as well as B. C. McGing, *The Foreign Policy of Mithradates VI Eupator*, Leiden 1986, *passim*, with recent literature.

⁷⁷ The last years of L. Lucullus's campaigns and the end of the Third Mithradatic War are carefully and incitingly analysed by Wirth, *Pompeius, passim*. Wirth (68) accurately stressed the relation between intention-reality-possibility; the Romans' new view in comparison with the actual facts in Orient which allowed him a correct reconsideration of Pompeius: „Für weiter-schauende, auch gegenüber eigenen Kräften maßvolle Imperiumspolitik nach außen, Zurückhaltung, Anpassung an die natürlichen Gegebenheiten und Verzicht auf persönlichen Taten-ruhm gibt es unter den Staatsmännern und Heerführern der späteren Republik nicht allzuvielle Beispiele. Pompeius in Armenien und im Kaukasusgebiet hat ein solches geliefert“; *idem*, *Osten* 87: „Erst Pompeius im Osten ist nach natürlichen Katastrophen ein Zeichen dafür, wie weit deutlich geworden war, was man sich leisten dürfe und was nicht“.

⁷⁸ Translated by White, *Appian* II 269.

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*, 271. Cf. also Appian, *Mithr.* 41.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, 369.

⁸¹ Mommsen, *RG* II 288: „... Thraker, Skythen, Sauromaten, Bastarner, Kolchier, Iberer (im heutigen Georgien) drängten sich unter seine Fahne...“.

⁸² Cf. Pippidi, *Scythica Minora*, Bucharest, Amsterdam 1975, 165; El. Salomone Gaggero, *Relations politiques et militaires de Mithridate VI Eupator avec les populations et les cités de la Thrace et avec les colonies grecques de la Mer Noire occidentale*, *Pulpuveda* 2 (1978) 294–305, etc. Unfortunately we are not in a position to define more accurately the forms taken by Mithradates' influence and domination in the region. A new inscription discovered at Histria which mentions a στρατηγός of Mithradates who was sent εἰς τῆ[ν Σκυθίαν?] was damaged just where it could have provided significant details. The marble inscription was discovered in June 1995 by O. Bounegru and V. Lungu. I am grateful to my colleague, A. Avram, for

Getae and Dacians in the north and the east — the Bastarnae — was consolidated owing to their status as Mithradates' privileged allies, as one can see in Appian, *Mithr.* 69⁸³.

The attempt to establish a chronology of Oroles' actions must also consider the information to be found in Akornion's decree. The first certain chronological landmark of Akornion's activity is a high position held when C. Antonius Hybrida spent the winter in Dionysopolis, in 62–61 B.C. Previously, Akornion went on a mission to the son of a Dacian dynast and then to the dynast himself, whom he met at [Z]argedava. But when did Akornion go to Zargedava?

In 72–71 B.C. the Greek cities were conquered by M. Terentius Varro Lucullus and brought into the Roman system of alliances⁸⁴. We maintain that the Roman proconsul also included the Thracian-Dacian tribes in the area in the political, diplomatic and legal regulation of the newly created situation⁸⁵. Undoubtedly, Rome's aim was the liquidation of Mithradates' military bases and sources of mercenaries here and the creation of a new component in the Roman system of alliances.

It is quite probable that M. Lucullus tried, as his brother, L. Lucullus, and then Pompeius⁸⁶ did, to draw, by peaceful means, some of the dynasts in their area into this system. As the Bastarnae were Mithradates' privileged allies it is to be presumed that M. Lucullus tried to annihilate them by an alliance with the Getae and the Dacians, the prevailing ethnic element in this area⁸⁷. No doubt they were interested in such an alliance, which made it possible for them to reinstate, here, their own domination that was contested by the Bastarnae⁸⁸.

The only force that could be considered for the Romans' plans was the powerful kingdom north of the Danube ruled over by King Oroles, the master of the *davae* at Piroboridava, Tamasidava, Zargidava and the conqueror of the Bastarnae.

If Rome's relations with the dynasts — or, at least, with most of them — south of the Danube were based on the *deditio* as a direct consequence of M. Lucullus' victories, it is difficult to define the nature of the possible relations established with Oroles⁸⁹. Considering the common interest of the two partners — the removal of the Bastarnae as Mithradates' allies — it is to be presumed that Oroles' position was

informing me about this find, which he will publish. According to Avram the inscription could be dated before or after the First Mithradatic War.

⁸³ *Supra*, n. 80. *Cf.* also Mommsen, *RG II* 288: „... vor allem rekrutierte er seine Kriegsscharen aus den tapferen Bastarnern“.

⁸⁴ *Cf. supra*, n. 82; Lica, *Das Foedus zwischen Rom und Kallatis* (n. 52).

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁶ *Cf.* Wirth, *Pompeius, passim*, for the policy of attracting and including the oriental dynasts in a coherent clientary system.

⁸⁷ Later M. Licinius Crassus would act in a similar way. He acknowledged Rholes' domination over Scythia Minor.

⁸⁸ On the other hand, Rome could control indirectly a region that stood for the starting point of the ceaseless raids against Macedonia.

⁸⁹ Only Florus I 39, 6 maintains that ... *Lucullus ad terminum gentium (scil. Sarmatae) Tanain lacumque Maetin*. This would imply a campaign to the North of the Danube and therefore the possibility of a clash with the Getae, Dacians and Bastarnae. The other ancient authors — Sallust, Livy, Appian, Eutropius, Festus, Ammianus Marcellinus, etc. — state that M. Lucullus only reached the river without crossing it.

superior to that of the others as he was granted the title of *amicus et socius populi Romani*, the protection of the Roman interests in the area being incumbent on him. It is quite probable that Rome accepted that Oroles, in exchange, should control the territories south of the Danube.

E. Cavaignac maintained that Oroles' victory occurred after the disappearance of Mithradates⁹⁰ but did not try to date it more precisely. Cavaignac's remark is correct as, after his brilliant initial successes, L. Lucullus did not manage to defeat Mithradates, with the result that in 66 B.C. he would be replaced by Pompeius⁹¹. If for the general theatre of military operations the plan, reminding one of Hannibal, imagined by Mithradates⁹² had no major importance⁹³ the same does not hold good for the influence on the barbarian peoples on the northern and western coasts of the Black Sea and of the Sea of Azov that were closely connected with the king of Pontus⁹⁴. Obviously, the Bastarnae were still one of Mithradates' important allies and further worked in this region to impose their own and the king's interests.

⁹⁰ Cavaignac, *Histoire* (n. 24) 482, n. 2.

⁹¹ Wirth, *Pompeius* 7: „... so ergab sich zwangsläufig um 67 als Erkenntnis eines fast siebenjährigen Krieges, daß die bisherige Art und Weise, diesen zu führen, versagt hatte ... Beide Gegner, Mithradates wie Tigranes, befanden sich nach mehrfacher Vertreibung wieder im vollen Besitz ihrer Macht, ja gingen ihrerseits zur Offensive über ...“.

⁹² Appian, *Mithr.* 101: „... Here (*scil.* at Dioscurias in Colchis) he conceived the vast plan, a strange plan for a fugitive, of making the circuit of the whole Pontus, and then of Scythia and the Sea of Azov, thus arriving at the Bosphorus ...“; — *Mithr.* 102: „Such was the chimerical project that Mithradates now eagerly pursued ... He even formed an alliance with them (*scil.* Scythian tribes) in contemplation of other or more novel exploits, such as marching through Thrace to Macedonia, through Macedonia to Pannonia, and passing over the Alps into Italy...“; — *Mithr.* 109: „He proposed to turn his course to the Gauls, whose friendship he had cultivated a long time for this purpose, and with them to invade Italy, hoping that many of the Italians themselves would join him on account of their hatred of the Romans; for he had heard that this had been Hannibal's policy when the Romans were waging war against him in Spain, and that he had become in this way an object of the greatest terror to them“. Cf. also Reinach, *Mithradates* 394 sq.; W. Hoben, *Untersuchungen zur Stellung kleinasiatischer Dynasten in den Machtkämpfen der ausgehenden Republik*, Diss. Mainz 1969, 6 sq.

⁹³ Wirth, *Pompeius* 28: „Soweit ersichtlich, reagiert man auf neuerliche Machtzunahme des Mithradates von nun an nicht mehr, und auch dessen Westpläne scheinen, falls Kenntnis davon überhaupt zu Pompeius gelangte, keine Beachtung mehr gefunden zu haben“. Wirth's remark (29, n. 86): „Allgemeine Kenntnis von der Entwicklung an der Donau wird Mithradates gehabt haben, ein geplantes Zusammengehen mit Burebista ist indes nur Spekulation“, is correct since the Getae and the Dacians could not be Mithradates' allies because they were fighting against the Bastarnae. Nevertheless one should notice that at the time — 65–63 B.C. — Burebista was not king at the Lower Danube. Cf. V. Lica, *StudCl* 22 (1984) 61 sq.

⁹⁴ Reinach, *Mithradates* 396: „Mithradates ... rief seine alten Vasallen, die Fürsten der maitischen Stämme, zu den Waffen ... Die langen Jahren seiner Abwesenheit und seiner Niederlagen hatten sein persönliches Ansehen so wenig zu erschüttern vermocht, daß die Barbaren sich haufenweise um den alten Kriegsmann scharten. Auch in der bosporanischen Bevölkerung begann es zu gären“; *ibidem* 403: „In der Hoffnung auf den Beistand der Sarmaten, Bastarner und Kelten lag zudem nichts widersinniges ... In ihren Augen war das Ansehen des alten Königs ungeschwächt, und das von Sinoria mitgenommene Gold genügte, um ihnen bis zur Plünderung Italiens Geduld zu verschaffen“; Hoben, *Untersuchungen* (n. 92) 8, n. 6; Wirth, *Pompeius* 58, n. 152.

Consequently, considering the entire context briefly presented here, the scenario of the events might be as follows:

1. After the withdrawal of M. Lucullus, after 70 B.C., there is a competition for the western coast of the Black Sea between Oroles and the Bastarnae, the latter acting on behalf of Mithridates;

2. The Greeks react and Akornion gets Oroles' assistance through his son (Syll.³ 762, the destroyed lines);

3. This son is defeated (Justin XXXII 3, 16), a fact that forces the Greeks to intercede again with Oroles himself (Syll.³ 762, lines 5-7);

4. Another war is waged between the Dacians and the Bastarnae and it ends in Oroles' victory (Justin XXXII 3, 16), which marks the end of the power of the Bastarnae in the Danubian region⁹⁵.

When did this victory take place? Cavaignac thought that the disappearance of Mithradates is the terminus post quem. With a view to a more precise dating, one must ignore the account given by Cassius Dio XXXVIII 10, 3 and LI 26, 5, of the defeat of Hybrida in 61 B.C. by a coalition between the Greeks and the Bastarnae⁹⁶. In this context one can accept that Oroles' victory occurred after 60, but before 55 B.C., the year when Burebista went to the Pontic cities without having to surmount the obstacle of the Bastarnae⁹⁷.

East of the Carpathians and, probably, in the south-east of Transylvania, there was a powerful kingdom that was accustomed to dominate part of the Dobrudja as well, up to the middle of the 1st century B.C. At the head of this powerful kingdom was King Oroles. If the „Dacian digression“ written by Pompeius Trogus was thinking first of all of Burebista and of the significance of his *incrementa*⁹⁸, the importance attached to Oroles must not be judged by Justin's preference for the anecdotic element⁹⁹. On the contrary, the presence of Oroles in the *Epitoma* — by the very means of an anecdotic

⁹⁵ Babeş, *Beitrag* 153: „Die Enddatum der P-L-Kultur wurde bis vor kurzem um die Mitte des letzten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts angesetzt. Nach der Entdeckung des Gräberfeldes von Dolinjany muß dieses Datum in Übereinstimmung mit den für die Spätphase der jüngeren vorrömischen Eisenzeit bzw. für die Stufe Latène D2 geltenden Zeitansätzen um einige Jahrzehnte, etwa bis ins letzte Viertel des Jahrhunderts, herabgesetzt werden“. Babeş 177 also maintains „daß der ausschlaggebende Faktor für das Verschwinden der bastarnischen Bevölkerung aus dem Raum östlich der Karpaten in dem explosionsartigen Aufstieg der Geto-Daker um die Mitte des 1. Jh. v. Chr. unter Burebista (*incrementa Dacorum*) zu suchen ist“.

⁹⁶ The presence of Hybrida's banners at Genucla can be explained through their seizing by the Getae and the Dacians who would later defeat the Bastarnae. On the other hand, it is not impossible that everything might be an argument from the pattern of *bellum iustum*, invented by Crassus, as it is obvious in Cassius Dio. This argument was intended to justify the attack against Zyraxes who had done nothing to provoke the Romans.

⁹⁷ Gostar, *La résidence* 66, n. 53 rightly stressed that: „Il n'est attesté nulle part qu'une guerre serait déchainée par Burebista contre les Bastarnes“. Cf. also Gostar, Lica, *Societatea* 22. According to R. Syme, *Caesar's Design on Dacia and Parthia* (ms. 1941–1944) 11 „the Bastarnae were his allies or subjects“. Again I express my gratitude to A. R. Birley for having the kindness of making this very interesting and provocative study available to me.

⁹⁸ Strabon VII 3, 11, stresses from the beginning Burebista's quick *incrementa* and the fighting force of his „empire“.

⁹⁹ Justin, *Praef.* 4.

dote — shows that the Dacian king was then well-known¹⁰⁰, as he was one of the leading figures in the history of the Getae and the Dacians at that time.

Pompeius tried to secure the Roman interests and frontiers not only by conquests, but also by „vertraglich gesicherte Friede“¹⁰¹, integrating even Pharnaces, Mithradates' son¹⁰², into the system which he conceived and built up.

Oroles, one of the important dynasts in the area, could certainly not be left out of the system created by Pompeius: the Dacian king had the role of protecting Roman interests to the west of the Black Sea¹⁰³. Perhaps he was also an *amicus Pompei*. Thus, one could assume that Oroles or his successor, by virtue of the earlier relations with Pompeius, helped him — with or without Burebista's agreement — against Caesar at Pharsalus¹⁰⁴.

Thus King Oroles probably initiated the legally formalized relations between Rome and the Getic and Dacian peoples.

Seminar für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik „N. Gostar“
University of Galați
Domneasca-street 47
RO-6200 Galați

Vasile Lica

¹⁰⁰ Similar is the case of Ateas, the Scythian king. See VI. Iiescu, *Cercetări Istorice* III, Iași 1972, 59 sq, with interesting methodological remarks.

¹⁰¹ Wirth, *Pompeius* 39 sq.

¹⁰² Appian, *Mithr.* 113: „Pharnaces, for delivering Italy from much trouble, he inscribed as a friend and ally of the Romans, and gave him Bosphorus as his kingdom...“.

¹⁰³ These relations would be further developed through the alliance between Pompeius and Burebista. The events of 48 B.C. cannot be understood without previous relations. Cf. Suceveanu, *Viața economică în Dobrogea romană. Sec. I-III e. n.*, Bucharest 1977, 16; Wirth, *Pompeius* 59, n. 152: „Die Gesandtschaft 48 läßt auf Beziehungen bereits vorher schließen; sie könnten auf Interessengemeinschaft zwischen Pompeius und dem durch die Pläne des Mithradates gefährdeten Burebista zurückgehen“. For the „gefährdete Burebista“, see my remarks under note 93.

¹⁰⁴ Caesar, *B. C.* III 4, 5–6, could not omit Burebista's Dacians in Pompeius' „catalogue of allies“. Could Caesar skip over Oroles, King of Κοτήνιστοι?