

STUDII ȘI
COMUNICĂRI

ETUDES ET
COMMUNICATIONS

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AT HAMANGIA III SETTLEMENT FROM CHEIA (2004-2008)

Valentina VOINEA,
George NEAGU

Archaeological research undertaken in the last decade along the Casimcea Valley pointed out the outstanding scientific potential of this microregion¹, which was signaled even from the 50's and 60's by researchers who have done stratified soundings in the grotas and caves of the carstic Central Dobrudjean Plateau.

The archaeological diggings at Hamangia settlement from Cheia – the village hearth, proved itself to be an inspired one, because, a rich and wealthy material was discovered, constructive details² were identified, complex pluridisciplinary analyses³ were made, which all completed the old, deficient type of settlement from Hamangia. As a result, we considered necessary to present the results obtained in the 2004-2008 archaeological campaigns, the new information enriching the preliminary report (VOINEA, DOBRINESCU 2002-2003; BĂLĂȘESCU, RADU, 2002-2003).

Until nowadays, a surface of approximately 585 sqm was excavated, representing the following sections and soundings S.B. (4 x 12 m) / 2001, S.C. (37 x 3 m) / 2002, S.D (2 x 16 m) / 2004, S.E. (6 x 18 m) / 2004 – 2006 (fig. 2/1), S.G. (8 x 16 m) / 2007 (fig. 2/2), S.F. (4 x 12 m) / 2008 (fig. 2/3), the soundings S.2 (1 x 20 m) și S.3 (1 x 10 m) / 2007 in the interior of the settlement, S.A. (2 x 10 m) / 2001), S.1 (1 x 10 m) / 2007 in the exterior and ST.1 (1 x 30 m), ST.2 (2 x 10 m), in the area of the tumulus situated at aprox. 100 m NW from the settlement (Fig. 1).

Stratigraphy

The impossibility of research on a larger surface⁴, as well as the scatered character of the settlements made difficult the establishing of a general statigraphy. Until nowadays, we identified most dwelling sequences in the SE and SG sections. The cronological succesion of archaeological complexes investigated in the two sections are as follows:

- in the first moment of dwelling the oven was built C.20 (-2,60 / -3,55 m; Fig. 6 - 7).
- the second sequence corresponds the dwelling L.2 (-1,20 / -1,80 m; Fig. 9/2), the holes C.11, C.12, C.13;

¹ Between 1984-1985 surface investigations in the Histrian territory were undergone along the Gura Dobrogei affluents, Grădina and Râmnic (ALEXANDRESCU *et alii*, 1986). Between 2001-2008, saving diggings were made in the late Roman settlement, when the gas pipe and the improvements of the Casian cave pond were constructed. (BĂJENARU, 2002; 2003).The systematic research from Hamangia settlement, Cheia – the hearth village, added into a vaster research theme that aims at Neo-Eneolithic from the West-pontic seashore, a project financed by The Cults and Culture Ministry (*The co-evolution of man and environment in the Black Sea basin. The impact of the climatic and geo-morphological changes over the neo-neolithic communities along the West-pontic seaside region - the segment between Mangalia and Tașaul / 2007-2010*).

² The application of the microstatified method allowed the capturing of some unburned down dwelling places.

³ Until nowadays, the Cheia settlement offers the richest faunistic lot for the Hamangia sites. The gathering of the archaeo-zoological and ichtyological material form certain archaeological contexts make possible the seasonal analysis, the identification of some detail elements related to paleoeconomy and diet of the Hamangia communities.

⁴ Most sections were made on private property, that is why, at the end of each campaign, those sections were covered.

-the third section was marked by several holes of larger dimensions C.1, C.2, C.5 (SC), C.8 (SE; Fig.10: 4-6), C.7(SD), C.9, C. 10 (SE; -0,90 /-2,25 m; Fig. 10/1-3).

- the dwelling L.1(-0,30 / -0,70 m; Fig.3/1; 4/1) and the exterior hearth C.21 (0,50 / 0,70 m) correspond to the last dwelling sequence.

Archaeological complexes

The majority of holes of larger dimensions were formed by clay extraction; their irregular outline and the fingerprints kept in negative demonstrated their forming method. (Pl. 10/4,6). Later on, the irregular clay cavities were discovered containing food remains, the filling being made of several layers of sediments with heterogenous compositions, very rich in archaeological material (C.8 – Fig./10:5). In many preliminary reports previously published, the large holes were mistakenly considered mud house settlements. Yet, the large sizes of these holes do not represent a sufficient criterion to define the living space inside the mud house. The lack of interior improvements (such as floor, hearth), the irregular outline of larger holes (D >1,50 m) - C.1, C.2, C.5, C.8, C.9, C.22, C.24 determine us to frame them in the categories of clay extraction.

Another category of smaller, circular holes (D < 1,50 m), with a „bell“ profile are situated in the vicinity of some combustion structures used for household purposes. Their filling contains ash, coal, hearth tiles. The holes C.3 (D = 0,80 m) and C.10 (D = 1,25 cm), situated inside dwelling L1, cut the first dwelling level and they are covered by the later floor repair (fig. 10/1-3). The hole C.31 (D = 1,15 cm) disturbed the exterior hearth C17 (Fig.5/2).

Out of five investigated hearths, the only preserved one appeared in section SF, at a depth of 0,50 m: the exterior hearth C.21, square-shaped (1,20 x 1,20 m), with rounded edges and a wide-mouthed chime, with no repairs, the thickness of burned tiles being of only 3-5 cm (Fig. 4/2). Other three hearths were detected in profiles:

-hearth C.4, in the Southern profile of section SC, at a depth of 0,20-0,30 m, situated inside dwelling L1; gravel was used for the improvement bed and for the level of reconstruction (2 constructive phases); L = 1,70 m.

-the hearth C.17, in the Southern profile of the SE section, at a depth of 1,75 m, cut by the holes C.8 and C.31; dimensions: 1,30 x 0,90 m (Fig. 5/1-2).

-the hearth C.25, in the Southern profile of the SE section, at a depth of 1,65 m, situated inside dwelling L2; L = 0,85 m. Also, inside dwelling L 2, at a depth of 1,50 m, (SG) we discovered a very disturbed hearth C.26.

The stove C.20 was arranged in a ditch of aprox. 1 m deep, carved in loess, detected in the north profile of the SE section (Fig. 7/1-3) and the Southern profile of the SG section (its basis reaching until - 3,60 m as opposed to the actual treading level). In the open panel in the Southern profile of SG section (Fig. 6/1-2), the remains of the stove (very disturbed), stretched on a surface of 2,30 x 1,60 sqm. In the upper side of the destruction level several fragments from the collapsed ceiling were detected.

The dwelling L1, outlined in the sections SC, SE and SG, at a depth of only 0,30 m, was very disturbed after the abandonment and its constructive details were detected only fragmentary, especially on the profiles (Fig. 4/1). As a result, on the Northern profile of the SE section and on the Southern profile of the SG section a foundation ditch was identified C.27 / US. 3127, section SG (Fig. 3/2-3) and C.29/US. 3070, section SE, destined for a partition wall, which alters our initial observation, the dwelling being partitioned and not unicellular. Fragments from the partition wall (on a length of aprox. 0,80 m) were detected in the SE section (Fig. 3/1). Also, on the profile, four remodeling of the floor were identified. Later improvements of the dwelling could only have been detected in the shape of a very disturbed hearth C.4, situated in the south side of the dwelling (SC). The archaeological inventory is rich and varied: ceramics, flint microliths, small stone axes and chisels, rings, idols, bone pearls.

The dwelling L 2, partially superposed by dwelling L 1, has a very uneven floor, and underneath the stove C.20 was discovered. The very small and sunken treading level inside the dwelling marks four successive remakings. The destruction level, under the shape of an adobe mass, occupies a surface of aprox. 60 sqm. In the abandonment level, very rich in faunistic remains, the hearth appeared at a depth of 1,50 m (US 3097).

As in the case of dwelling L 1, the walls have not been burnt, after the abandonment being gradually destroyed, which makes impossible the attempt to mark the limits of the construction. The only constructive details that have been detected on the Northern profile of SG section are : underneath the partition wall between rooms a foundation ditch was delimited

(C.30/3088). At its basis, in an alveolate area (C.16) we discovered a ritual sediment – bones coming from a young bovid together with bones from other species (Fig. 8:1-2). The investigation of the dwelling L2 provided us with even greater surprises: on the entire surface skulls and parts of skulls were discovered, coming from species such as: *Equus hydruntinus*, *Bos primigenius*, *Bos taurus*, *Cervus elaphus*, *Capreolus capreolus*, *Ovis aries*, *Capra hircus*, *Canis familiaris* (Fig. 9/1-2; BĂLĂȘESCU 2008). Just as surprising was the archaeological inventory of this layer (US. 3079, 3081, 3094, 3096): together with usual pieces such as ordinary practice vessels, microliths, flint nuclei, axes and chisels, needles and stitchers, rings, bone beads, cult pieces, some of them unique for the Hamangia culture were discovered. Among these, an idol, a Spondylus anthropomorphous amulet, with its belly area marked by an opening (Fig. 17/11) and a schematic representation of clay, its fragmentary state making us unable to identify the silhouette.

The lithic industry surprises through the typological variety and through the microlithism. In terms of percentage, the flint tools and weapons represent the largest category so far, being discovered over 2000 pieces. Most of the pieces were cut in brown-beige local flint, also called „Balkanic” flint. Rarely (under 5%), we encounter the microliths made of grey-black flint, similar to those discovered in eneolithic sites in the Varna – Beloslav lakes region.⁵ The „domestic” character of the lithic industry is suggested by the large number of nuclei and chipping splinters. The microlithic pieces obtained through indirect percussion – especially the long and thin blades (aprox. 5 mm) – point out the craftsmanship of the people in the Cheia settlement. Typologically speaking, we find all categories signaled in the other Hamangia sites: vielle arrow points, dihedral burins, blades, micro-graters, blade-graters, splinter graters, knives, geometrical microliths (Fig 12-13; HAȘOTTI, 1997, p. 34; SIRAKOV, 2002; GUROVA, 2002;). The blades used for the sickles have a strongly polished active part (Fig.13/2). Green-gray axes made of granite (brought most likely from North of Dobrudja) and chisels carefully cut from shale, gritstone and calcite (local rocks) are scarcer (Fig. 13/3-4). Stone perforated pieces are missing. Portable mills and plungers, discovered especially inside the settlements, together with carbonized cereals, complete the picture of household activities linked to the cereal growing.

The industry of hard materials, especially of animal origin was considered for a long time to be not so well developed at Hamangia populations. These objects did not stand out either through their number or through the typological variety (HAȘOTTI 1997, p. 35). The research of Cheia from the 2001-2002 campaigns had not changed this situation (VOINEA, DOBRINESCU 2002-2003, p.12). In return, in the 2004-2008 campaigns, a very rich lot, but not so varied, of bone tools, has been discovered. Their number exceeded 100, being, by far, the most representative sample for the Hamangia culture. This thing may owe also to the research method used as well as to the washing out of a large quantity of archaeological deposit.

The largest category is formed of stitchers (Fig 14/1). Morphologically speaking (after the form of the distal part), they can be categorized into several subgroups: needles with a linear longitudinal section, simple or with head and point, most of them in large sizes, with triunguiular longitudinal section. The ratio between the 2 subgroups is aprox. 5 to 1.

The length of the needles varies between 3 to 17 cm, most of them could be framed between 5-10 cm. Due to their frailty, most of them being already broken for a long time, it is impossible to establish their initial sizes. The distal part of the small pieces (3 to 6 cm in length) is sharper, thinner, with important traces of blunting from the handles in which they were fixed. Most of the points have been made from animal rib. Two pieces with their proximal side cut uneven: the distal half is thin, with the thickness like most of the stitchers from this group, while the other half remained unfinished. One may think that the thicker part could have been spared to serve as handle. Rarely, round bones, empty on the inside, have been used as stitchers, their point being made through oblique cut and sharpening.

The polishers and the spatulae, made of cow ribs and astragali of ovi-caprine, were used for polishing the vessels.

⁵ In a recent study, L. Manolakakis considered that the grey-black flint, discovered mostly in the flooded regions in the lake Varna settlements, was formed through the alteration of beige muddy flint, the light coloured core being kept in the larger pieces (MANOLAKAKIS 2008, p. 117).

From the category of intermediary pieces we can mention the handles, cut very often from bones with medullary canal (bovine, ovicaprine). A less usual piece, probably of the same category, was made of an equine phalanx through the circular perforating of the wall (Fig.14/3).

The *jewellery* made of *Dentalium*, *Spondylus* and *Cardium* shell are exquisite: necklaces, tubular pearls, an anthropomorphous amulet. The same holds good for bone rings, in the course of finishing and stylization (Fig 14/2, 4).

The ceramics

The Cheia ceramics corresponds to the classical phase Hamangia III, best represented by the so far discoveries. The vessels were mostly hand made, the large ones made by the soldering of some clay stripes, whereas the small ones by the moulding of a piece of clay. A singular category is made of objects simetrically shaped, with thin walls, which, suggests, through their quality, the existence of a speed wheel with slow rotation.

The vessels with hollow bottom are very interesting. One can notice, traces of knitting / mats, presumably coming from the drying process. The profundity of the vegetal prints, especially in the case of smaller vessels, could be explained only through a powerful pressing, the vessel being held on a knitted mat during moulding (Fig. 15/12).

In order to establish the ceramic categories two elements have been taken into consideration – the structure of the paste and the type of burning. As a result 3 groups have been identified:

- A category - homogenous paste, completely burnt;
- B category – paste with impurities, well tempered, completely burnt;
- C category – paste with a lot of impurities, insufficiently tempered and burnt, often exfoliated (VOINEA, NEAGU 2006a, p.11).

On an exhaustive analysis we have noticed that the ceramics discovered in the holes C.1, C.2 and C.3 belongs to the B category (aprox 2 thirds from each of the analised complexes). Although it was not large in number, the A category ceramics stands out through its wonderful quality. The clay was carefully prepared, well tempered, and they used sand as main degreasing substance, and sometimes well pounded fine clay. Exceptionally, mica also appears but it has not been specified if it was added during the technological process or it could have been found in the natural clay deposits. The ceramic objects belonging to the third category are fewer than the other ones.(usually under 10%) (VOINEA, NEAGU 2006a, p.30).

The stylization of the vessels was made with care, the vessels being covered in fine quality engobe, mostly of dark shades from scarlet to black with metallic shine. The ratio between the polished and the non polished vessels is favourable to the former category.

Generally speaking, the colour of the Cheia ceramics proves an uniform, good quality burning. Dark colours predominate, which suggests a closed medium for burning. The discovery of the ceramics in the unburnt complexes excludes the possibility of accidental burning. As a result, the traces of secondary burning appear frequently only on the sphere shaped vessels, covered on the exterior in slurry or incisions, used for food making.

The shapes are those used in the contemporary settlements: shapes with harmonious proportions, balanced ratio between different parts of the vessels, the preference for middle or small sizes. The most frequent open shapes are bowls, and rarely fruit dish with stem. The profiles are close to letter S, the margins being arched towards the exterior, rarely straight or arched towards the interior. The closed shapes, more varied, include bitronconic vessels (from miniature cups to large, deep bowls), tronconic ones (from glasses to vessels of 20-30 cm in height) and cylindrical vessels (especially glasses – Fig. 15/3), large vessels – pythoi – with the inferior part sphere-shaped, thin neck and the rim arched towards the exterior. This type of vessels has been discovered in the Durankulak necropolis having sometimes prosomorphous lids (*Durankulak* 2002, Teil 2, tabl. 161/3, 196/1). Several fragments of lids have also shown up in the Cheia settlement – „hood” lids (Fig. 15/8), as well as conic, simple or with knobs.

The ornament is impressive through its minuteness. The lines of dots, lines, triangles are organized harmoniously and simetrically. With simple motifs, lines, triangles, rarely with meanders, the potterer proved his artistic craftsmanship; through lines of vertical hollows he managed to amplify the gracious line of the closed vessels in „S”, with the large upper side, largely widen out at the mouth (glasses, vessels with necks) and through its radial ornament he created the illusion of rotation for circular surfaces (bowls, fruit dish, lids, salvers). Fine,

parallel or concentric folds create the impression of a painting (Fig. 16). On a ceramic fragment one can notice a human silhouette (Fig. 15/11). This is one of the few anthropomorphic representations from Durankulak necropolis (prosopomorphic lids).

The analysis of the ceramic material from Cheia, starting from typological and stratigraphical observations, points out its uniformity. Although the settlement has at least four dwelling sequences, we cannot notice variations in the technology of vessel making or in their shape or ornament.

Varia. The clay weights used for the weaving looms have a longitudinal ditch just on the gripping opening, which is an unusual form until nowadays in the Hamangia culture (Fig. 14/5). The miniature vessels like glasses and long-necked vessels, are associated with the ritual practices, similar pieces being discovered in necropoles (Fig. 15/1-2).

Plastics. During archaeological research from Cheia settlement between 2004-2008, a large number of anthropomorphic figures have been discovered. The minimum number of figures exceeds 30, which can be added to those discovered between 2001-2002, and they offer a total number of 40, representing the richest lot offered by a Hamangia settlement. If some of the figures can be seen as classical ones, as defined by D. Berciu (BERCIU 1960) and nuanced by P. Haşotti (HAŞOTTI 1986), others are exquisite representations, unique even, in the general picture of those communities. Those objects have been found not only in the inside but also in the exterior of the settlement complexes – holes, dwellings.

Most figures have been made of clay, with the exception of *Spondylus* amulet. The paste differs from one figure to the other, there were figures made of dense, well tempered clay, whereas in the case of others a porous, non-homogenous, crumbly paste has been used. As degreasing substance fine clay and sand had been used. In the case of fragmentary pieces, technological details have been noticed – the moulding has been made through the successive adding of clay layers. This is a very interesting aspect from a certain point of view: the origin of the plastic Hamangia culture has several times been traced in the Hacilar tradition. If shape had been one of the arguments in favour of this hypothesis, which is very unlikely, as long as representations similar to Hamangian canons are spread on large areas during the Neolithic period, the moulding of the pieces is totally different, pleading thus in favour of the existence of different roots. The Hacilar figures were made of one sculpted piece of clay (MUSCARELLA 1971, p. 77-78).

The surfaces of most of the pieces has been treated with care, being covered with black or dark brown, polished slips. With few exceptions, the burning process was well made, uniform, contrasting with those figures discovered in necropoles, that were so broken that it made their reconstruction impossible.

Although most figures fall into the three classical categories of the Hamangia plastics, standing, sitting, and with realistic moulded head, the existence of canons is far from hindering the creativity of old artists. New discoveries from Cheia enrich the already known artistic repertory. A 4 cm figure stands out, moulded of crumbly paste, its surface being neglectfully treated. The burning does not seem to be of a good quality. We can only assume what it represents. It may be the image of a character dressed in a long dress and underneath it we can vaguely see its legs. It looks as if it is wearing a mask, and its posture might suggest that of a person taking part in a ceremony. Yet, these are only suppositions.

A figure with *bell-dress* is different (Fig. 17/12), unique so far in the Hamangia area. The way in which it was made brings it nearer to the Boian culture; it could have been imported, but a precise analogy has not been found yet.

Another important piece is an anthropomorphic amulet made of *Spondylus gaederopus* shell (Fig. 17/11). Similar pieces have been discovered in the Durankulak necropolis (VAJSOV, 2002, p. 261 – 262, Abb.255; Durankulak 2002, Teil 2, tabl 105/17).

If we cannot draw relevant conclusions taking into account the discovery context, more elements come to illustrate special practices in which those figures were used.

One first clue is illustrated by the crumbly state in which they can be found nowadays. The breaking of the head, hands and legs is an unlikely hypothesis. Traces of hittings are visible on a large number of them and the favourite area seems to be the stomach. Furthermore, halves of torso have been found, which might be the result of strong, intentional hitting.

The second element that comes to illustrate the using of figures in some special practices

is the discovery of lower halves of some figures, which presented in the genital area evident traces of red ochre.

Conclusions

The results of the researches in the Cheia settlements allow us to complete with new data the type of Hamangia habitat. Situated on the south side of the plateau near the Casimcea river, the settlement has been protected by strong winds and, at the same time, it has had a good visibility, controlling the entrance in the Dobrudja gorge. The wealth of the natural riches allowed the Hamangia communities from here to live for a long time, a proof to sustain this idea are the four stratigraphic sequences. The stratigraphic differences between the sequences suggest the scattered character of the settlement and the successive recurrence of the communities, after short periods of abandonments, the explored regions for clay being later on inhabited. The archaeozoological analyses confirm the field observations: the pastoral character of the economy is showed by the high percentage of domestical animals, especially bovine and ovicaprine. The meat requirements was completed with hunted animals, especially large ones. (equines and cervids).

Apart from the economic level, the animals also played an important role in the religious life of the Hamangia communities. The preference for animal offerings (especially skull parts) exceeds the funeral domain (Cernavoda and Durankulak necropoles), the ritual deposit discovered under the wall of dwelling L2 being related to the foundation rituals.

The mobility of the Hamangia communities along the Casimcea valley – a passage way between the central Dobrudjean karstic zone and the west-pontic zone – is proven by the presence, in the Cheia settlement, of fish and marine mollusks as well as that of grey-black flint, specific for Varna region. The intercultural exchanges Hamangia – Boian, mentioned from the 60's due to the soundings in the La Izvor and La Baba caves, have been confirmed by the discovery, in the Cheia settlement, of some Boian- Vidra imports: ceramic fragments (Fig. 15/13) and most probably, a figure with a „bell” dress (Fig 17/12); (VOINEA, NEAGU 2006b; CĂRPUȘ C., CĂRPUȘ L., 2006; 2007).

The absolute date for a sample of Bos bone (US 3010) obtained at the Belfast University laboratory UB-7276 / 6020 ± 43 BP; (1 sigma) cal BC 4977 – 4975; (2 sigma) cal BC 5020 - 4797⁶ relates to the cronology of the Hamangia III phase (5000 – 4700 BC).

The expanding of the archaeological research in the caves and shelters of the Casimcea Valley region will allow, in the future, a better understanding of the living strategies in close connection to the area natural resources. Thus, the living dynamics of the Hamangia communities will be looked upon through the perspective of co-evolution man-environment, of the changes of the microrelief (the Casimcea flow, the configuration of the Tașaul lake, the marine transgression), all these traits could be indirectly found in the type of habitat and economy.

⁶ The date was obtained in a project ECONET, coordinated by Anne TRESSET – CNRS, and Adrian Bălășescu - MNIR.

**PRELIMINARY REPORT FROM THE NEW EXCAVATION
IN BABA CAVE, GRĂDINA VILLAGE,
CONSTANȚA COUNTY**

**Bartłomiej Szymon SZMONIEWSKI (Polonia),
Răzvan PETCU**

In July 2008 the Baba Cave also known as “La pământul galben” (see BORONEANȚ 2000, p. 52) was excavated (Fig. 1-3).

The Baba Cave is, in reality, a large rock shelter, 13 meters long, corridor – shaped, ending in a round wall. The width of the cave oscillates between 1,20 to 2,65 meters. Its entrance (Fig. 3), narrow, low and east facing, is in the calcareous Cheile Dobrogei hills, about 100 meters above sea level, near the valley of Cheia River (Valea Seacă) which is a tributary of the Casimcea River. This zone is very rich in caves and rock shelters (see BORONEANȚ 2000, p. 52-53, PĂUNESCU 1999).

Only one excavation in the Baba Cave, occasioned by the Paleolithic research in Dobruja was realised in 1957 by Alexandru Păunescu and Nicolae Harțuchi (NICOLAESCU-PLOPȘOR, PĂUNESCU, HARTŪCHI, 1959, p. 48). Unfortunately, the authors had only written very short reports without a plan of the cave and not detailing the place where the archaeological trench was located. According to Păunescu’s and Harțuchi’s report, there were three levels with fireplaces found in the cave. Two of them were connected with the Gumelnița Culture and the other had later chronological position. Pottery dating to the Roman and the medieval period was also found. In further papers, written by N. Harțuchi (1973, p. 248 and 1976, p. 18) the chronology of the levels from the Baba Cave has been precised. The author dated the levels to the Gumelnița I C – II A phases and also provided information about the fragments of pottery ornamented with the cord specific to Cernavoda I, and about the level from the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (HARTŪCHI 1976, p. 18, Fig. 5). The profile published in 1976 of the archeological trench made in the Baba Cave in 1957 did not, however, mark in the plane of the cave and so it is very difficult to verify (see HARTŪCHI 1976, Fig. 5).

The excavation in 2008 has verified the oldest data and has also yielded new and unexpected results. In the largest part of the cave there was lodged a rectangular trench with dimensions of: 2,80 x 1,60 meters. In the lower part of the trench (0,80 meters) an edge of the excavation from 1957 was found (Fig. 4). After the finish of the rectangular trench, a small part of the cave in the northern area was excavated. The trench was documented with three cross sections (profiles), drawings and photos. Observations at levels between 10-15 cm have also been documented with plans, color drawings of cross-sections and photos. Stone, iron and bronze artifacts were localized in the distinguished layers. Pottery, animal and human bones as well as charcoal were separately documented from different fireplaces. The earth from the fireplaces and grave pit was sieved.

The stratigraphy of the excavated part of the cave is as follows (see profile A-A` - Fig. 5): the bedrock was about 1,70 meters below point “0” (ground surface) located in the upper part of the trench; in the gaps between the big stones from (1,70 – 1,45 m) - culturally sterile deposits of the yellow loess with small stones and fossils; this layer was overlain by the next one, 0,55 – 0,60 m (1,45 – 0,90/0,85 meters) thick, rich in Neolithic micro levels and the fireplace cultural levels (Fig.5); in the following level, 0,10 – 0,15 m. (0,90/0,85 – 0,80/0,70 meter) thick, the different size stones, with pottery and animal bones between them, were found (Bronze Age, Hallstatt); the next level (0,80/0,70 – 0,30 meters) which is partly destroyed by the medieval or modern pits, had a fireplace with Roman pottery (0,60 m) and there was evidence of Romano-Byzantine pottery (0,45 m); the upper levels close to ground surface were composed of thin micro-levels 0,45 m (0,45 – 0 m) thick which can be dated to late medieval and modern times.

The Neolithic level with its fireplaces was very rich in pottery. The chronological stages are as follow: Hamangia culture pottery, Gumelnița culture pottery and in the same level Cernavoda pottery and Cucuteni C. Stone artifacts; an axe (Fig. 7/1), a basalt mallet with ochre traces (Fig. 7/2), a longitudinal pendant (Fig. 7/3) and stone tools such as retouched blades have been found. The presence of human hand bones was observed as well animal bones and a

small amount of shells. In the upper part of this Neolithic level, close to the level with stones, one piece of pottery with cord was found. The Neolithic materials correspond with the finds from "La Izvor" Cave and the site located in Cheia village (Hartuchi 1976, p. 17, Fig. 8/5-7; VOINEA, DOBRINESCU, 2002-2003, p. 9-22; VOINEA, DOBRINESCU, NEAGU, BĂLĂȘESCU, RADU, 2006-2007, p. 10-11). Hamangia pottery (with black engobe and ornamented with vertical equal rows of dots) can be dated to III phase of the Hamangia Culture (Fig. 8/1, VOINEA, NEAGU, 2006, 12-13). Gumelnița pottery forms are analogical to the following types: open forms: - I. 2 (dishes), closed forms - II. 15 (bowls) II. 16 (bi-tronconical vessels with an inward rim) and 31 (lids) according to Valentina Voinea's typology, and can be dated to Gumelnița A1 and A2 (Fig. 8/2-5; VOINEA 2005, p. 37-39, see tables with pottery forms).

In the stone level the animal bones, Bronze age and Hallstatt pottery were found. The fragments of the thick hand made pottery with the plastic strip are especially interesting. An analogical vessel – *phytos* – has been found in close vicinity to Baba Cave in Grădina (IRIMIA, BARDAC 1995-1996, p. 13, Fig. 1, Fig. 3/1). According to the authors this vessel can be connected with the Sabatinovka culture and dated to the late and middle Bronze Age (IRIMIA, BARDAC, 1995-1996, p. 14, 20-21). In "La Izvor" Cave and in the vicinity of Cheile Dobrogei, other materials dated to the Late Bronze Age and Hallstatt have been found (HARTUȚHI 1976, 17; ALEXANDRESCU *et alii*, 1986, 244, Fig. 6; IRIMIA 2003, 37-38, Fig. 4).

It was partly in this level, in the upper part of the Northern zone of the cave that an inhumation grave was unearthed (Fig. 4.9). The skeleton, partly preserved - no legs from the knees down - was located from 50 cm to 80 cm below the ground level. Typical nomadic grave goods were found in the grave pit, listed as follows: one iron stirrup, bone elements from a bow, two bronze buckles, steels (a device for kindling fire), iron, simple pieces of belts, knives and a partly preserved horse bit. Also found in the grave was a partly preserved saber. The skull was deformed. Based on preliminary analysis of the metal, the finds can be connected with early medieval nomadic period.

The upper levels dated to the Roman and Romano-Byzantine time had two fireplaces which have been partly destroyed by younger pits. In these pits Bronze Age, Hallstatt, Hellenistic and Romano-Byzantine pottery was observed. In the microregion Cheia, traces of intensive Roman, Romano-Byzantine and Early Middle Age settlements were observed (HARTUȚHI 1976, 17, ALEXANDRESCU *et alii*, 1986, 244-247, Fig. 4).

The 2008 campaign has brought forward new data about Neolithic cultural differentials of the presented zones. It is confirmation of the presence of the Cernavoda pottery and Cucuteni C (Fig. 8/6) – unknown before in the analysed zone. People who used the shape in style Cucuteni C are related to communities settled in the northern periphery of Cucuteni-Tripolye and moved south under the pressing of another population (DODD- OPRÎTESCU, 1980, 554). The closest finds are known from the excavation realized by dr. Valentina Voinea on the "La Ostrov" Island on Tașaul Lake (MARINESCU-BÎLCU *et alii*, 2000-2001).

The most surprising discovery was, however, the nomadic grave. This is the first inhumation grave found in a cave in Dobruđa which can be dated to the Early Medieval period (compare SPINEI 1999, Fig. 33). It is the first archeological find of a nomadic grave in the aforementioned territory. A detailed analysis of the grave is in preparation.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE MAMMALS MANAGEMENT AT CHEIA (HAMANGIA CULTURE)

Adrian BĂLĂȘESCU

Abstract

The Cheia Eneolithic settlement has provided over the last years an impressive fauna quantity, which makes this site to have presently the largest faunistic sample for the Hamangia culture. The present article can be looked upon as a preliminary study which will point out the analysis of one single stratigraphical unity (US), that is US 3094, that belongs to the dwelling 2 (L2).

The archaeozoological study led to the identification of 12 wild species: the Pleistocene wild donkey (*Equus hydruntinus*), the aurochs (*Bos primigenius*), the red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), the roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*), the wild pig (*Sus scrofa*), the wolf (*Canis lupus*), the fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), the wild cat (*Felis silvestris*), the badger (*Meles meles*), the hare (*Lepus europaeus*), the beaver (*Castor fiber*) and the hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*) (Table 1), apart from the domestic, classical species belonging to the Romanian Neolithic: the domestic cattle (*Bos taurus*), the sheep (*Ovis aries*), the goat (*Capra hircus*), the dog (*Canis familiaris*).

The ratio between the domestic and the wild mammals is 86,2% to 13,8% which would suggest that animal breeding played an important role for the Cheia Eneolithic community.

Within the activity of animal breeding, the bovine operation seems to play a prevailing role, a thing proven by the large number of remains that was discovered (48%). This was followed by ovicaprine remains which reaches 38%. Within the small horned animals, the most seem to be the sheep remains which are in a ratio of 3,6 to 1 as opposed to the goat ones. Bovine firstly and then ovicaprine are exploited especially for their meat production. Regarding the breeding of these animals for the milk production, indications are more present (relevant) in the case of bovine (Figure 1) and more discrete in the case of ovicaprines (Figure 2). The present study confirms the absence of pig, which in the paleoeconomy of the community was, at that moment, unknown or not so much exploited.

Although the hunting represents 13,8%, it is well certified as a number of species, which would suggest that this activity is a secondary supplementary one and also one of completion for meat nourishment. The largest importance in this sample has the medium and large sized species, such as: the hydruntinum (2,99%), the red deer (2,75%), the wild pig (1,98%), the aurochs (1,70%) and to this category we can also add a series of smaller sized species such as the fox (2,26) well known for its anthropophily and the hare (1,21%).

We hope that in the future our archaeozoological analysis could be enriched with new samples which would allow a detailed characterization of animal paleoeconomy of the Hamangia community of Cheia.

**THE STUDY OF THE FAUNISTIC MATERIAL (MOLLUSKS, FISH,
TURTOISES, BIRDS) TAKEN FROM III LEVEL OF HAMANGIA
FROM CHEIA (CONSTANȚA COUNTY).**

Valentin RADU

Abstract

The present study continues the research regarding the fauna discovered in the Hamangia III cultural level from Cheia (Constanța county).

The analysed material comes from archaeological structures that connected with the 2 dwellings discovered at Cheia: L1 and L2.

A number of 1867 faunistic remains belonging to the Mollusca (mollusks), Pisces (fish), Chelonia (turtles) and Aves (birds) taxonomy have been studied. Out of these remains the fish ones are most numerous (around 60% from NR) followed by those of birds (26%). The species identified in this study can be framed into the faunistic spectrum of the Dobrodjea region.

The exploitation of the resources in the neighbourhood of the site by the inhabitants of the Cheia settlement guarantees supplementary sources of protein during the summer period coming from different animals such as fish, mollusks and cormorant. The analysis of the faunistic material emphasizes the exchange of products, especially of fish, with the seaside inhabitants around the Tașaul lake.

ENEOLITHIC CERAMIC TABLETS (ALTARS) FROM BULGARIA

Dimitar CHERNAKOV (Bulgaria)

Whenever a research on various prehistoric sites has been carried – findings of non-utility comprise a considerably large share of the overall objects discovered. Such objects are mostly made of ceramics and represent cult tables, chairs, stamps, etc. Among the findings generally different in terms of form and purpose one small group of objects does attract attention and is comparatively unexplored. The group of objects mentioned comprises ceramic tablets of polygonal or oval shape, with extended bottom part, interpreted by some explorers as „altars”, due to their resemblance of the pediment building facade (TODOROVA 1983, 91). Up to now there is no typology published regarding such objects except for several preliminary studies (TAKOROVA 2006). Separate publications have been developed concerning the ornamentation and purpose of such objects. The present study aims at developing certain taxonomy of the publications regarding the eneolithic ceramic tablets from Bulgaria.

The different types have been defined based on their general form whereas for the sub-types the definition is made based on the presence or absence of additional components. The typology suggested is based on the principles of the abovementioned typology pattern (TAKOROVA 2006, 28 - 30).

The tablets have been crafted from a piece of clay shaped to the desired form whereas ornamentation has been added via different ornamentation techniques. The tentacle-type details at the upper part of the tablets have been formed and shaped through pinching. The basis of the tablets is slightly broadened which is achieved by taking away clay from the middle part of the tile and adding it to the bottom part of the tile. This leads to tablets being less thick at their upper end. The tablets have been baked under different conditions, most commonly – in a non homogenous environment.

The ceramic tablets included feature objects from the eneolithic layers of archeological sites in Bulgaria – 30 objects in total. Most of them explored (12 objects), they were discovered during the excavations of Ruse tell (40% of all objects).

Formal typology

Type 1. Includes tablets of pentagonal form

- 1.1. These are tablets of pentagonal forms with no additional components. (Fig. 1).

The pentagonal tablets comprise 6 objects (20% from all) discovered at Deneva tell, Salmanovo village¹ (Fig. 1/6) (POPOV 1908, 667), Kodjadermen tell - 2 objects (Fig. 1/2,3), (POPOV 1909, 561, Pl. XXII - Fig. 10; Pl. XV, Fig. 9) and Sultan tell (Fig. 1/4), (MIKOV 1922-1925, 46, Pl. 83). The height/length proportions of the well-preserved or restorable objects is 1:1,2 and 1:1,3. Most of the objects are richly ornamented with paint, carved and inlaid ornamentation except for the tablets from Kodjadermen tell. The tablets from Kodjadermen feature a rough surface, barely definable inlaid ornamentation on one of them and admixtures in the clay dough. The object from Deneva tell features miniature size of 4 cm in length and 3,1 cm and differs from the other objects in the sub-type and is unique for the whole group. The piece is decorated with red and black paints organized in parallel vertical bands. The other two objects are discovered in Ovcharovo tell, 5th level (Fig. 1/1), (TODOROVA 1983, Pl. 90, 13) whereas there is an object discovered at the Gudjova Tell, Madrets village, dated in Late Eneolithic (Fig. 1/5), (Leshtakov *et alii* 2001, fig. 23 e). The object discovered at Gudjova tell features inlaid ornament as a means to add anthropomorphous features to the object.

- 1.2. Tablets of pentagonal shape with additional components (Fig. 2; Fig. 3).

1.2.1 These are the objects featuring bud-like growths in their upper end edges (Fig. 2/1-4). There are 4 objects of this kind (13,3%) whereas two of them are discovered at Ruse tell, late eneolithic horizons (GEORGIEV, ANGELOV 1952, 161, Pl. 146; Popov 2002, 553 Pl. 13:3) (Fig. 2/1,2). The height/length proportion is 1:1,15-1,2. The ornamentation features inlaid white and red ochre. An object that can be classified to this type of altars has been discovered at Drama -

¹ Thanks to my colleague Svetlana Venelinova for the assistance for the publication of the find.

Merdjumeikia tell (Fig. 2/3) and in particular in the Karanovo V level (LICHARDUS *et alii* 2001, Pl. 22, 1), another object that belongs to the sub-type is a tablet discovered at Okol-Glava tell, Gniljane village, Sofia district (PETROV 1933, 136-137; PETROV 1950, 161, Pl. 95; Fig. 23, 2), (Fig. 2/4).

1.2.2 These are tablets of prolonged and evenly cut central upper edge. Only one object under this pattern is present and is discovered at Ruse tell (POPOV 2002, Pl. 13:1), (Fig. 2 5) featuring height equal to the length and is richly decorated with inlaid ornamentation. This variant is 3 % of all objects.

1.2.3 Tablets featuring bud-like growths at their upper edges – represented by objects discovered at Ruse tell, late eneolithic horizons (Fig. 3/1), (GEORGIEV, ANGELOV 1952, 162, Pl. 147), Sultan tell (Fig. 3/2), (MIKOV 1922-1925, 46, Pl. 83) and Kurttepe tell, (DETEV 1965, 71, Pl. 12, 2), (Fig. 3/3). The tablets are decorated with inlaid ornamentation. This variant is 10% of all objects.

The two fragments featuring (6,6%) central upper edges are discovered at Ruse tell (POPOV 2002, 553, Pl. 13 : 2; 554, Pl. 14 : 1), (Fig. 3/4,5) and can not be assigned to any of the two subtypes due to their preservation condition.

Type 2. Ceramic tablets of quadrangular form

▪ 2.1 These objects have no additional components. The category is represented by 3 objects (10%): from Ovcharovo tell – a part from a „Cult scene“ (TODOROVA *et alii* 1983, Pl. 89: 3), (Fig. 4/2), from the prehistoric settlement at Telish village, Redutite area (GERGOV 1992, 29, Pl. 3), (Fig. 6/2), as well as an object similar in its features to the abovementioned, discovered at Ruse tell, XIII horizon, Late Eneolithic (CHERNAKOV 2006, 22), (Fig. 4/1). The height/maximum length is 1:1,5. The object from Telish is the largest from all the rest discovered. Its dimensions are 1,28 m width, 0,60 m height and 0,12 m thickness. The decoration features red ochre ornaments. The object was discovered in a house, II horizon, dated in Late Eneolithic.

2.1.1 The subclass includes an object from Ovcharovo tell (Fig. 4/3) and is also a part from the „Cult scene“ (TODOROVA *et alii* 1983, Pl. 89:1). The upper end is round whereas a decoration of red paint is laid on the front and back side of the tile. This variant is 3% of all objects.

2.1.2 The subclass includes an object from Vaksevo (Fig. 6/1). The upper end is round, the two upper edges on each other sides are parallel of the base. The tablet is fragmented and decorated with a couple of arc fluting filled with white paint (ČEOHADJIEV 2001, 168, 177, Fig. 95). This variant is 3% of all objects.

▪ 2.2. Objects featuring additional components.

2.2.1 This particular subclass relates to objects with two growths pinched in their upper end and a third one pinched from the center of the upper edge. The three objects discovered are from Kodjadermen tell (POPOV 1916-1918, 148, Pl. 159) (Fig. 4/5), Ovcharovo tell (Fig. 4/4), (TODOROVA *et alii* 1983, Pl. 89:2) – part of the „cult scene“, and a fragment of a similar object found in Kurttepe tell at Ruen village (DETEV 1965, 71, Pl. 12:1), (Fig. 4/6). The height/length proportions are respectively 1:1,1 and 1:1,5. The tablet from Kodjadermen has no decoration; the one from Ovcharovo is ornamented with red ochre and the last one features inlaid decoration. This variant is 10% of all objects.

2.2.2 The subclass features one object discovered at Ruse tell (GEORGIEV, ANGELOV 1952, 163, Pl. 148:3), (Fig. 4/7) with two growths pinched from the upper edges. The height/length proportion is 1:0,9 – it is the only object with length smaller than its height. This variant is 3% of all objects.

Type 3. These are tablets of round, semicircular shape and even base end.

▪ 3.1 Objects featuring no additional components.

There are two objects from Ruse tell, late eneolithic horizons (GEORGIEV, ANGELOV 1952, 163, Pl. 148: 1, 4), (Fig. 5/1, 2). Their height/maximum length proportion is 1:1,3. The objects are ornamented with inlaid decoration. The common feature is a spiral element on the one side and a combination of vertical lines on the other. This variant is 6,6% of all objects.

▪ 3.2 Objects with additional components.

This group includes one tablet from Ruse, 15th construction level. There are growths pinched in the upper ends. There are four small legs pinched from the bottom, whereas the bottom itself is even and slightly thickened. The object is ornamented on both sides by inlaid

spiral motives. (POPOV 2002, 533. Taf. 13 : 4), (Fig. 5/3). This variant is 3% of all objects.

Type 4. Unclassified. The subclass includes fragmented ceramic tablets which based on their preserved parts cannot be related to any of the three classes mentioned above. This is the reason why these objects are classified under a different object type. This variant is 6,6% of all objects.

The category includes two fragments of ceramic tablets with lower end parts. The objects are discovered at Podgoritza tell (TAKOROVA 2006, cat. № 105, Fig. 20, 5) and Ruse tell (GEORGIEV, ANGELOV 1952, 163, Pl. 148:2), (Fig. 5/4). The objects feature inlaid decoration.

Ornamental motives on the eneolithic ceramic tablets.

1. Vertical fields – these are filled with sidelong, horizontal or crossed cuts and lines. In one case the lines form V shaped motives. The technique features carving and in other case painting. This particular model is typical for tablets type 1.

2. Spiral – This ornamentation pattern is related to tablets type 1 and 3. The pattern is usually the only decoration for the tile and in only one case it is combined with other ornamentation motives. The ornamentation is made through carving and with one of the tablets the model is placed on both sides of the tile.

3. Spiral - meander – this is the model related to objects type 2. The pattern is placed on the tablets in combination with other motives through carving.

4. Concentric circles – four cases as a central motive. It is always placed in combination with other motives. The technique features painting with red paint. The model features only on the tablets from the so called „Ovcharovo” cult scene.

5. Circles – the model is present solely on one tile (type 1) and features on other tablets in complex combination of multiple motifs.

6. Semicircles – this pattern features only on the tile from Gudjova Mogila, type 1, whereas the pattern is used to add anthropomorphic features (eyes) to the object. The pattern is laid through carving.

7. Concentric bows– it is a single case related to the tile discovered at Sultan settlement tell. The tile is type 1 and the model is laid through carving. Due to the fragmented matter of the finding it can not be ultimately defined whether the model is used solely or in combination with other motives.

8. Angular model – the motif features in 7 cases. The pattern is always laid in combination with other motifs. The motif is typical for all tablets from the Ovcharovo cult scene. The technique of ornamenting includes painting with red painting or carving.

9. Complex patterns – 7 cases featuring inlaid and painted motifs. It is the typical pattern for objects classified type 1 and 2.

10. Vertical lines, crossed with sidelong diaper-pattern lines found in 4 cases whereas the lines are carved. In one case - a tile type 2 from Ruse the motif is present on both sides of the tile. The pattern does not feature in combination with other motifs.

11. A dot in the centre of the ornamental composition is a motif featuring in 3 cases of the tablets from the Ovcharovo cult scene. The pattern is laid via painting with red paint.

12. Vertical and sidelong lines are a motif featuring in two cases type 1 and 2 respectively. It is a stand alone motif placed via carving.

13. Vertical and horizontal lines forming a net of small quadrants is a motif featuring in one case (type 1 object from Ruse tell) placed via carving.

There are repetitive combinations on both sides of the ceramic tablets: two type 3 objects from Ruse settlement tell featuring spiral on one side and fields of vertical cuts on the other. Two type 4 objects from Podgoritza and type 2 from Ruse feature spiral and vertical lines crossed by sidelong lines on the other.

Based on the objects explored in this particular study there is no dependency between the form and the ornamentation motifs.

Quite often the motifs on the objects are interpreted as sign compositions (NIKOLOV 1991, 97 – 102; RADUNCEVA 2003, 284; CHERNAKOV 2003, 217 - 219). Other scientists define the findings as decoration (DETEV 1965, 65) or classify them as objects of unidentified purpose (GEORGIEV, ANGELOV 1952, 59). Such objects are typical for the last levels of the so far explored eneolithic settlements. Similar objects have been discovered in much earlier neolithic exploration sites (KÎNCEVA – RUSEVA 2000, 61; ILCEVA 2002, 68).

Various research and classification systems have been developed in regard to the semantics and meaning of certain purposely repeated ornaments on prehistoric findings. S. Winn collected samples mostly from the area of Vinča whereas his exploration and conclusions have been documented and published. (WINN 1973; WINN 1981). M. Gimbutas who prepared one of the first catalogues of „sacred symbols“ of various prehistoric ages and regions, formulates her own concept regarding symbolic readings (GIMBUTAS 1991). Similar issues have been also explored by I. Paul (PAUL 1990), G. Lazarovici (LAZAROVICI 2000), N. Vlassa (VLASSA 1976), J. Makkay (MAKKAY 1969, MAKKAY 1984).

H. Todorova supports the thesis that the concentric circles, the spiral and the spiral - meander reflect general concepts related to the cosmogony of the prehistoric people. The continuity of the spiral - meander maybe linked to the perceptions of cyclic recurrence of the main events in agriculture and nature in general (TODOROVA 1986, 210).

In one of his studies V. Nikolov interprets the spiral - meander ornament on pottery discovered in the early neolithic settlement near the town of Rakitovo as „The garland of fertility“, closely related to the movement of the sun. The author presents the hypothesis that the ornament is actually a graphical interpretation of the annual path of the sun (NIKOLOV 1987, 19-20). It should be accentuated on the fact that the spiral - meander is widely used as an ornamental motif during the neolithic and especially during the eneolithic.

Russian explorer B. Rybakov states his own interpretation of some ornamental motifs typical for the findings of various prehistoric ages. In his view the vertical and sidelong lines symbolize the rain. Such motifs are found on the side of the ceramic tablets object of the present study (Fig. 4/1). Rybakov interprets the spiral as a symbol of the time flow (RĪBAKOV 1965, 38 – 44).

V. Gergov explains the geometrical pattern of ornamenting as an evidence of a definite rule present in prehistoric art and life. The magical force encoded in the painting could have been defined by certain priests leading and practicing a religious cult. (GERGOV 1992, 30).

The ornamentation on the tablets that is similar to the one from the group of the so called cult objects and the fact that objects have been discovered in the same area and context (Ovcharovo cult scene) are evidence that these objects were somehow connected to the ancient cults. In case we support these hypotheses we should point out that the ornamental compositions on the ceramic tablets are in fact symbols related to the concept of fertility. The objects were most probably used in ancient cult rituals dedicated to Mother - Goddess (CHERNAKOV 2006, 22).

Based on the archeological data available such findings can be related to the Early Eneolithic. In the end of the said age their diffusion has undergone popularization. The largest number of such objects is concentrated on the territory of North Bulgaria (83,4%). Only 5 object are discovered in South Bulgaria (16,6%), (Fig. 7).

**SCEPTRES EN PIERRE INEDITS DU DEPARTEMENT DE CONSTANTZA
ET QUELQUES REMARQUES CONCERNANT LES LIAISONS ENTRE LA ZONE
OUEST-PONTIQUE ET L'ESPACE EGEEN
A L'EPOQUE DU BRONZE TARDIF**

Mihai IRIMIA

Résumé

L'auteur présente quatre sceptres en pierre inédits du Bronze tardif.

1. LANURILE (comm. de Mereni).

Sceptre fragmentaire avec le corps approximativement tronconique, cassé du temps jadis à ses deux extrémités. Au niveau de la partie supérieure, on observe un petit évasement qui pourrait suggérer le bout de la pièce en tant qu'une tête épaisse ou un bouton. Toujours sur la partie supérieure, il y a quatre boutons disposés en forme de croix. La surface du sceptre était parfaitement ciselée par polissage.

2. PANTELIMONUL DE SUS – „Moară” (comm. de Pantelimon).

Sceptre ayant la nuque en forme de lentille bombée, arrondie, le cou à profil concave, l'épaule épaisse et le corps brusquement élargi vers le pic, tout en suggérant un bec d'oiseau (vautour? aigle?) stylisé.

3. RASOVA – „Malul Roșu” (comm. de Rasova).

Sceptre fragmentaire, cassé du temps jadis à ses deux extrémités; le corps en est quasi cylindrique, avec un petit évasement vers la partie inférieure. La nuque du sceptre, ayant la forme d'une lentille bombée ou de champignon, habituelle pour de tels type de pièces, manque depuis très longtemps. La surface en est parfaitement ciselée par polissage.

4. SATU NOU – „Valea lui Voïcu” (comm. d'Oltina).

Sceptre fragmentaire, cassé du temps jadis, ayant, selon toutes les probabilités, ou cylindrique. La nuque, en forme de bulbe semiglobulaire (tel un champignon), en est séparée du corps proprement – dit de la pièce. La surface en est parfaitement ciselée par polissage.

*

* * *

Pour l'encadrement du point de vue typologique des sceptres de Lanurile, Rasova – „Malul Roșu” et Satu Nou – „Valea lui Voïcu”, l'auteur se sert de la typologie élaborée par BOROFFKA-SAVA 1998. Conformément à celle-ci, le sceptre de Lanurile appartient au type I, sans pouvoir à en établir aussi la variante (I a ou bien I b). L'état fragmentaire des sceptres de Rasova et Satu Nou rend difficile leur encadrement typologique. Ils semblent appartenir au type II ou III. Quant à l'exemplaire de Satu Nou, les analogies les plus claires se rapportent aux sceptres découverts à Elhovo – „Lozjata” et Haskovo (SE de la Bulgarie), qui appartiennent au type III. Les types I et II se retrouvent dans la zone ouest de la grande aire de dispersion des sceptres en pierre. On rencontre le type III dans toute l'aire de dispersion des sceptres, avec une plus grande concentration dans la zone NO de la Mer Noire et dans l'Asie Centrale, situation qui est due au stade des recherches et de la publication de ces sceptres.

Les sceptres des types mentionnés se sont répandus dans plusieurs cultures du Bronze moyen et tardif ainsi qu'au début de l'époque du Fer. Sur le territoire de la Roumanie, quand on a pu établir le contexte de leur découverte, on a constaté qu'ils avaient apparu dans les cultures Monteoru (la période tardive), Noua et Coslogeni.

Les sceptres de Rasova et Satu Nou peuvent être attribués sans réserve à la culture Coslogeni, étant donné que, dans les deux sites, on a découvert, parmi d'autres, des matériels spécifiques à la culture mentionnée. Le sceptre de Lanurile appartient, très probablement, toujours à la culture Coslogeni, bien qu'il n'y ait, jusqu'à présent, aucune information concernant le lieu et le contexte de cette découverte.

L'auteur se réfère aussi, brièvement, aux découvertes de sceptres du même type du NE et du SE de la Bulgarie, considérés par la plupart des chercheurs, des témoignages de la pénétration des influences nord – et ouest – pontiques dans ces zones, notamment de l'aire du complexe culturel Sabatinovka – Noua - Coslogeni. On a remarqué la présence de certaines

découvertes du type Coslogeni dans de nombreux sites du NE de la Bulgarie, qui reflètent les rapports existants entre cette région et le complexe culturel mentionné.

Le sceptre de Pantelimonul de Sus représente une unicité. Les pièces rapprochées en quelque sorte comme forme, en pierre ou en bronze, sont rares et répandues sur une vaste aire. L'auteur mentionne un exemplaire bien semblable découvert dans l'épave d'Uluburun (Turquie).

Certains spécialistes considèrent que ce sceptre est originaire de l'Europe de SE, éventuellement de la Péninsule Balkanique, représentant une preuve des relations entre les régions nord-balkaniques et le monde égéen/est-méditerranéen. Le sceptre en discussion n'appartenait pas à la marchandise commercialisée; il représentait, comme toutes les pièces de ce type, un signe du pouvoir et du prestige de celui qui le détenait. Selon l'hypothèse de C. Pulak, que A. László considère plausible, le sceptre en pierre de l'épave d'Uluburun aurait appartenu à un mercenaire originaire d'une région avoisinée au nord de la Grèce.

Le rapprochement typologique entre le sceptre de Pantelimonul de Sus et celui d'Uluburun se limite à la partie supérieure des deux pièces, car l'exemplaire de Pantelimon a l'extrémité inférieure épaisse tandis que celui d'Uluburun a extrémité inférieure en spirale. On y mentionne aussi d'autres pièces qui ont servi d'analogies pour le sceptre d'Uluburun: les sceptres en bronze de Drajna de Jos (départ. de Prahova – Roumanie) et Lozova (République de Moldavie), les moules en pierre pour couler des sceptres de Pobit Kamăk (Bulgarie) et le sceptre en pierre de Ljulin.

L'apparition singulière du sceptre d'Uluburun, des pièces de Ljulin et Pantelimonul de Sus ou bien des sceptres en bronze et des moules pour de telles pièces dans l'aire carpatobalkanique prouve l'existence des relations entre la partie orientale de la Mer Méditerranée, la Mer Egée et les régions carpatobalkaniques ou nord-pontiques. Les relations mentionnées se rapportent d'une part à certains aspects de l'impact récent de la civilisation égéenne/micénienne sur les régions circumpontiques et est-européennes et, d'autre part, aux formes de manifestation et aux conséquences de la pénétration des communautés/des influences du complexe culturel Sabatinovka – Noua – Coslogeni dans la Bulgarie de SE et même plus loin en Grèce et dans la zone de la Mer Egée. Le SE de la Roumanie – y inclusiv la Dobroudja, le NE et le SE, de la Bulgarie, jusque vers le littoral ouest-pontique, ont eu le rôle de passage culturel, permettant l'accès et la circulation de certaines communautés et/ou de certains objets, entre lesquels les sceptres en pierre d'origine nord-pontiques.

Tous les quatre sceptres présentés ont été travaillés en roches qui se trouvent dans différentes zones de la Dobroudja ou, unes d'entre elles, même dans les alluvions du Danube.

Bien que le sceptre de Pantelimonul de Sus représente une découverte isolée, sans un certain contexte archéologique, l'auteur considère qu'il pourrait être attribué toujours à la culture Coslogeni, présente dans une zone relativement proche (la localité Grădina, départ. de Constantza). Le sceptre en discussion, ainsi que les exemplaires d'Uluburun et Ljulin, suggère, par les analogies existantes, le phénomène de l'imitation en pierre de certaines pièces en métal, sans que cela représente une contemporanéité obligatoire des deux catégories d'objets.

NOTES ARCHEOLOGIQUES HISTRIENNES. DECORATIONS D'HARNAIS ACHEMENIDE A ISTROS. PERSES, SCYTHES ET SACES

Petre ALEXANDRESCU

Résumé

1. Dans les fouilles de 1956, Suzana Dimitriu a découvert dans l'habitat civile d'Istros, fosse α , 13 pièces de décoration d'harnais achéménide, en basalte et en os, dont 5 passe-guides, 7 baguettes à tête de champignons et une indéterminé. Les analogies des plus proches de toutes les pièces se retrouvent sur l'Apadana de Persepolis, les frises des délégations. Les passe-guides sont les plus significatifs. Le plus caractéristique est le no. 1 en forme de défense de sanglier. Les pièces les plus anciennes de ce type ont été retrouvées au pays de Saces, le tumulus d'Ardjan ; de la fin du IX^e s. av. J-C. Les trois autres désignent une origine plutôt assyrienne.

2. Le contexte archéologique de cette découverte est assez bien précisé de la fin du VI^e s. av. J. C. à l'aide de la céramique attique à vernis noire.

3. A la fin du VI^e s. la ville d'Istros est passée par un terrible sac «(y compris la zone sacré et l'habitat civile). A ce même moment la tombe XII d'incinération sur place de la nécropole tumulaire abritait dans deux fosses un holocauste de 35 de morts et 14 chevaux et ânes misent en pièces et jetés pèle mêle les uns sur les autres. Il s'agit probablement selon l'avis de Dr . Dardu Nicolăescu Ploșor et C. Rîșcuția et de Dr .A . Bolomey de guerriers d'origine irano-aphganne et d'animaux de l'Asie Antérieure.

Il est donc plus probable de mettre en rapport tous ces documents avec la marche ou la retraite de Darius I en Scythie .

VASES LYDIENS DE BEREZAN AU MUSEE ARCHEOLOGIQUE D'ODESSA

Pierre DUPONT (França), Vasilica LUNGU,
S. B. OKHOTNIKOV

Le fonds Ehrlich Von Stern du Musée Archéologique d'Odessa renferme une très importante collection de vases archaïques de Bérézan dont la plupart proviennent des cités de Grèce de l'Est (Milet, Clazomènes etc.) et, plus accessoirement, d'Athènes et de Corinthe. A côté de ces grandes catégories, on y trouve également quelques spécimens isolés d'origine diverse, dont certaines plutôt inattendue. C'est le cas de quatre pièces de type lydien, consistant en une œnochoé trilobée trapue (A-39395), une *olpetta* fuselée (A-53540), un petit *lydion* à panse facettée (A-73156) et un autre plus gros (A-31765). Trois d'entre elles (les deux *lydia* et l'*olpetta*) présentent la pâte micacée, habituelle des productions lydiennes, et toutes les quatre sont recouvertes d'un vernis brun dilué „à la brosse”, que l'on retrouve sur bon nombre de trouvailles de Sardes. A ce petit lot de facture très probablement lydienne, on peut adjoindre une œnochoé trilobée à long bec en gouttière, du type „Schnabelkanne” (A-24882), plus proche des productions phrygiennes tardives. Même si ces matériels ne proviennent pas de contextes datés, il est fort probable qu'ils sont parvenus sur place en compagnie des céramiques grecques orientales archaïques. A ce titre, leur présence dans le fonds Von Stern méritait d'être signalée, ces quelques pièces anatoliennes isolées venant s'ajouter au petit lot de même provenance conservé au Musée de l'Ermitage, que nous avons eu l'occasion de présenter dernièrement à la XIIIe conférence organisée par l'Université de Rostov-sur-le-Don.

Dans les deux cas, se trouve soulevée la question de leur mode d'acheminement au nord de la mer Noire: via la Grèce de l'Est certes¹, mais à partir de quelle cité? Plusieurs éventualités se présentent à l'esprit: depuis l'Ionie du Sud², par Milet notamment, fondatrice de tant de colonies pontiques? ou bien par l'Ionie du Nord, de Smyrne notamment³, capturée en 585 par Alyatte? ou encore par un établissement des Détroits, comme Daskyleion⁴ par exemple? ou depuis le sud de la mer Noire, par Sinope⁵?

¹ Sur les rapports des cités d'Ionie avec le royaume de Lydie, cf. I. S. SVENTSITSKAYA, *Grecheskie goroda v sostave lidiiskogo tsarsva*, VDI 1 (1978), 26-38.

² De nombreux fragments de „Black-on-Red” et de „Bichrome Ware” anatoliens ont été trouvés à l'Artémision d'Ephèse (F. Brein, in E. Akurgal (ed.), *Proc. of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology*, Ankara-Izmir, 23-30 sept. 1973 [1978], 726-727). Quant à l'„Ephesian Ware”, que Greenewalt, *CSCA* 6 (1973), 91-122 attribuait à un centre de fabrication d'ambiance gréco-anatolienne, son cas est plus douteux: on n'en a trouvé que quelques fragments. Des *lydia*, tant de fabrication lydienne que d'imitation ionienne, ont également été exhumés en grande quantité dans les nécropoles de Samos (J. Boehlau, *Aus ionischen und italischen Nekropolen*, Leipzig 1898, 35, 145, pl. VIII: 5, 6, 10). Sur les trouvailles de céramique lydienne en Ionie et Eolide, cf. l'étude détaillée de M. KERSCHNER, *Die Ionier und ihr Verhältnis zu den Phrygern und Lydern. Beobachtungen zur archäologischen Evidenz*, dans E. Schwertheim & E. Winter, *Neue Forschungen zu Ionien*, Fahri Isik zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet, = *Asia Minor Studien*, Bd. 54, Bonn, 2005, 129-141.

³ Le sanctuaire d'Athéna à l'Ancienne-Smyrne a livré un certain nombre de vases lydiens (J. M. COOK, *Old Smyrna*, 1948-1951, *BSA* 53-54 (1958-1959), 21 note 87 et pl. 4: „marbled ware”, *lydia* et *skyphoi* lydiens; E. AKURGAL, *Die Kunst Anatoliens von Homer bis Alexander*, Berlin, 1961, 151, 155, fig. 106: *lydion*). Inversement, les fouilles de Clazomènes n'en ont pas livré un seul fragment (Y. ERSÖY, *Pottery Production and Mechanism of Workshops in Archaic Clazomenae*, in *Griechische Keramik im kulturellen Kontext*, Akten des Internationalen Vasen-Symposiums in Kiel vom 24.-28.9.2001, B. Schmaltz – M. Söldner ed., Münster, 2003, 256). A noter que quelques *lydia* sont apparus aussi plus au nord, à Antandros (plusieurs exemplaires, tant lydiens que d'imitation ionienne, exposés au musée de Bursa) et dans les fouilles canadiennes du Kastro de Mytilène, de même que des *skyphoi* lydiens ont été livrés par la nécropole de Pitané (*Izmir Arkeoloji Müzesi. Seramik katalogu*, Izmir, 1999, n° 130, 135, 136).

⁴ R. GÜRTEKIN-DEMİR, *Lydian painted pottery at Daskyleion*, *AnatSt* 52 (2002), 111-143.

⁵ Outre quelques „Schnabelkannen” phrygiennes tardives, publiées par E. Akurgal (*Phrygische Kunst*, Ankara, 1955, pl. 33), le musée de Sinope expose quelques *lydia*, tant lydiens que d'imitation ionienne, ainsi qu'un *skyphos* lydien à décor de triangles appendus. Quant au „Black-on-Red” anatolien, il est présent dans l'arrière-pays immédiat, à Amisos et Akalan (information aimablement communiquée par L. Summerer, Munich).

Encore faudrait-il, pour choisir la réponse adaptée, avoir une idée plus précise du lieu de fabrication réel de ces pièces de type anatolien. Le fait que la plupart d'entre elles semblent d'inspiration lydienne doit inciter, nous semble-t-il, à la prudence, compte tenu de la forte imbrication des civilisations hellénique et lydienne sur divers sites de la Grèce de l'Est, où des artisans lydiens établis à demeure ont très bien pu exercer leur art pour répondre à la demande d'une clientèle bigarrée. A cet égard, de grandes métropoles-carrefours comme Ephèse en Ionie du Sud, ou encore des établissements de Propontide, telle Cyzique⁶, fondation de Milet adossée à un arrière-pays lydien, apparaissent comme des pistes à ne pas négliger non plus et qui pourraient nous réserver des surprises.

CATALOGUE

- OGIM A-39395: œnochoé trilobée à panse ogivale trapue. Forme complète reconstituée. Base plane débordante à semelle concave. Pâte beige clair, fine, non micacée, avec minigranules de chaux. Ext. entièrement recouvert de vernis brun passé „à la brosse” [Fig. 1].

H. 12. 6; diam. 10. 5; diam base 6. 6; anse ovale 1. 3 x 1. 2.

Comparanda: prototype en métal? Cf. A. K. Knudsen, *A Study of the Relation between Phrygian Metalware and Pottery in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.*, Diss. Philadelphia, 1961 (1979), 212sq, + tableau p. 315.

- OGIM A-53540: olpè fusiforme à embouchure ronde. Forme à peu complète, à l'exception de l'anse. Pâte beige orangé, finement micacée avec quelques paillettes éparses. Extérieur en vernis „à la brosse” brun plus ou moins dilué [Fig. 2].

Diam. emb. 4. 0; H. 14. 0; diam. base 4. 5.

Comparanda: M. Lambrino, *Les vases archaïques d'Histria*, Bucarest, 1938, fig. 116b (exemplaire à décor de bandes); H. P. Isler, *Samos IV*, Bonn, 1978, 98, n° 161 et pl. 50 (décor „à la brosse” sf. 2 bandes réservées; daté fin VIIIe s. av. J.-C.); A. Furtwängler, in *Samos III*, Bonn, 1989, 90-92, fig. 15c („Kännchen mit runder Mündung”).

- OGIM A-31765: lydion. Portion d'épaule, présentant trois larges facettes de tournassage concaves, avec amorce de col évasé. Pâte beige orangé, finement micacée, chatoyante. Décor en vernis brun noir lustré: une bande en bas du col, trois filets sur l'épaule, une bande à mi-panse (ou bas de panse entièrement verni?) [Fig. 3].

Diam. estimé de panse: c. 13.

Comparanda: A. I. Bilgin, R. Dinç, M. Önder, *Lydia'daki iki tümülüs'de temizlik çalışmaları*, Arkeoloji Dergisi, IV, Izmir, 1996, 217 fig. 13 (ép. d'Alyattes); K. Sams, I. Temizsoy, *Gordion Museum*, s. l., s.d. (2000 ?), 51 fig. 107 (Gordion, Tumulus A); R. Gürtekin-Demir, *Lydian painted pottery at Daskyleion*, AnatSt 52, 2002, 137 fig. 19.

- OGIM A-73156: petit lydion. Partie supérieure manquante. Panse à facettes de tournassage concaves. Pied tronconique évidé. Pâte gris beige, plus orangée en surface, finement micacée, chatoyante. Surface extérieure en vernis brunâtre „à la brosse”, finement micacé [Fig. 4].

H. cons. 6. 3; diam. panse 7. 3; h. pied. 1. 2; diam. pied 2. 8.

Comparanda: Gürtekin-Demir, *op.cit.*, 135 fig. 18 n° 193; H. Dedeoglu, *The Lydians and Sardis*, Istanbul, 2003, 40 en bas à dr.

⁶ Le fait que Cyzique ait été le siège d'un artisanat de parfumerie réputé à base d'essence d'une plante locale, l'*Amaracus Cyzicena* a du certainement engendrer des besoins en vases-conteneurs adaptés, peut-être à la mode lydienne du fait de la proximité de Daskyleion.

ROME, TARENTUM AND THE DEFECTION OF THE LUCANIAN LEAGUE, 326-298 B.C.*

Decebal NEDU

The crisis started in 327 B.C. at Naples had a great importance for the development of the relationships between the communities of Italy during the last decays of the IVth century B.C. This led to the outbreak of the Second Samnite War, which allowed Rome to establish its power over the middle area of the peninsula, after twenty years of fights. In the same time, the incidents which happened at Naples in 327-326 B.C. represented the opportunity to define some new systems of agreements, very important for the balance of forces in Italy.

The development of the crisis of Naples was described to us due to two versions, preserved by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The first historian presents the following evolution of the events: in 327 B.C., the Greeks from Naples and Palaeopolis committed hostile acts against the Romans from Falernum and from Campania and they refused to discuss the possible repairs which could peaceably solve the situation; facing such an attitude, the Romans began military operations against the city, entrusting the leadership to the consul Q. Publilius Philo; the other consul, L. Cornelius Lentulus, with an army, was charged to prevent a possible Samnite intervention in favour of the Greek city (8.22.7-10); in spite of these measures, 2.000 soldiers from Nola and 4.000 Samnites managed to enter the city by intimidation rather than request (8.23.1-2); in 326 B.C., the Lucanians and the Apulians concluded treaties with Rome, promising soldiers and weapons (8.25.3); due to the siege length, the privations implicated by the isolation of the city and the numerous Samnite presence, some of the Naples inhabitants decided to come to a diplomatic solution with Rome, although there were some rumours about the arrival of some supports from Tarentum (8.25.7-8); after the negotiations with the proconsul Q. Publilius Philo, the Samnite and Nolan troops had been evacuated outside the city; this action proved to have useful consequences, because, in the same year, Naples concluded a treaty with Rome which preserved its independence (8.25.9-8.26.7).

The version of the crisis of Naples preserved in *The Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius offers a different view upon the events happened in 327-326 B.C.: the inhabitants from Naples committed hostile acts against the Campanians who were in friendly relationship with the Romans; the Roman ambassadors asked Greeks not to bring damages to the subjects of Rome and if they have any litigation they should solve it by discussing and not by war; but privately the delegates of the Roman Republic were negotiating with the weighty men of Naples the city revolt under the Samnites and its entering in good relationships with Rome (15.5.1); in the same time, ambassadors were arriving from Tarentum, refined men who had traditional relationships with the people of Naples; together with them, delegates from Nola advised the inhabitants not to make any agreement with Rome and not to abandon the Samnite friendship; the Greeks were advised not to give up in the case of open warfare with Rome, because the Samnites would send help and Tarentum would put a strong fleet to their disposal (15.5.2-3); the members of the council could not manage to take a decision and thus the debates took place in the assembly of the people; influenced by the Samnites representatives, who promised the retrocession of Cumae which was occupied by them two generations ago, the people send the Roman ambassadors back home without any answer, thus beginning the warfare (15.6.1-5).

Among other variations of details, both versions result in the fact that four „actors“ actively participated in climbing over the pressures between 327-326 B.C. In the main foreground there are Rome and Naples which were on the edge of warfare, but in the secondary ground the texts present two other powers interested in the development of the crisis, the Samnite League with its allies from Nola and the Dorian colony of Tarentum.

* This paper work had been made during the training stage financed by the Alexander von Humboldt and Fritz Thyssen foundations during the summer of 2006, at „Seminar für Alte Geschichte“, Bonn University. We express our profound gratitude towards the two foundations and towards prof. dr. Gerhard Wirth and prof. dr. Vasile Lica, without support of which this training period would not have been possible.

The participants' grouping in a coherent formula and the explanation of the role played by each and everyone in the development of the events does not represent an easy target. Either direct or indirect, the Tarentum's participation to the incidents that took place around the Greek city from Campania had been disputed by some researchers inclined to believe that the Tarentine intervention could only be an anticipation of the strained relationships between Rome and the Dorian colony of the following decades⁷. If we had in view only the Livian paragraphs, than we might have doubts concerning the Tarentine appearance in the crisis of Naples. The text of Livy includes enough elements that indicate, in all likelihood, hidden behind the narration, an annalistic source which distorted the events to Rome's advantage. The responsibility of the conflict is assigned to the Greeks who committed acts of violence against the Romans from Campania and Falernum and refused to accept a diplomatic solution to end the crisis⁸. In their turn, the Samnites succeeded in bringing troops within the city more by intimidation and pressures and not necessarily by the inhabitants' request⁹. These examples of the Livian version probably represent traces of the annalistic intervention upon the description of the events, meant to emphasize the ethics of the position adopted by the Romans in 327-326 B.C. They can undoubtedly be submitted to a critical examination.

But the exclusion of the Tarentine intervention cannot find arguments strong enough in the literary tradition that preserved the events of the years 327-326 B.C. If we only study the text of Livy, then the denial of the Tarentine participation would be taken into consideration. But the other version of the crisis, preserved in the work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, offers another perspective upon the events and Tarentum appears as well in the narration of the Greek historian. Dionysius gathered many of the episodes of the history of the Roman Republic from the annalistic literature but the investigated issue seems to count among the exceptions. In accordance to his variant, the Greeks of Naples did not commit hostile acts against the Romans in close proximity, as Livy is describing, but against the Campanians¹⁰. During the negotiations between Rome and Naples, the Roman ambassadors were having private „underground“ talks with the important members of the community, in order to take out the Samnite influence upon the city¹¹. These two elements of Dionysius's version rise question marks upon the author's source of inspiration. Would an annalist really have recognized that the Roman delegates negotiated secretly and simultaneously with the official talks in order to spread the Roman influence upon the city? The most likely answer is not and thus it makes us question about the annalistic source of the paragraphs elaborated by the Greek historian about the crisis of Naples. Other short descriptions seem as well to be unknown by the annalistic horizon. The source of Dionysius had been able to inform him about the existence of a council and a public assembly at Naples which represents specific institutions of a Greek city. In accordance with the description of Dionysius, the strained situation appeared in 327 B.C. had been first discussed in the council, without any conclusion, and then the decision had been moved in the assembly of the people¹².

The elements emphasized above have little chances to be found in a work elaborated by an annalist. These component parts of the narration of Dionysius prove the existence of a Greek source as informative base for the episode of the crisis from 327-326 B.C. The political involvement scheme of the four actors, Naples, Rome, the Samnite League and Tarentum probably arises from the same literary source and there are insufficient reasons to dwell upon it with an excessive doubt¹³.

From our point of view, Tarentum was one of the powers that participated to the evolution of the crisis of Naples from 327-326 B.C. Its presence is clearly certified by both of Dionysius and Livy, and political and strategical explanations may be discussed in order to

⁷ DE SANCTIS 1907, 299.

⁸ Livy 8.22.7.

⁹ Livy 8.23.1.

¹⁰ Dionysius 15.5.1.

¹¹ Dionysius 15.5.1.

¹² Dionysius 15.6.1-2.

¹³ HOFFMANN 1934, 21sq., 131sq.; FREDERIKSEN 1984, 208sq.; OAKLEY 1998, 640-642; FORSYTHE 2005, 293-294.

justify the intervention¹⁴.

There is no doubt that Naples and Tarentum had connections before 327 B.C. The Italiote League seems to be the structure within which there have been developed the previous relations. The Greek league of the cities from Italy had been established around 396 B.C., in order to be able to withstand against the aggressiveness of the Syracusan tyrant Dionysius the Elder and against the attacks of the Italic populations in close proximity¹⁵. In the IVth century B.C., after the going out of Dionysius, there have been certified as the members of the league the cities of Croton, Thurii, Metapontum, Naples, Tarentum and Heraklea. Probably around the half of the century, during the the greatest flourishing of the Dorian city under the leadership of Archytas, the headquarters of the federal organism moved from the Cape of Lacinium, from the territory of Croton, to Heraklea, colony of Tarentum¹⁶. The settle of the league's capital at Heraklea, a city under the direct influence of Tarentum, shows that the great Dorian colony succeeded to establish itself as the leadership of the Italiote federal structure.

Going back to the crisis of Naples, it is hard to believe that Tarentum together with the members of the Italiote League passively assisted to the convulsions that were about to put the city under the Roman control. The two versions that we have to our disposal only present the Tarentine reaction to the incidents that took place between 327-326 B.C., but this focus can easily be understood if we take into account the position of Tarentum within the league. The danger that threatened Naples was more likely to be the subject of the common debates between the members of the Italiote alliance¹⁷. The sending of a military expedition to Campania was definitely not an easy decision due to the distance and the possible implications of the intervention. The long and contradictory debates, as well as the necessary time for the equipping of the army and of the fleet that were about to leave to Naples, all these represent suppositional elements that might help us to understand however the reason why the help of the Greek league did not manage to come in the right time¹⁸.

As the leader of the Italiotes, the Dorian colony had probably been the one that informed the Greeks of Naples that the other cities were not indifferent concerning their fate and assured them about receiving help. Another reason for which Tarentum took over the mission of encouraging the Greek resistance at Naples, facing the war with Rome, is suggested in the text of Dionysius. At Naples arrived delegates of Tarentum, selected among the elite of the city, who had traditional relationships of hospitality with the citizens of the Greek city from the Campanian coast¹⁹. This detail plunges an interesting view upon the relationships developed between Tarentum and Naples before 327 B.C. and explains once again the reason why the powerful Dorian city of south had been very active diplomatically during the crisis.

In 326 B.C., after one year of siege, Naples concluded with Rome a treaty in favourable terms. Although the situation was politically solved without dramatic consequences for the Greek community, the crisis of Naples however represented an essential point for the further development of the balance of power from Italy. The premises of the Second Samnite War are found in the incidents that took place at Naples in the years 327-326 B.C. The war stained with blood the middle part of Italy til 304 B.C. but, in the same time, the strong efforts of the two adversaries determined the spreading of the war's consequences towards the south of the peninsula. From another view, the intervention of Tarentum at Naples, as well as the entering

¹⁴ The involvement of Tarentum had been accepted by MOMMSEN 1987, 213; CIACERI, 1927, 20-21; PAIS 1928, 134; HOFFMANN 1934, 22sq.; WUILLEUMIER 1939, 89-90; AFZELIUS 1943, 162; FREDERIKSEN 1984, 208; BRAUER 1986, 73-74; LOMAS 1993, 46sq.; OAKLEY 1998, 680-682.

¹⁵ The set up of the Italiote League: CIACERI 1932, 413; the Greek alliance from Italy already existed in 393 B.C. when Dionysius the Elder besieged Rhegium (*ibidem*); see also WUILLEUMIER 1939, 64, BRAUER 1986, 43-44.

¹⁶ Data concerning the history of the league and its structure: CIACERI 1932, 436-437, BRAUER 1986, 55, LOMAS 1993, 46.

¹⁷ LOMAS 1993, 40 noticed the fact that there was a confusion in sources concerning the federal decisions and the individual initiatives of the league's members; from this point of view, it is hard to tell which actions refer only to the Tarentine affairs and what decisions resulted after the commun consultations.

¹⁸ The relationships between Naples and Tarentum developed not only within the political sphere but also in the economic field. It is possible that Tarentum would have issued coins after the weight standard of some coins from Naples. The dating of this currency issue with „Campanian influences“ is uncertain (see FREDERIKSEN 1984, 208 sq., LOMAS 1993, 202, n. 38).

¹⁹ Dionysius 15.5.2.

of the Greek city from Campania under Rome's protection, represent the starting points of some Roman-Tarentine relationships that had been very strained during the last years of the IVth century B.C. and the first decades of the following century. The Italiote League had lost an important member and Tarentum felt the loss of the city from its influence like a bad stroke. From this moment, Rome and Tarentum suspected each other and the political game of the alliances developed in the peninsula proves that both powers were trying to be as cautious as possible²⁰.

On this background, the diplomatic approaches were considerably intense. As early as 326 B.C., at the beginning of the Second Samnite War, according to Livy, the Lucanians and the Apulians concluded treaties with Rome²¹. As it was to be expected, these diplomatic connections made up the subject of some contradictory debates in the modern literature.

The evolution of the Roman-Lucanian relationships until the end of the Third Samnite War is marked by some disputed episodes: in 326 B.C., as we already noted, Livy mentioned an alliance between the two powers²²; over only one year, this treaty had been broken due to the Tarentine incitements²³; in 317 B.C., the author from Patavium describes in detail a Roman military expedition to Nerulum, in Lucania²⁴; after the Samnites' attack over the Lucanians, in order to bring them about within the anti-Roman coalition, in 298 B.C., the Lucanian League concluded an alliance with Rome²⁵. The picture resulted from the connection of all these episodes must be unitarily treated in order to be able to be understood and explained. From our point of view, Tarentum was doubtlessly not a negligible element in the history of Roman-Lucanian political relationships.

G. de Sanctis, E. Salmon and S. Oakley denied the authenticity of the treaty signed by Rome with the Lucanian League during 326 B.C.²⁶. The rejection's motivation as an approach, resembles to the one proposed occasionally in order to deny the Tarentine intervention at Naples: the alliance between Rome and Lucania represents only an anticipation of the diplomatic relationships developed between these two powers at the beginning of the following century. During the whole period of the Great Samnite War, as the Italian historian shows, the Roman forces did never convey transit through Lucania to get to Apulia, where a second battlefield was opened. When the Rome's troops had to move towards Apulia, they always had to march through the central area of the Appennines Mountains, covering the territories of those small Sabellian federations from the north of the Samnite territory²⁷. E. Salmon added to G. de Sanctis's observations another possible explanation of an antidating alliance between Rome and Lucania in 326 B.C.: the annalistic tradition or Livy probably mixed up the Volscian community of Luca with the Lucanian League²⁸.

In the literary tradition there cannot be found a single mention about a Roman army covering the Lucanian League's territories towards Apulia. Apparently, this stillness of sources seems to be a strong argument for supporting the assumption of G. de Sanctis. Still, if we wish to make an accurate assessment of the Roman-Lucanian relationships during the Samnite Wars, then we have to admit that the material of the literary sources is only a scheme of these kind of relationships. Thus, from Livy for instance, we learn of the fact that in 326 B.C. the two powers concluded a treaty and then, during the next year, the relationships had been broken due to a Tarentine intervention, but they were resumed in 298 B.C., on the eve of the

²⁰ The Roman-Tarentine strains might have older sources, during the presence of Alexander the Molossian in the south of Italy. In 331 B.C., the king expanded his area of action towards Poseidonia. This context of events led to a treaty between Rome and Alexander (Livy 8.17.10-11; Justin 12.2.12), terms of which did not preserved. It is possible that this diplomatic act would have been received as an hostile attitude by the Tarentines, who were in conflict with the king because his trying to assert himself independently in the Italic area.

²¹ Livy 8.25.2-3: *et alia nova nihil tum animo tale agitantibus accesserunt auxilia. Lucani atque Apuli, quibus gentibus nihil ad eam diem cum Romano populo fuerat, in fidem venerunt, arma virosque ad bellum pollicentes; foedere ergo in amicitiam accepti.*

²² Livy 8.25.2-3.

²³ Livy 8.27.6-11.

²⁴ Livy 9.20.9-10.

²⁵ Livy 10.11.11-10.12.2; Dionysius 17.1.1-17.2.2.

²⁶ DE SANCTIS 1907, 303; SALMON 1967, 215; OAKLEY 1998, 651.

²⁷ DE SANCTIS 1907, 303; see also PAIS 1928, 137, CIACERI 1932, 21-22, SCULLARD 1951, 109, GIANNELLI 1974, 354-355, 362.

²⁸ SALMON 1967, 215.

Third Samnite War. Only these brief pieces of information can not tell us for certain what was negotiated in 326 B.C. – if we accept the contacts mentioned by the historian from Patavium – or what were the terms of the alliance concluded in 298 B.C.

Among the modern researchers who placed the beginning of the Roman-Lucanian relationship in 326 B.C., the majority of them estimated that we might speak, in general terms, about the concluding of an alliance²⁹. On the other hand, concerning the problem of balance of forces from the central area and the meridional region of Italy, we consider that it is essential to establish, even hypothetical, if this alliance was motivated and against whom it was directed.

One of the major consequences of the crisis of Naples was probably represented by the rapprochement between Tarentum and the Samnite League. The reasons for this agreeable stand are connecting with the events happened at Naples, in which the two powers had been involved. Beginning with 327 B.C., the Samnite League was at war with Rome and the operations started the next year, in the Liris Valley and Campania. The agreement concluded between Rome and Naples in 326 B.C. was felt by Tarentum as a stroke against its personal interests and it perceived it as an intervention within its own sphere of influence. The juncture of the years 327-326 B.C. was made to establish a new polarisation of the Italic states, on the basis of some specific interests. Due to solving of the crisis of Naples in favour of the Roman Republic, Tarentum and the Samnite League had reasons to consider Rome a common target in their foreign policy as early as 327-326 B.C.³⁰. We do not know for certain if the two powers interested in Rome's fighting concluded a formal alliance, but surely the new context of the peninsula could bring in the Tarentines and the Samnites in a close relationship³¹.

Rome had to find an urgent diplomatic answer to this coalition. The reinforcement of the Samnite and Tarentine relationships encouraged the extension of the Roman political relations in the southern extremity of Italy. The Lucanian League had no reason to encourage the contacts between the Dorian colony and Samnium, if we take into account the warlike relationships developed with Tarentum along its history before the Great Samnite War. The Dorian colony proved to be a strong opponent for the Lucanian League tempted to spread itself on the account of the Greek cities from Magna Graecia³². If Tarentum and Samnium have found common references in the foreign policy beginning with the year 327 B.C., then we do not have many reasons to doubt that Lucania had been troubled by this rapprochement and searched in its turn to respond by an alliance. In the restless context of 327-326 B.C., Rome proved to be the best partner of the Lucanian Federation in order to conclude an alliance that would answer to the new external needs, due to its war with the Samnite League and the strained relationships with Tarentum.

Thus, there is not any strong reason to allow the denial of the Roman-Lucanian alliance recorded by Livy for the year 326 B.C. Its existence seems natural within the new alignment of the Italic powers, generated in the context of the incidents from Naples³³. On the same

²⁹ MOMMSEN 1987, 214; HOFFMANN 1934, 46 sq.; AFZELIUS 1943, 161; HEURGON 1973, 208; FREDERIKSEN 1984, 208; BRAUER 1986, 73-74; LOMAS 1993, 47.

³⁰ MOMMSEN 1987, 214; HOFFMANN 1934, 46sq.; AFZELIUS 1943, 162.

³¹ According to A. Afzelius and M. Frederiksen, the beginning of the Samnite-Tarentine approaching can be chronologically placed before the incidents from Naples. In 334-331 B.C., as a request of the Italiote League, the Epirot king Alexander the Molossian fought in the south of the peninsula against the Italics who put in danger the existence of the Greek cities. The general brought from Greece respected at first his duties and acted in the name of those who called him; then, the Epirot king tried to create a personal domain in the meridional part of Italy and conflicted with Tarentum and the other Greeks. Eventually, his former protégés could freely breathe: Alexander was defeated and killed in the battle of Pandosia by the Lucanians and by the Bruttians, in 330 B.C. (Livy 8.23.4-8.23.14, Justin 12.2.1-12.2.14.). In the context of the divergences with the king, Tarentum understood that the Samnites could have been dangerous enemies for the ambitious general who had to be eliminated (AFZELIUS 1943, 162; FREDERIKSEN 1984, 208).

³² We mention here only one episode of the near past: the Lucanians were in conflict with Tarentum and the allies of the city during the first stage of the expedition of Alexander the Molossian in Italy; beginning with 331 B.C., the Lucanians together with the Bruttians opposed to the king's tendencies of creating a domain in the south of the peninsula (Justin 12.2.1-12.2.14, Livy 8.24.4-14).

³³ After the expression of FREDERIKSEN 1984, 209: "The main alignments of the Italian powers are clearly visible".

background, we may hypothetical reconstitute the content of this treaty, although the historian from Patavium notes only its contraction³⁴.

As we pointed out above, the Lucanian Federation was harmed by the rapprochement between the Samnite League and Tarentum. This was a fear reason but probably not strong enough to begin a war against the Samnites. The main Lucanian's concern was continue to stay in the south of Italy and its feared opponent was Tarentum which exerted the hegemony upon the Greek cities from Magna Graecia. The dissensions between the Dorian colony and Rome could have been handled by the Lucanian League, at the beginning of the Second Samnite War, in order to attract the Roman Republic in its antiTarentine policy. Such an approach of its interests in the southern area became convenient for Rome as well. The war from Samnium had just begun and probably between 327-326 B.C. none of the Roman politicians did not dare to debate upon the final result or its length. In order that the chances of victory would increase, it was obviously that Samnium had to be isolated from its potential upholders. In the south of the peninsula, such an important mission could be accomplished by the Lucanian League which was able to keep Tarentum to distance from the Italic conflict through a permanent threat.

This appears to be the picture of the political relationships between the Italic states that took contact with the Second Samnite War. On its basis, we may suppose that the Roman-Lucanian alliance from 326 B.C. had first been conceived against Tarentum, and contained terms concerning the possibilities of a commun action in front of the danger. Still, if the text of the treaty had contained articles concerning the league from Samnium, there would probably have been arranged in a more defensive formula, following that Rome would support Lucania only in the case of a Samnite attack. Such an organization spared the troops of the Lucanian League from the presence on the Samnite front but Rome got an ally which had all the interest to be vigilant about the southern extremity of Italy and about Tarentum especially³⁵.

The alliance's consequences, recorded by Livy in the narration referring to the year 326 B.C., offer support for this interpretation. During this year, in accordance with the Livian narration, it broke out the war between Tarentum and Rome. According with Livy, the Tarentines were disturbed by the entering of Naples under Roman control, they feared of the Rome's alliances from Apulia and Lucania, they felt the war approaching the city's gates and they would rather had the Romans as opponents rather than masters³⁶. Tarentum is not being pointed out as a direct participant to the open warfare during the Second Samnite War, but this absence could be explained by the existence of the Roman-Lucanian alliance. Having an ally of Rome in its flank, we may suppose that Tarentum hesitated to directly interfere in the operations from the center and the south-east of Italy. In exchange, its only option was to encourage the Samnite efforts and to hope that these ones would obtain the victory.

The next move concerning the Roman-Lucanian relationships is a naive exploitation of the Tarentine hostility by the annalistic historical tradition. In 325 B.C., some young Lucanians, incited by the Tarentines, claimed they were beaten with rods at the consuls' demands, on the reason that they entered the Roman camp³⁷. After contradictory debates upon this incident, the Lucanians decided the breaking off of the treaty with Rome and the renewal of the alliance with the Samnite League³⁸. From our point of view, the incident has little chances of having a

³⁴ The fact that Livy recorded the treaties without any accuracy can also be proved by other situations: concerning the Roman-Carthaginian treaty from 306 B.C., he only mentions that it had been renewed for the third time (Livy 9.43.26) while the peace from 304 B.C., between Rome and the Samnite League, is presented as a renewal of the old Roman-Samnite alliance (Livy 9.45.4); both cases urged to prudence and the Livian descriptions must not be taken literally.

³⁵ FREDERIKSEN 1984, 208; LOMAS 1993, 46 foreseen in the alliance of 326 B.C. an antiSamnite project.

³⁶ Livy 8.27.1-3: *Aliud subinde bellum cum alterius orae Graecis exortum. Namque Tarentini, cum rem Palaepolitanam vana spe auxilii aliquamdiu sustinuissent, postquam Romanos urbe potitos acceperere, velut destituti ac non qui ipsi destituisent, increpare Palaepolitanos, ira atque invidia in Romanos furere, eo etiam magis, quod Lucanos et Apulos – nam utraque eo anno societas coepta est – in fidem populi Romani venisse allatum est: quippe propemodum perventum ad se esse, iamque in eo rem fore, ut Romani aut hostes aut domini habendi sint.*

³⁷ Livy 8.27.6-9.

³⁸ Livy 8.27.9-10.

real historical nucleus³⁹, although it had been some attempts in order to rehabilitate this event⁴⁰.

The third episode of the relationships between Romans and Lucanians was sometimes used as an argument against the historicity of the alliance of 326 B.C. In the context of 317 B.C., Livy mentions the extension of the military campaigns towards south, in Lucania, where the Roman troops captured Nerulum, locality placed close to the Greek colony of Thurii⁴¹. Due to this single recording, some historians were tempted to assert that the Lucanian Federation shared the Samnite side during the war⁴². The risks of a demonstration in the favour of the reality of this expedition were not assumed by all the researches and further on J. Beloch proposed a solution approved by E. Salmon⁴³. The consuls of 317 B.C. had been C. Junius Bubulcus and Q. Aemilius Barbula, recorded also by Livy, as well as in *Fasti Consulares*⁴⁴. Both of them are presented by Livy having military activities in Apulia, but the lack of some separated areas of operation is not doubtful concerning the year 317 B.C. The cessation of the hostilities with the Samnites, following the fight from Caudium in 321 B.C., had set free Rome by the pressure of the Samnite War. From the military point of view, the Caudine peace represented the closing of the main front from the Liris – Campania area, and the loss of it allowed the concentration of efforts in the regions where Rome wished to strengthen its presence before the reappearance of the hostilities with the Samnite League⁴⁵. Taking into account the objectives of these years, it is not unlikely at all the fact that both of the consuls would have been sent in Apulia in 317 B.C. The name of one of them, C. Junius Bubulcus, as well as his activity in the southern region, seem to be the essential factors for separating reality from fiction and for establishing until where the Roman campaigns were taken place in 317 B.C. After Pyrrhus left Italy in 278 B.C., the Roman forces did their best to fill up the emptiness left in the south of the peninsula due to the leaving of the Epirot king. One of the consuls of 277 B.C., C. Junius Bubulcus, the son of the magistrate from 317 B.C., had been the commander of the troops sent in Lucania⁴⁶. The similitude of name between the consul of 317 B.C. and the one of 277 B.C. is possible to have generated confusions between their actions that the annalistic tradition would have probably mixed up⁴⁷. Accepting the dates of this interpretation, it is less venturesome to place the military activities of the year 317 B.C. in Apulia and not to drive it towards south, in Lucania, as Livy is inferring.

The last episode of the Roman-Lucanian relationships that retains our attention took place at the beginning of the Third Samnite War. Further more, as it is resulting from our sources, Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, this episode represented the pretext for the beginning of the hostilities. On a first stage, the narration of Livy contains attacks of the Samnites upon Lucania in order to make it to conclude an alliance and to take part to the war prepared against Rome (10.11.11-12). But the Lucanians were ready to bear anything but they did not wish to bring another outrage to the Roman people (10.11.12). They asked the senators to take them under their protection and to protect them against the Samnites, by offering hostages as a guarantee of loyalty (10.11.13). The Roman senate decided to accept the offered alliance, then the fetials were sent to Samnium with the request of evacuating the territories conquered in

³⁹ It was rejected by HOFFMANN 1934, 49 and OAKLEY 1998, 685-686; WUILLEUMIER 1939, 90-91: the Lucanians incitement to cancel the treaty with Rome represents a tricky way of accusing the Tarentines and of hiding the failure of the Roman diplomacy who was trying to isolate Samnium.

⁴⁰ LOMAS 1993, 49: Tarentum sustained the antiRoman party from Lucania in order to protect its own interests.

⁴¹ Livy 9.20.9-10. During the same expedition, the Roman army also captured Forentum, characterised by Livy 9.20.9 as „strong fortress from Apulia“; the position of this fortress seems to indicate that it was still on the Lucanian territory (see DE SANCTIS 1907, 320, SALMON 1967, 231).

⁴² DE SANCTIS 1907, 303, 320; CIACERI 1927, 22.

⁴³ BELOCH 1926, 401-402; SALMON 1967, 231 accepts the hypothesis of J. Beloch but he also suggests that it might be another confusion between the Volscian community of Luca and Lucania.

⁴⁴ Livy 9.20.7; *Fasti consulares* 317; BROUGHTON 1951, 155.

⁴⁵ The consequences generated by the Caudine peace: SALMON 1967, 226sq., OAKLEY 2005a, 34-38.

⁴⁶ *Fasti consulares* 277; *Fasti triumphales* 277 register him having military successes against the Lucanians and the Bruttians; see BROUGHTON 1951, 194.

⁴⁷ BELOCH 1926, 401-402; SALMON 1967, 231. The conquest of Forentum is assigned to the consul C. Junius Bubulcus by Livy 9.20.9, while Nerulum was conquered by the other consul Q. Aemilius Barbula, in 317 B.C. Having the same field of operations in the south-east of Italy, it is possible that the literary tradition would have mixed up the actions of the two magistrates.

Lucania (10.12.1-2). Due to the negative response, the Roman people declared war to the Samnites (10.12.3).

The version of Dionysius contains a narrative thread close to the one preserved by Livy. This variant also mentions about the Samnite attacks against Lucania and its request addressed to Rome in search for help (17.1.1-2). Due to the fact that during the past the Lucanians had violated the alliance with Rome, this time the request was accompanied by hostages in order to guarantee the good-faith (17.1.2). The Roman senate accepted the proposal, the people ratified the alliance and an embassy went to Samnium to announce that the Lucanians were friends and allies of Rome and the Samnites had to return the conquered territories and stop the attacks (17.1.3-4). As a reply, the Samnites showed that the Lucanians were not the allies of the Roman Republic in the moment when they attacked them and the Romans signed the treaty only when the Samnite League began the war with the Lucanian Federation (17.2.1-2).

A few details make the difference between the two versions but the nucleus of the Roman-Lucanian relationships from 298 B.C. stays the same. As it indicates the numerous common elements, the narrations are influenced by the same source or, at least, exploit the similar informative lodes⁴⁸. Also, it contains signs that prove the annalistic source of the description and the tendency of distorting the events in a proRoman signification. Although in the past the federation canceled the alliance, the senate's goodwill demonstrated within the relationships with the Lucanian League⁴⁹ represents an obvious sign of the fact that the annalistic tradition processed the material in order to obtain an image as favourable as possible of the Roman policy at the beginning of the Third Samnite War. Attacked by the Samnites, the Lucanians appealed to those whom they offended years ago, but in spite of the past incident, the senate decided to conclude an alliance that saved the Lucanian League⁵⁰.

Many voices of the modern historiography considered this episode as the starting point of the juridical relationships between Rome and the Lucanian League, denying the alliance mentioned by Livy at the level of the year 326 B.C.⁵¹. Actually, if we look carefully to the two texts related to the agreement of 298 B.C., it clearly results a very important aspect of the composition: the sources of Livy and those of Dionysius distorted the diplomatic contacts which had preceded the beginning of the Third Samnite War, organizing them in such a way that it could be adjusted to the relationships from the previous period. Thus, in the „outrage” mentioned by Livy 10.11.12 and the „violated alliance” from the paragraph of Dionysius 17.1.2 we must distinguish two references to the incident happened in 325 B.C., with the great participation of Tarentum⁵². The giving up of the hostages is also connected with this event because they were going to hinder the future turns over and represented the guarantee of the new alliance.

Other pieces of information presented in the literary tradition as well as in the epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, allow us to reconstitute, at least hypothetical, the real development of the Roman-Lucanian relationships at the beginning of the IIIrd century B.C. In accordance with the Livian narration, as proconsul, in 296 B.C., Q. Fabius Rullianus suppressed some seditions broke in Lucania due to some incitements of few plebeian agitators⁵³. The epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, describing his achievements as consul in 298 B.C., reminds us about his activities in Lucania⁵⁴. Due to this final piece of information,

⁴⁸ OAKLEY 2005b, 167.

⁴⁹ Livy 10.11.12-13; Dionysius 17.1.2.

⁵⁰ Livy 10.12.1-2; Dionysius 17.1.3-4.

⁵¹ OAKLEY 2005b, 167-168.

⁵² It appears at Livy 8.27.6-11; it is possible that this fabricated episode to exist in *The Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius but they were preserved only in excerpts after 444/443 B.C.; the lack of a fluent narration hinders any reliable conclusion.

⁵³ Livy 10.18.8: ... *et Lucanorum seditiones a plebeis et egentibus ducibus ortas summa optimatium voluntate per Q. Fabium, pro consule missum eo cum vetere exercitu, compresserat*. The vocabulary seems to be inspired from the Roman realities.

⁵⁴ *CIL* I² 6,7 = *ILLRP* 309: ... *subigit omne Loucanam opsidesque abducit*. Livy describes another distribution of the provinces: L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus received the command in Etruria and upheld a battle at Volaterrae; the second consul from 298 B.C., Cn. Fulvius Centumalus, fought in Samnium, where he conquered Bovianum and Aufidena (10.12.3-9). *Fasti triumphales* 298 considers the latest as the one who celebrated a victory against the Samnites and Etruscans; cf. OAKLEY 2005b, 170-175 for a discussion upon the distribution of the consular headquarters in 298 B.C.

colligated with the negotiations mentioned by Livy and Dionysius, it seems to appear the existence of a possible connection between the presence of L. Cornelius Scipio in Lucania and the signing of the treaty with Rome.

In Italy, the new Gallic invasion from 299 B.C. agitated the spirits temporarily dulled by the peace signed in 304 B.C.⁵⁵. The short period of time between 299-298 B.C. was intensely used by both Rome and the Samnite League in order to find new allies and to verify the soundness of the treaties previously signed. In the case of Lucania, it is highly possible that it might have emerged a proSamnite party, in the convulsive context of the years 299-298 B.C., that began to fear the interferences of Rome in the south. This might be the reason why Q. Fabius Rullianus, in the narration of Livy, appears to be involved in the suppression of some seditions happened in Lucania. Following the same logical thread, it is also possible that the activity of L. Cornelius Scipio in the south, two years ago, to had been connected with the political instability from Lucania, generated in the context of preparations for war from Samnium⁵⁶. Because the outbreak of a new Samnite war was only a matter of time, Rome had to take urgent measures not to lose the Lucanian League from the its net of treaties. In these circumstances, the old alliance had been renewed but the success of the proRoman grouping is likely to have been ensured by the presence of the legions commanded by L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus. Further more, drawing the necessary conclusions of this experience, the Roman senate tried to prevent the loss of an important ally in the south of Italy. For the guarantee of the loiality, the giving up of the hostages was the hardest thing to be done.

The content of the new alliance probably included differences in contrast to the old treaty signed in 326 B.C. Due to the internal agitations of the federation, the Rome's confidence in the loiality of the Lucanian League had been shaken. Because the antiRoman grouping had been supported by a Samnite military intervention, the new structure of the alliance seemed to involve terms against the league from Samnium, in contrast to the one negotiated in 326 B.C. Thus, in 294 B.C., Livy records the presence of a Lucanian cohort beside the Roman legions engaged against the Samnites⁵⁷. Also, other political and military events developped in the south of Italy at the end of the IVth century B.C. and at the beginning of the next one are likely to impose some changes in the content of the old Roman-Lucanian alliance. These incidents connect to the presence of two disturbing characters in the south of the peninsula, Cleonymus and Agathocles.

After the peace from Bovianum in 304 B.C., it was obvious that Tarentum could not count anymore on the Samnite League against Rome. Its political and military isolation was increasing even more the fear of a possible conflict with the Lucanian League and Rome. In order to outrun the situation, there were fastly found some measures, probably even when the Romans and the Samnites were negotiating. In 303 B.C., after the Lucanians opened the warfare against Tarentum⁵⁸, the Spartan Cleonymus went to Italy, as a request of the Dorian colony, taking the commitment to protect it against the aggressions it was submitted by the Italics⁵⁹. In 303 B.C., under his leadership, there were gathering more than 30.000 fighters⁶⁰.

During the first stage of his expedition, the main issue of Cleonymus had been the adjustment of the relationships with the Lucanian Federation. Diodorus of Sicily does not describe any military fight between the forces of Cleonymus and the ones of the league, but it

⁵⁵ Livy 9.45.4.

⁵⁶ SALMON 1967, 260sq.; FORSYTHE 2005, 328-329.

⁵⁷ Livy 10.33.1.

⁵⁸ Diodorus 20.104.1-2. Writting down the reasons for his landing in Italy, the Sicilian historian records that Tarentum was in conflict with the Lucanians and with the Romans and this situation determined the call to Sparta. The text of Diodorus 20.104.1 seems to indicate not necessarily an open conflict between Rome and Tarentum, but moreover a worry within the Dorian colony at the same time with the isolation of the city after the exit of the Samnite League from the war. Lucania, allied with the Roman Republic from 326 B.C., was waiting for this moment for many years and the context allows us to understand the reason why, during the years 304-303 B.C., it gathered its troops against the Dorian colony: it opened the hostilities with Tarentum immediately after the concluding of the peace of Bovianum. Behind it there was the threatening shadow of Rome. From this point of view, Diodorus probably noted only a frame of mind and the fear that Rome would send its troops towards south for helping its ally.

⁵⁹The western expedition of Cleonymus: Diodorus 20.104.1-4, 20.105.1-3, Livy 10.2.1-3.

⁶⁰ Diodorus 20.104.2.

only records that the Lucanians did not risk a military fight with a strong expeditionary group and they would rather signed a peace treaty⁶¹.

Alongside with the reasons reported by the Sicilian historian, it is possible that we might identify a succession of factors that lead to the end of the hostilities between the Lucanian League and Tarentum. The events happened in 298 B.C., as we have already mention, reveal the existence of the two groupings with different views concerning the foreign policy of the federation. One of them favoured Rome, the other one seemed to be proSamnite and it presupposes that it supported a relaxation of the relationships with Tarentum. The two groupings stand out in the history scene only in the context of the beginning of the Third Samnite War but their delimitation might be a phenomenon which happened at the end of the IVth century B.C., in the same time with the extension of the Roman influence towards the south of Italy. Probably Cleonymus knew well his opponent and he was familiar with the agitations from within the league. As it is described in another paragraph of Diodorus, the Spartan found the best way to strenghten the position of the antiRoman and proSamnite grouping. Speculating about the adversary's inclinations towards robbery and violence, he left Metapontum which refused to obey him at the Lucanian League's discretion⁶².

From the point of view of the alliance contracted in 326 B.C. with Rome, the Lucanian-Tarentine agreement from 303 B.C. could not be interpreted as a violation of this juridical act. It did not canceled the alliance, but the Roman politicians were not able to see in a good way the new situation from the south of Italy. The diplomatic intrigues from 303 B.C. have doubtlessly been rcepted as an expression of a duplicitary attitude and thus, a distrusted atmosphere established between the two partners, visible in the treaty of 298 B.C.

The first years of Agathocles's career consumed in terribly fights against Carthage⁶³. In 306 B.C., confronted with the resistance of some Greek cities from Sicily, Agathocles concluded a treaty with the traditional enemy of Syracuse in honourable conditions⁶⁴, which allowed him to rule upon the Sicilian territories from the east of Halycus river. Beginning with 305 B.C., when he managed to defeat the refractory cities of his domain, the tyrant was free to consolidate his position and to extend his possessions⁶⁵. After 306 B.C., Syracuse needed to recover its strenght and Agathocles did not risk to bring about a new conflict with the African state. The necessity of finding new ressources for revival and a new action field outside Sicily urged the tyrant to look beyond the borders of the isle towards the Italic coasts⁶⁶.

In 304 B.C., Diodorus points out the presence of Agathocles in the Italic waters, when he plundered the Lipare isles⁶⁷. Around 300 B.C., the same author describes the repression of a rebellion of the Ligurians and the Etruscans from his army, incident followed by a conflict with the Bruttians who managed to defeat the forces of Agathocles⁶⁸. Five years after this event, in 295 B.C., Agathocles conquered Croton, ruled by the tyrant Menedemus and

⁶¹ Diodorus 20.104.3: „Because he had a strong army under his leadership, the Lucanians concluded a treaty with the Tarentines” (*philía*).

⁶² Diodorus 20.104.3-4.

⁶³ The great African expedition: TILLYARD 1908, 103 sq., CARY 1927, 624 sq., MEISTER 1984, 393 sq.

⁶⁴ Diodorus 20.79.5; Justin 22.8.15; TILLYARD 1908, 188-190; MEISTER 1984, 404.

⁶⁵ In the west of Sicilly any political or military interference risked to bring back the tyrant in war against Carthage. The idea of a revenge, after the defeat from the conflict of 312-306 B.C., did not left Agathocles until the last days of his life. The land troops and the fleet were prepared in 289 B.C. for a new war but the tyrant died during the same year, leaving unfulfilled his plans against Carthage.

⁶⁶ The Syracusane presence in the affaires of southern Italy was not a fact related only to the period of Agathocles. At the apogee of its power, Syracuse showed a special interest for the Greek colonies from Magna Graecia. Dionysius the Elder led his troops many times in the south of Italy, at the beginning of the IVth century B.C., getting important achievements. By war or by diplomacy, many of the Italiote cities were brought under the control of the Syracusane tyrant, becoming an appendix of his Sicilian kingdom. After the death of Dionysius, his descendants did not managed to stop the fission of the Syracusane domination, but his interest for the regions from the south of Italy opened a new direction in the foreign policy of the great Sicilian city (the Syracusane extension in Italy under Dionysius the Elder: CAVEN 1990, 124sq.).

⁶⁷ Diodorus 20.101.1.

⁶⁸ Diodorus 21.3. Agathocles received news about the mercenaries rebellion while he was fighting at Corcyra, against Cassandrus, who wished to occupy the isle, event happened in 300 B.C. (Diodorus 21.2-3).

concluded alliances with the Iapyges and the Peucetii⁶⁹. Probably during the same campaign, his troops succeeded to conquer Hipponion⁷⁰. The Bruttians, frightened about the city collapse, concluded peace with the tyrant but after he left Italy, they defeated the force of occupation let by Agathocles and set them free from the Syracusane domination⁷¹.

After the robbery of the Lipare isles in 304 B.C., the first target of the military actions developed by Agathocles in the peninsula might have been Cleonymus, who came in 303 B.C. planning to establish a personal domain in the regions occupied by Greeks in the west⁷². Agathocles probably considered him a possible enemy in the meridional part of Italy after he used force against Metapontum, in collaboration with the Lucanian League⁷³. The two characters could hardly find a way to live in peace, because the intentions of the Spartan general contradicted the traditional interests of Syracuse in the southern region of Italy. In these circumstances, it seems that Agathocles tried to strengthen the Syracusane presence in the peninsula in order to anticipate a possible expansion of Cleonymus.

The second campaign, started in 295 B.C., proves that after 300 B.C. Agathocles tried to remake the traditional sphere of influence of Syracuse from Bruttium, lost due to the entirely concentration of forces against Carthage, during the previous period⁷⁴. At the level of the year 295 B.C., after the occupation of Croton and Hipponion and the concluding of the treaty with the league from Bruttium, Agathocles succeeded in giving an outline to the southern region of the peninsula where Syracuse used to have interests⁷⁵. Moreover, his diplomatic relationships were making progresses towards north where he concluded alliances with the Iapyges and the Peucetii.

Rome's response in front of the new balance of forces from the meridional region of the peninsula can only be supposed, in the circumstances of the sources' reticence. The restoration of the Syracusane domination in Bruttium after 304 B.C. as well as the possible contacts of the tyrant with Tarentum were supposed to stir the senate's fears. The alliances contracted by Agathocles with the Iapyges and the Peucetii, in a region where Tarentum also had the tendency of demonstrating its influence, seem to prove that the tyrant and the Dorian colony found a common point concerning the balance of power from the south of Italy. In 298 B.C., Rome renegotiated the alliance with the Lucanian League first taking into consideration its relationships with Tarentum and the reopening of the hostilities against the Samnites. On the other hand, we must keep an eye on the Roman-Lucanian alliance which had again been discussed in 298 B.C., in times when Agathocles was already been operating in Bruttium and he was probably in contact with Tarentum. The chronological arrangement of events and the equation of power from the south of the Italic peninsula makes us believe that the presence of Agathocles imposed the acceleration of contacts settlement of Rome with the Lucanian League. If he was planning to cross over the borders of the Bruttian region, the tyrant announced himself as a possible enemy and could not be meaningless to suppose that the Roman-Lucanian alliance of 298 B.C. also included stipulations in order to block his advance.

Drawing a conclusion of the relationships between Rome and Lucania at the end of the IVth century B.C. and at the beginning of the next one, we may assert that Tarentum played a leading part in the developing of these relations. Among the four episodes mentioned in the literary tradition, only two of them can be considered as being historical realities. Rome signed

⁶⁹ Diodorus 21.4. As a chronological reference, we have an important fact. Agathocles occupied Croton using a stratagem, when he accompanied his daughter Lanassa to Epir, where she became the wife of Pyrrhus; the first year of their marriage is 295 B.C. (Diodorus 21.4).

⁷⁰ Diodorus 21.8; see also Strabo 6.1.5; cf. VATTUONE 1987-1988, 66-67.

⁷¹ Diodorus 21.8.

⁷² VATTUONE 1987-1988, 63-64. The rumours about his intention of releasing Sicily from his domination, spread even from the first year of his western military adventure, probably determined Agathocles to keep an eye close to the event from the south of Italy (Diodorus 20.104.4).

⁷³ Diodorus 20.104.3-4.

⁷⁴ Diodorus 21.4, 21.8; see also Justin 23.1.3-23.2.2; the insurrection of the Bruttians, reported by Diodorus 21.8 immediately after the last Italic expedition of Agathocles, was probably happened after his death in 289 B.C.; Strabo 6.1.5 mentions the building of a harbour station at Hipponion by the tyrant, which suggests that the Syracusane presence in the southern area of Italy was longer than it may be understood from the text of Diodorus (see GIANNELLI 1974, 379-380, MARASCO 1984, 100).

⁷⁵ GIANNELLI 1974, 373 sq.; VATTUONE 1987-1988, 66-67; LOMAS 1993, 43; MARASCO 1984, 104-105 also investigated the possibility that the Italiotes would have called the help of Agathocles, offering him a reason for his interventions in the peninsula.

an alliance with Lucania in 326 B.C. and then, in 298 B.C., it renewed this treaty essential for its meridional policy. The antiTarentine policy of the two partners represented for over more than 20 years the leading idea of the external positions adopted by Rome and the Lucanian League in the southern area of the peninsula.

MILESTONES FROM DOBRUJA IN THE COLLECTIONS OF THE MUSEUM OF NATIONAL HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY CONSTANȚA

Maria BĂRBULESCU, Livia BUZOIANU,
Zaharia COVACEF

The pieces we are going to dwell upon in this study have been included rather recently in the patrimony of MINAC, either they have been discovered accidentally in the villages Cheia and Arsa (Constanța county), or they have been found in systematical diggings in Capidava; only one milestone, found in Mangalia, is included for a longer period into the collection of Constanța museum¹.

1. Fragment of a lime milestone (inv. 43454), discovered in Cheia². Sizes: h.= 0,48 m; d. = 0,25 m, letters height = 6-7,2 cm (Fig. 1 a-b).

There are preserved partially the last three lines from the text, with letters evidently cut, but less accurate letters. On the first line, the last letter seems to be M, with short median hastae (there is poorly seen the left one in the digging)³.

Few of preserved letters on the 1st line allow us to restore the legate's name, of which we know the end of a *cognomen* in accusative, NVM, followed by a second *cognomen* beginning with M; this reading lead us to the following completion of the text:

[.res]-
[tituerunt per M(arcum)]
[Servilium Fabi]-
[a]num M[aximum]
[l]eg(atum) Aug(usti) [pr(o) pr(aetore)]
m(ilia) p(assuum).

„..... have rebuilt (this road) by care of Marcus Servilius Fabianus Maximus, pretorian rank imperial legate, thousands of steps”.

Therefore, the work was done under the care of an well-known governor of Moesia Inferior, under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, M. Servilius Fabianus Maximus⁴.

¹ Milestones in MINAC collection, including the present unpublished ones, have been recorded in order to include them in CIL XVII, the chapter destined to Moesia Inferior; the study has been made in summer 2007, by a team led by prof. dr. Anne Kolb, from Zürich University, to whom we express our gratitude also on this occasion for the photos of the pieces 1 and 2.

² The milestone was found and donated to MINAC by teacher Anghel Bardac from Grădina village (Constanța county), who offered us the sample in order to be published; we express our gratitude on this occasion.

³ The letter M cut with short median hastae can be seen on the epigraphical monuments in the area dated in the 2nd century A.D., see ISM II, 61, 64, 65, 69, 68 (= ISM III, 198); ISM II, 196 (both forms) etc.; parallel with the median hastae, up to the bottom of the letter M, as appears on other inscriptions, too, in the 3rd century A.D. as well; it is possible that the paleographical letters on the milestone from Cheia to be dated in the 3rd century A.D., without being identified, based on the preserved letters, the name of a governor of the province Moesia Inferior, from the 3rd century A.D.

⁴ THOMASSON 1984, col. 136, nr. 93: A. 162 (162/ 164?); DID II, p. 161-162, n. 194-198; p. 168, n. 230-236 (161-163 A.D.); DORUȚIU-BOILĂ 1992, p. 26-27.

The legate's name is mentioned, in nominative, this time, on a milestone discovered in Sinoe, dated by the name of the two associated emperors, in 162 A.D., milestone with the distance of XIX *m.p.* on it⁵. In this case, it is a milestone placed on the coast road, in an area identified as *vicus Quintionis*⁶, marked also by two other milestones⁷; it is to be added another sample discovered in Histria, but uncertainly dated⁸.

The road on the West-Pontic coast was rebuilt near the city of Callatis, as show us few milestones discovered in 23 August (former Tatlageac), Mangalia and 2 Mai, pieces written in 163 A.D., after a rough draft written in the previous year⁹, without mentioning the name of the governor.

The constructions attested on the coast in 162 A.D. and continued in the following year were done in the same time with those on the Danube *limes*, as an evidence we have the two milestones in the NV area of the province, near Dinogetia, in 162 A.D., and the third one found as well in the North of Dobruja¹⁰, as it is known, on the same road, to the South, a milestone from *Sexaginta Prista* (Ruse)¹¹.

The milestone from Cheia could come from the coast road¹², the „travelling stone“¹³ being well-known in ancient times as well in the modern time. We can't exclude the milestone placement on the secondary road Histria-Capidava¹⁴, which function is supposed to have existed in the 2nd century, as a consequence of a an important *vicus* on its route, *Ulmetum* (Pantelimonul de Sus)¹⁵, without being aware to what extent the road attracted the attention of the imperial authorities at that moment¹⁶.

2. The second milestone holding our attention was discovered in Arsa, near the cemetery in 1994^{*}; the piece, included recently into the MINAC collection (inv. 43455) has a rectangular large sizes basis, the inscription being cut on the upper part of the milestone, which general sizes are: h.=2,31 m; d.=0,36 m; height of the letters = 5-6 cm (Fig 2 a-c).

The lime milestone is a palimpsest, including an older inscription (a) and an newer one (b). The text is erased at the beginning and most at the end of the lines^{**}. There were used again or transformed certain letters on the second inscription, and partially the stone was hammered to be written again; on the 2nd line, the letter S was changed in L; N is smaller in size and inscribed inside O, on the 6th line; M has a different aspect compared to the same letter from the 1st line, on the 7th line, because some previous medial hastae were used again.

a. We can distinguish (sometimes unclearly) from the first inscription the following letters:

the 2nd line, IVS;
the 4th I, AVR, linked;
the 5th I, ANT, linked;
the 6th I, E.O;

⁵ ISM I, 318 (= CIL III, 12514).

⁶ BĂRBULESCU 2001, p. 35-36.

⁷ ISM I, 317 (= CIL III, 12513, 159 A.D.); 322 (CIL III, 12515, Decius).

⁸ ISM I, 319 (M. Aurelius, Caracalla or Elagabalus; uncertain dated in 162 A.D.); HOLLENSTEIN 1975, p. 31, nr. 25 (Antoninus *incertus*).

⁹ ISM III, 195-199; ȘTEFAN 1984, p. 95-107.

¹⁰ ISM V, 256-258; ARICESCU, 1977, p. 158-159.

¹¹ SEURE, RA 2 (1915), p. 181-184, nr. 137; DID, II, p. 161, n. 194; HOLLENSTEIN 1975, p. 29, nr. 8; ȘTEFAN 1984, p. 103, n. 25.

¹² The milestone from Cheia doesn't complete the fragmentary milestones from Histria, ISM I, 316 and mostly 319, as we are tempted to say according to their writing.

¹³ PIPPIDI 1988, p. 166-172.

¹⁴ DID II, the map II; SUCEVEANU 1977, fig. 3; PANAITE 2006, p.60.

¹⁵ ISM V, p. 78-116, nr. 57-91. As regarding the Roman epoch discoveries from Cheia, mainly coins, see BĂRBULESCU 2001, p. 44, n. 136 and p. 292, nr. 26; TALMAȚCHI, BARDAC 2006, p. 377-380.

¹⁶ OPRİȘ, POPESCU 1986, p. 190, n. 3; on the milestone from Capidava it is mentioned III *m.p.* and the initial placement is unknown; the authors suppose a connection between this milestone and the secondary road through Băltăgești to Tomis or Histria.

^{*} The discovery of the piece was reported to us by our departed colleague N. Cheluță-Georgescu, with whom we went to Arsa in 1994.

^{**} The milestone - fallen down on the ground- was preserving the text better on this side.

the 7th l, TV(L)L, linked?
 the 8th l, EGA (the last two letters used in text *b*).
 the 9th l, M (unclearly written).

The letters parts lead us an inscription from Severi time; the text size and the arrangement on lines of the preserved letters don't allow a restoration of it, according to the formula seen on the milestones from Septimius Severus time¹⁷, suggesting us a shorter imperial name, possibly of Caracalla or Elagabalus^{***}.

b. On the other hand, the second inscription can be completed as follows:

1	Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) [M(arco)] Iul(io) Phi- lippo Pio [Fe- lici invic[(to)]
5	Aug(usto) et M(arco) I[ul(io)] [P]hilippo no- bilissimo Caes(ari).

„To the emperor Caesar Marcus Iulius Phillipus, Pius, Felix, unvanquished August and to Marcus Iulius Philippus the noblest Caesar”.

The text could allow us the identification of a fragmentary milestone from Capidava, uncertainly dated under the common rule of Philip the Arab and his son¹⁸, piece on which, similar as here, there isn't mentioned the name of the governor who ordered the restoration of the road¹⁹.

As regarding a hammered milestone found in Topalu, on the same Danube road, after the initial reading *Philliippo*, it was assumed that the legate who ordered the milestone to be built, Sallius Aristaenetus, functioned in Moesia Inferior during Philip the Arab²⁰.

As the identification of the above mentioned governor with a famous person attested by literary, epigraphical and numismatic sources, during Caracalla it is more real²¹, the legation of C.Sallius Aristaenetus in Moesia Inferior was dated during Elagabalus period²².

M. Iulius Philippus is mentioned together with his son, on the Northern area of the province Moesia Inferior, two times in *regio Histriae*²³, then on the Danube *limes*, possibly at Troesmis²⁴, as we have seen, the same at Capidava. Farther on, to the South, at Sacidava (Muzait-Dunăreni), a dedication is addressed to the Caesar M. Iulius Philippus by *cohors I Cilicum* in the name of the governor C. Prastina Messalinus²⁵.

¹⁷ The letters identified on the 7th line of the first inscription don't ensure a clear reading of the name of the legate of Moesia Inferior, C. Ovinus Tertullus (198-201 A.D.); for the milestones raised by his care, see HOLLENSTEIN 1975, p. 30-31. BĂRBULESCU-MUNTEANU, RĂDULESCU 1980, p. 140-148, nr. 1-3; IIDEM 1991, p. 123-126, nr. 1; BĂRBULESCU, CÂTEIA 1998, p. 123-124, n. 41-52.

^{***} There are not known in the region certain milestones from these emperors periods, the pieces being rather dated during Marcus Aurelius time, see ISM I, 319; ISM III, 196; but see in the following the notes 21 and 22.

¹⁸ ISM V, 9 (also to be dated: Maximin the Thracian and his son Verus).

¹⁹ For the governors between 244-247, see THOMASSON 1984, col. 145, nr. 137 (Severianus-A 244) and nr. 138 (Prast(ina) Messallinus, 244-247 A. D.).

²⁰ BĂRBULESCU, RĂDULESCU 1993, p. 197-206, fig. 1-3; BĂRBULESCU, CÂTEIA 1998, p. 125-126, n. 70.

²¹ PETOLESCU, Ann.Ép., 1994, 1532; Idem 1996, p. 409-410, nr. 691.

²² PETOLESCU 1994 and 1996 suggests Elagabalus period. To be added PUECH 2002, p. 137-138, n. 39, cf. AVRAM, *Prosopographia* nr. 609; see as well the nr. 833 bis.

²³ ISM I, 349 (*Vicus Secundini*, 246 A.D.); ISM V, 124 (years 244-246 A.D.).

²⁴ ISM V, 152 (years 244-245 A.D.; possible completion); 153 (inscription from the middle of the 3rd century A.D. with hammered imperial names).

²⁵ SCORPAN 1980, p. 204-205, nr. 3, fig. 5-6. Ann.Ép. 1981, 743; PETOLESCU 2001-2002, p. 287, nr. 892.

The Carpi attack against Dacia in 245-247 A.D.²⁶, had consequences in Moesia Inferior²⁷, even they didn't aim directly this province, as the inscriptions dedicated the two regents prove as well.

If in Thracia, the effort of building roads in the years mentioned before is more obvious²⁸, in Moesia Inferior this effort seems to be diminished (maybe precisely because of the Carpi danger), activity attested now by the milestone from Arsa and uncertainly by that from Capidava.

The milestone from Arsa could come from the coast road, rebuilt in different stages around Callatis, as we had the opportunity to mention²⁹.

It is possible that the ancient road route to go to the West, rounding the existent lagoons at that time, that meaning a common route with the *semita* Callatis-Tropaeum Traiani³⁰, situation when the milestone from Arsa³¹ could be important for both roads³².

The few milestones built at Tomis between the rule of Gordian the 3rd and Claudius the 2nd Gothic³³, during the empire crisis, of that long *bellum Scythicum*, beginning in 238 A.D. ³⁴, shows us, beside other discoveries in the province, that there were enough the rebuilding moments, now confirmed as well by the milestone from Arsa. This one was placed between 244-247, when Philippus II had only the title of Caesar³⁵, together with other monuments in Moesia Inferior³⁶.

3. Fragmentary lime milestone discovered in Capidava, in 1999, in the diggings situated in the Eastern *intra muros* area inside one of C10 building walls³⁷. In order to used again, the piece back side was cut, so it had the aspect of 0,20 m thick plate. The milestone preserved height reaches 0,67 –0,70 m, d= 0,33 m; the letters height= 3,5-5 cm (inv. 43459). (Fig. 3 a-b).

The text, set on nine lines is fragmentary preserved, on the left side, and some lines-3,4-6-are totally or partially erased. Some letters are poorly printed (or they were erased later on). The milestone is a palimpsest with an inscription from the Tetrarchy period, *a*, written uncertain on an older text, *a'*, the stone was used again later on during Constantine the Great and Licinius, the inscription *b*.

As regarding text *a*, it was assigned to Diocletian based on the paleographical letters, on the general aspect, as well as on the recognition of the imperial name „[Au]re[[io] Val]l[er]io)", with the letters RE erased on the 2nd line, to copy the *praenomen* C on the inscription *b*, and the same, L changed in FL linked.

It is- also- added, the identification at the beginning of the 7th line of the letter A with a middle broken hasta (as in the entire text, and that brings the text unity)* and after two erased letters, there can be partially seen R and I (the latter was changed further

²⁶ RUSCU 2002, p. 150-158 (the subject bibliography).

²⁷ DID II, p. 240; POENARU BORDEA 1971, p. 91-103; PETOLESCU 1987, p. 57; MITREA, RĂDULESCU 1975, p. 125-148 ; see also GEROV 1963, p. 127-146.

²⁸ HOLLENSTEIN 1975, p. 35-36, nr 43-46, the milestones don't include the name of the young Philippus; GERASIMOVA TOMOVA, HOLLENSTEIN 1978, p. 102 (nine milestones dated 244-247).

²⁹ *Supra*, n. 9. For Callatis see *infra*, n. 54 and 55 (Vama Veche).

³⁰ For *semita* Callatis - Tropaeum Traiani-Durostorum, see BĂRBULESCU - MUNTEANU, RĂDULESCU 1980, p. 146-148, nr. 3, fig. 3 a-b. Add PANAITE 2006, p. 60-68; PANAITE, ALEXANDRESCU 2008. We express our gratitude to our colleagues A. Panaite and Cr. G. Alexandrescu for the information offered.

³¹ For Arsa see BĂRBULESCU 2001, p. 67, 160 and the table from p. 296, nr. 110.

³² In this way, IONESCU, PAPUC 2005, p. 91, n. 569.

³³ BĂRBULESCU, RĂDULESCU 1991, p. 126-141; BĂRBULESCU, CĂTEIA 1998, p. 125-127.

³⁴ SHA, *Vita Maximini et Balbini*, 16, 3. DORUȚIU-BOILĂ 1975, p. 635-642; BOUNEGRU 2003, p. 98-102.

³⁵ Philippus Iunior is named *Augustus* in the summer of 247, see, PIR², IV, 3 I 461-462 (L. PETERSEN); LORIOT 1975, p. 792-793; TUDOR 1976, p. 90.

³⁶ DID II, p. 239-241; SUCEVEANU, BARNEA 1991, p. 33-34.

³⁷ The milestone appeared at 1,5 m from the entrance in C10, near the NV wall of the room, used again as basis for a partition wall. As regarding the archaeological context, see COVACEF 2000, p. 26, nr. 31.

* Thus the letter A appears on the lines 2, 7 and 9.

on), this aspect allows us to read [G]a[le]ri[o]**, mentioning the last letters of the 7th line are uncertain, they were written again on inscription *b*.

On the 8th line there can be seen four vertical hastae on the stone, followed by the well-known abbreviation COS. The hastae could indicate the number IV*** from an older inscription *a'*, where there were mentioned, according to the frequent order, *trib.pot//IV, cos.[...]*; the imperial salutation appear often on milestones until to the middle of the 3rd century, without being mentioned usually later on³⁸.

The letters COS seem to be also more accurated comparing to those on the previous line (or this is to be own that on this line probably there were copied less words), without excluding the letters belonging to the inscription *a*, as we 'll mention further on.

Based on this analysis and on the samples from the Tetrarchy period (293-305 A.D.) in Scythia, the inscription *a***** can be completed as follows:

- 1 Imp(eratoribus) C[ae]s(aribus) C(aio) Au-
[re]l(io) Val[(erio) Diocletiano]
e[t] M(arco) Aur(elio) Val(erio) Maximiano]
P(ii)s F(elicibus) inv[ic]is Aug(ustis)]
- 5 [et M(arco) Fl(avio) Valerio]
[Constantio et C(aio)]
[G]a[le]ri[o] Val(erio) Maximiano]
III con(n)s(ulibus) [nob(ilissimis)]
Caes(aribus).

Inscription *b*.

- 1 Imp(eratores) C[ae]s(ares)]
C(aius) Fl(avius) Val[(erius) Constantinus]
e[t] Val(erius) Licin(ianus) Licinius]
P(ii) F(elices) inv[ic]is Aug(usti) et Fl(avius)]
- 5 [Val(erius) Crispus et Lici]-
[nia]nus [Licinius Iun(ior) et
Fl(avius) C[ae]l(audius) Constantinus]
[nob(ilissimi)]
Caes[(ares)].

As regarding the inscription *b*****, there were used again in the text the common parts: there can be seen poorly on the 1st line the letter P linked with the median vertical left hasta inside the letter M; C was written again in an angular manner. The same letter C can be seen as well on the 2nd line, written again on a part previously erased, and FL appears linked. On the 4th line, the first P hardly can be distinguished, and inside the broken part after the second P, only the basis of some vertical median hasta of an F letter can be clearly seen. At the beginning of the 6th line, the letter is unclear (F or P or only marks on the stone), but, there can be seen after 2-3 erased letters, N (poorly) and VS clearly, that showing us that the text *b* was written in nominative, offering as well an evidence to complete the text. The letters at the end of

** The end of the name *Galerius* is not preserved, and its completion in dative was done as consequence of the majority of the known samples, though there are written texts in nominative in the same period, see IGLR, 84=ISM III, 196 b; IGLR, 230 and some Tetrarchic inscriptions (*infra*, n. 48-50).

*** The consulate appears more rarely mentioned on milestones, though see *supra*, n. 5 and 9; ISM V, 1 (160 A.D.); 96 (200 A.D.); 223 (237 A.D.), 250 bis (236 A.D.) and other samples.

³⁸ IGLR, *passim*. For the milestones, see more recently CIL XVII/2 and XVII/4, *passim*.

**** Due to the different length of the names, we must admit a variable number of letters on lines, the different use of the abbreviations and probably some links.

***** It is possible the imperial names to be written abbreviated and not complete written here, mentioned similarly on some milestones.

the 7th line are unclear, their interpretation is still a hypothesis: FLC? On the 8th line it can be seen after COS, the basis of a vertical median hasta slightly inclined, probably from N, and on the 9th line it can be seen inside the broken area the upper part of the letters ES (the last one maybe double).

Thus, we notice, that in the text *b* there were used parts of the old inscription and there were preserved sometimes its scraps, situation frequently seen on the milestones in the province³⁹.

The inscription *a* from Capidava belonged to an ample series of a milestones if the first Tetrarchy period, illustrated on the road to the Scythian *limes* by the milestones found in Rasova,⁴⁰ Carsium⁴¹, Arrubium⁴² and Dinogetia⁴³, but also placed on the coast road, on the central-Dobrujan route, and more recently on the secondary roads, too⁴⁴.

As regarding the same inscription, we add the median hastae at the beginning of the 8th line could mention the IVth consulate⁴⁵ of the two *Caesares*-M. Flavius Constantius and C. Galerius Valerius Maximianus, previously mentioned in the text, owned by both in 302 A.D.⁴⁶; it is possible that their common consulate determined this mention, thus we are meeting an exacte dating of the text *a*, with the caution already expressed of the lack of analogies in the province Scythia for the discussed period⁴⁷.

The above mentioned date corresponds to a very intense building stage on the Scythian *limes*, at the end of the 3rd century-the beginning of the 4th century A.D., illustrated archaeologically and epigraphically, for the second situation, as we can see the Tetrarchic inscriptions on the occasion of some cities rebuilding, discovered at Sexaginta Prista⁴⁸, Transmarisca⁴⁹, Durostorum⁵⁰ and Halmyris, the last dated between 301-305 A.D.⁵¹.

The inscription *b* from Capidava doesn't have added, as usually, the formula *Domini nostri*, if it wasn't possible to have been written on the broken part of the stone.

The text *b*, written in nominative is similar to a milestone, unknown source, dated between 313-323 A.D.⁵².

To the period when the born nr 4 from Capidava was supposed to have been written, meaning the 1st of March 317, the date when there were proclaimed the three *Caesares* - Crispus, Licinius *filius* and Constantinus II, until the moment when Licinius *pater* was eliminated, in 324⁵³, it is known a milestone discovered in Mangalia⁵⁴; we add to this one another milestone discovered on the same coast road, in Vama Veche⁵⁵, where the name of Licinius who suffered *damnatio memoriae* was erased (as well as on the previous piece).

³⁹ We mention only some examples, IGLR, 82, 84, 167, 190, 276 etc.

⁴⁰ IGLR, 190: a) 293-305; b) 367-375 A.D.

⁴¹ IGLR, 230: a) 200 (= ISM V, 95); b) 293-305; IGLR, 231: a) Gordianus III (= ISM V, 98); b) 293-305; 232: a) 293-305; b - not dated; c) 323-337 A.D.

⁴² IGLR, 239: 293-305 A.D.

⁴³ IGLR, 240: 293-305 A.D.

⁴⁴ BĂRBULESCU, CĂTEIA 1997, p. 193-197; ZAHARIADE 2006, p. 43-49. About the two milliaries from the Tetrarchic period, discovered in M. Kogălniceanu (Constanța county), see Pontica 42(2009) (forthcoming). To be added the milestone near Crângu (former Caramat): Gr. Tocilescu, Mss 5312, p. 178-179 and 194; see now PANAITTE, ALEXANDRESCU 2008 (which date the milestone during the Tetrarchic period; the presentation of the milestones of this period in the same article).

⁴⁵ Usually, the numbers are placed according the indicated function-COS; there are also situations when the numbers of the archaeological context are situated before or there are used both methods, see ISM V, 8 landmark from Capidava and 57, identical sample from Ulmetum etc.

⁴⁶ CAGNAT 1914, p. 236; DEGRASSI 1952, p. 77, nr. 1055.

⁴⁷ IGLR, *passim*; though, see the notice COS on the milestones in other areas, CIL XVII/2, 613, 368, 186 (the period of the 1st Tetrarchy).

⁴⁸ Ann.Ép. 1966, 357 (298-299 A.D.).

⁴⁹ ILS, 641 (294-299 A.D.).

⁵⁰ Ann.Ép. 1936, 10 (292-299 A.D.).

⁵¹ ZAHARIADE 1994, p. 173-186; ZAHARIADE 1997, p. 228-236 (= Ann.Ép. 1997, 318).

⁵² IGLR, 274.

⁵³ CAGNAT 1914, p. 239, 242 (307-323); LIEBENAM 1909, p. 120 (308-324). For the imperial cognomen Licinianus written completely, see IGLR 237; add also 170 (the erased name); see also CIL XVII/2, 608, 610, 293 and 183 a (Licinianus Iunior).

⁵⁴ BĂRBULESCU-MUNTEANU, RĂDULESCU 1980, p. 151-155, nr. 5 (317-324).

⁵⁵ IGLR, 108 (307-323 A.D.); *supra* n. 54; the name of Licinius is erased also on other monuments, see mostly IGLR, 170 (Tropaeum Traiani).

The names of Licinus (r.3) together with Crispus and Licinius Iunior (r. 5-6) are erased (the last one partially) on the milestone discovered in Capidava; in the same time, probably, the double letters referring to the two *Augusti* (l. 4) are reduced to one.

The milestone from Capidava, together with the fragmentary one from Troesmis, dated between 308-323⁵⁶ indicate the reconstruction of the road on the *limes*, otherwise known in the whole province of Scythia and continued during the Constantinian period⁵⁷.

The milestones discovered in Capidava until now, dated in 159 A.D., then a sample from the middle of the 3rd century (as we have mentioned, probably from Philip the Arab⁵⁸) and now the milestone from the first Tetrarchy and the Constantinian period, underline the well-known importance of this centre on the Danube *limes*⁵⁹, centre situated on a trade and strategic, route constantly repaired in the 2nd-4th century; Capidava was, in the same period, a connection, by the secondary roads⁶⁰, with the West-Pontic cities Tomis and Histria.

4. The milestone discovered occasionally in Mangalia (Callatis), included for a long time in MINAC collection, inv nr. 47*. Both the upper part and the lower parts of the milestone are broken, the actual sizes are: h.= 0,37 **; d. = 0,28 m; the letters height = 4,5-5 cm (Fig. 4 a-c).

The stone is eaten away considerably, some poorly carved letters hardly can be distinguished, others, on the 2nd-3rd line, were carved deeper, probably when the inscription was written again.

The milestone is a palimpsest, with a fragmentary text preserved on six lines, still having between few letters to 10-11 letters. Thus, on 1st line there can be seen the letter M, followed by A; on the 2nd line F was transformed in P, L has the lower line inclined, and C is rectangular in shape with opened hastae; the 2nd line final is unclear, B (or S?) can be seen and hastae traces. In the end of the 3rd line, AVG can be distinguished, as well as an A inclined to the left, V better carved and G as well. On the 4th line, the first preserved letter could be T, then a broken part, it is to be seen M, probably linked with A***. On the 5th line, the letters NS have a special shape, probably a consequence of using the old hastae; then letters traces are to be seen and on the end of the line there are two vertical hastae. On the 6th line, only the upper part of some letters is still preserved, among which there are to be distinguished unclearly ET GA... and letters traces.

The milestone from Mangalia offers us some hints to include the last text among those of the first Tetrarchy (293-305 A.D.):

.....
Ma[ximiano]
Piis Felici[(bus)]
invictis Aug(ustis)
[e]t M(arco) [Fl(avio) Val(erio)]
[C]ons[tantio]
et Ga[lerio Val(erio)]
[Maximiano]

⁵⁶ IGLR, 237 (308-323 A.D.).

⁵⁷ HOLLENSTEIN 1975, p. 39-40; BĂRBULESCU, CÂTEIA 1997, p. 195.

⁵⁸ OPRIȘ, POPESCU 1986, p. 189-190; ISM V, 9 and *supra* n. 18.

⁵⁹ FLORESCU 1958, *passim*; ISM V, p. 30-76; IGLR, p. 230-236; SUCEVEANU 1977, *passim*. ZAHARIADE 1988, p.123-125; ZAHARIADE, GUDEA, 1997, p.79; ZAHARIADE 2006, *passim*.

⁶⁰ A recent discussion about the categories of roads at FODORAN 2006, p. 17-50; PANAITI 2006, p. 57-70.

* The piece evidence card was made on the 5th December 1960 by Adrian Rădulescu, indicating also older inventory numbers of the piece (191; 33177), evidence the milestone was included in the collection of Constanța museum for a long time; the date when the piece entered in the collections, 1956, corresponds to the museum reorganisation.

** The same source defines that the „both the upper and the lower parts of the milestone are broken”. As the card has enclosed a photo identical with the actual stone situation, we believe the indicated height of 0,940 m is not real. As far as we know, the piece doesn't complete neither of the already published milestones in the area, though, according to the fragmentary aspect of the inscription, this is not to be excluded for the future.

*** The left hasta of the letter M is deeper, being probably a letter not mentioned, written at the beginning as CA.

[nob(ilissimis) Caes(aribus).

According to the letters and the name position in the text, this one seems to belong to the *Caesar* M. Flavius Valerius Constantius, mentioned both with *praenomen* on a milestone of the same period****; mentioning again the present milliary, the name of the other *Caesar*, Galerius, on the 6th line is not enough clear.

We are also interested by the imperial epitheticals-*p̄ii felices* (in dative), written almost *in extenso*, as there can be seen on some samples in the 3rd century A.D.⁶¹, maybe an evidence of the fact that we are in front of an inscription of this period, partially used, without having enough elements to date it exactly.

We mentioned previously the milestone discovered in an unknown area, on which there was identified an inscription (*a*) dated during Marcus Aurelius time (163 A.D.) (found also on some milestones in the area of the city of Callatis) and another text (*b*) dated during Diocletian's period, with a more accurate writing than the present one and with the imperial names written in nominative, evidence the work was done by imperial command⁶².

The milestone above mentioned has some paleographical similarities with the inscription on the milestone found in Dorobanțu⁶³ and, of course with other inscriptions of the same period.

The part of the road in the neighbourhood of the city of Callatis attracted the attention of the imperial authorities in a first stage of Marcus Aurelius period, when the building efforts aimed a section of about 14 km, along the coast (between the villages 23 August and 2 Mai)⁶⁴ and less in the 3rd century A.D. (Philip the Arab), as the milestone of Arsa shows us, consequences of very well known causes; new works to restore the coast road are better done during the first Tetrarchy, by the two milestones from Mangalia previously mentioned; these works were continued during Constantine's period on the section between Callatis-Vama Veche, where also come from other two milestones⁶⁵.

The four milestones above discussed as well as other samples⁶⁶, complete a well-known description of the itineraries of the ancient roads and their restoring stages in the area, from the Mouths of the Danube and in the West-Pontic area⁶⁷.

The discovery of numerous *milliaria* in the last decades in the North area of Moesia Inferior, later on Scythia leads to a more ample discussion (taking into consideration all the categories of sources), on the Roman communication ways in the province and in a larger region⁶⁸.

**** Studying the rests of the letters on the 1st row indicating Maximianus and the two *Augusti* mentioned in the text (on the 2nd and the 3rd row), it is less probably to speak about another *Caesar* with a similar name: Constantinus the IInd, Constans or Constantius II, the sons of Constantine the Great, see as well *infra* n. 62.

⁶¹ BĂRBULESCU-MUNTEANU, RĂDULESCU 1980, p. 148-151, nr. 4; IIDEM 1991, p. 132-136, nr. 3: two milestones from Tomis, during Valerianus and Gallienus period, on which the written words are similar: „*p̄iis felic[is] sic invictis Aug(ustis)*”.

⁶² IGLR, 84= ISM III, 196; ȘTEFAN 1984, p. 95-100, nr. 1, fig. 1-5; Ann.Ép. 1985, 757: „*et M(arcus) / [Fla(vius) Val(erius) Constant]iu[s]...*”

⁶³ IGLR, 83 (293-305).

⁶⁴ *Supra* n. 9; ȘTEFAN 1984, p. 105.

⁶⁵ BĂRBULESCU-MUNTEANU, RĂDULESCU 1980, p. 151-155, nr. 5; IGLR, 108 (307-323).

⁶⁶ To be added other milestones already published: two samples from Carsium, cf. NICOLAE 1995-1996, p. 143, n. 76, pl. 5, 1A and B; pl. 5, 2; NICOLAE, NICOLAE 2004-2005, p. 393-394 and p. 402, pl. VII. For some unpublished pieces, see BĂRBULESCU, CÂTEIA 1998, p. 127, n. 89 and *supra* n. 44 (Mihail Kogălniceanu).

⁶⁷ BARNEA 1997, p. 29-43; BĂRBULESCU, CÂTEIA 1997, p. 183-198; Eaedem 1998, p. 119-129.

⁶⁸ *Supra*, n. 1; ZAHARIADE 2006, p. 43-49; PANAITTE 2006, p. 57-70; PANAITTE, ALEXANDRESCU 2008; see also MROZEWICZ [2004], p. 345-359.

EXCAVATIONS IN THE ROMAN NECROPOLIS OF TOMIS

Constantin BĂJENARU,
Cătălin DOBRINESCU

Abstract

The archaeological salvage excavations on the area at 22, George Enescu Str. in Constanța have evidenced 16 graves from Roman and Roman-Byzantine epochs (12 from the 2nd-3rd cent. and 4 from the 5th-6th cent. A.D.). Research in this new sector of Tomitan necropolises has shown that over the main nucleus from the 2nd cent. and the first part of the 3rd cent. another one was applied (maybe beginning with the last decades of the 4th cent.), but more rarefied.

THE STONE ROMAN COFFINS DISCOVERED AT APULUM

Radu OTA

Summary

The development of the Roman cities around *municipium Aurelium/colonia Aurelia* and *municipium Septimium/colonia Nova*, shows us the opulence of the citizens' life which is evidenced by a lot of artefacts found every year on the occasion of the archaeological excavations or the accidental findings. The author talks about several stone Roman coffins found in the old collections of the Museum from Alba Iulia. He also describes two babies' coffins found in a good state of preservation. The others are in a fragmentary state, only one being preserved intact. We don't know the spot where these sepulchral stones were found, but we suppose that the majority of these artefacts were found in the Roman cemetery situated between two Roman cities, precisely in the spot called „Podei”, and the other burial area, which is also divided into three zones called „Stația de salvare”, „Stadion” and „Profi”. According to the theory concerning the existence of the third necropolis near the southern limit of the *municipium Aurelium/colonia Aurelia*, elaborated by M. Drâmbărean, the author agrees with this new hypothesis. Today this last necropolis is flooded by the Mureș river. Finally, the author speaks about the theme of the hands stretched to the sky, appearing on each face of an acroteria. It is probably the single funerary artefact on which we found this funerary symbol in Roman province Dacia. What is the significance of this funerary symbol? This theme is explained by M. Bărbulescu, in the second edition of the book „Interferențe spirituale în Dacia romană” (Spiritual interferences in Roman Dacia)⁷⁶. He explains that this symbol shows us the pain related to the early disappearance of someone. The dedicants protest against the deities who have taken their relative so early. In other cases, the relative asks the deities to revenge the premature death of a person.

⁷⁶ BĂRBULESCU 2003, p. 249-250.

BONE OBJECTS FROM DUROSTORUM. I.

Dan ELEFTERESCU

Abstract

Subject of the present paper is a number of 600 pieces, their utmost majority from Roman epoch, made of bone, horn and ivory. The artefacts were found in the Roman settlement at km 132 DN 3A, Bucharest-Constanța (site code 62547.01), having a profound workshop character, certified by collecting thousands of little pieces made of clay, metal, bone and glass, many of them rejected. A large number of ovens and pits with workshop rests were also found. Most pieces date to the settlement maximum activity period (2nd-first half of the 3rd cent. A.D.).

The simple shape of most pieces in our collection is making master „stamp“ difficult to be recognized. Reduced sizes and stable physical resistance, determining a possible and easy economic transport on long distances, the social-economic environment they are coming from (in which artifacts are strictly functional and occasionally can have numerous secondary functions – as we consider that the more a society is primitive or rural, the more usual pieces, and not only, various functionality increases), and not last, the actual research level have determined us not to go beyond the limits of a simple catalogue. For the same reasons we shall not discuss these artifacts processing and trade but only strictly regarding the pieces in the catalogue and only as far as new and exact information is given.

As the paper is large, it will be published in two successive volumes of the yearbook.

In the first part we shall deal, apart from some exceptions, with objects considered to be from *mundus muliebris*.

We consider a discussion to be premature after presenting only half the material and before concluding we mention that the monetary discoveries situation in the area is shortly presented at the beginning.

UN PROBLEME DE GEOPOLITIQUE DE LA POLITIQUE DANUBIENNE DU CONSTANTIN LE GRAND (324-337): LA RECONQUETE ET LA DOMINATION DE LA DACIE MERIDIONALE

Vasile MĂRCULEȚ

Mots clef: Constantin le Grand, la Dacie méridionale, Brazda lui Novac de Nord (Le Sillon de Novac de Nord), Visigoths, Taïfales, Sarmathes argaragantes, Sarmathes limigantes, ripa Gothica, Sucidava, Constantiniana Daphne, limes Transalutanus, limes transdanubien, foedus, foederati.

La victoire décisive de Constantin le Grand (306-337), *augustus en pars Occidentis* contre Licinius (308-324), l'empereur de la partie Orientale de l'Empire Romain, de l'an 324, avait mener au plan politique, aux mutations fondamentales dans le cadre de l'État romain: l'instauration de la monarchie de type orientale; le transfère de la capitale de Rome à Constantinople et implicitement *translatio imperii en pars Orientis*; la constitution du première empire chrétien. Au plan de la politique externe, en même temps avec la victoire de Constantin et le transfert de la capitale de l'empire de Rome à Constantinople, la politique danubienne de l'empire recevait des nouvelles valences accordées par le développement substantiel de l'importance géopolitique et stratégiques des territoires du Bas-Danube.

La reconquête de la Dacie méridionale. Environ les années 324/325, on assiste dans la

politique danubienne de l'Empire Romain à l'ouverture d'une nouvelle étape: reprenant l'initiative militaire et politique, Constantin le Grand abandonne la défensive active du Bas-Danube, promovée dans l'intervalle 312-323⁷⁷, en faveur d'une politique offensive de grandes proportions dirigées contre les peuples barbares établies au nord du fleuve, qui par leurs incursions répétées au sud du Danube, représentaient une permanente menace pour les provinces nord-balkaniques de l'empire, y compris même pour la nouvelle capitale. Dans cette étape, le rôle déterminant dans l'imposition de la politique de l'empire au nord du Danube est revenu au facteur militaire. L'offensive romaine – précédée et annoncée d'une puissante riposte donnée à l'invasion des Gothes dans l'an 323, qui conduit les forces impériales jusqu'à la plaine valaque, où ils écrasent les Germaniques⁷⁸ – qui avait mener à la réinclusion dans les frontières de l'Empire Romain de la Dacie méridionale, depuis les régions du Banat et jusqu'aux bouches du Danube et le bord du Tyras (Nistre), après une moitié de siècle de son abandon.

La nouvelle politique danubienne de l'Empire Romain enrégistrait un moment de pointe dans l'an 326, matérialisé par une ample campagne militaire entreprise au nord du Danube. L'action de force romaine a eu comme objectif l'apport à l'obéissance des peuples récalcitrants barbares de la région, fait confirmé par quelques sources tardives, inspirées, certainement, des autres plus anciennes. «*Pendant cette année – relate le chroniqueur byzantin Théophanes Confessor (le VIII^e siècle) – le grand Constantin est parti avec l'armée contre les Germaniques (les Taïfales, n.n.), les Sarmathes et les Gothes et a remporté une victoire solide à l'aide de la croix; et après qu'il les a dévastés, il les a emmenés finalement à l'esclavage*»⁷⁹. Des informations pareilles ont été prises après et transmises aussi par un autre chroniqueur byzantin Georgios Kedrenos (les XI^e-XII^e siècles), mais qui date la campagne romaine en Dacie dans l'an 328⁸⁰.

Les sources en discussion nous permettent, parmi les autres, même la poursuite aproximative de l'itinéraire suivi par les forces romaines. Conformément à celles-ci nous considérons que, déclanchée dans la zone de l'actuel Banat, la campagne s'achevait quelque part dans les régions méridionales de la Moldavie, probablement dans les territoires du nord des bouches du Danube, contrôlés par les Visigothes. Nous tirons aussi la conclusion, comme nous l'avons fait aussi avec autre occasion, qu'après les succès militaire enrégistré par ses forces, l'Empire Romain s'est assuré, autant *la domination sur les territoires du droit de l'Alutus (l'Olt)*, mais aussi la prééminence incontestable dans les rapports avec les Visigothes⁸¹. Ainsi, après environ une moitié de siècle depuis leur abandon, les régions méridionales des anciennes provinces romaines la Dacie Apulensis et la Dacie Malvensis revenaient dans la compomence de l'État romain.

L'action militaire de l'an 326 a été suivie toute de suite par des consistentes démarches diplomatique, subordonnées au même objectif: la faiblesse au masimum des barbares qui contrôlaient les régions de la rive gauche du Bas-Danube en vue de la facilitation de la reconquête totale de ceux-ci. Dans ce but, aucun moyen n'a pas été omis par la diplomatie impériale pour l'atouchement de l'objectif politique-territorial suivi. Par suite, ont été investi des grandes sommes d'argent et des dons en quantité pas du tout négligeable destinées à acheter des dirigeants de quelques groupements barbares, pour qu'ils soient jettés après l'un contre l'autre pour s'annihiler réciproquement. Se rapportant à ces actions de la diplomatie constantinopolitaine, le chroniqueur Léon Grammaticus (le X^e siècle) consigne que «*de ces pierres précieuses, l'empereur [Constantin] a fait un objet de parure et l'a envoyé aux peuples de delà du Danube, écrivant sur lui: «Seulement pour les plus appliqué». Cet objet est devenu pour eux une occasion des massacres, à cause des mots écrits sur lui*»⁸². Faisant abstraction de la forme

⁷⁷ Pour la politique danubienne de Constantin le Grand pendant la période 312-323, voire: BARNEA, ILIESCU 1982, p. 95-107; MĂRCULEȚ 2002, p. 65-71; MĂRCULEȚ 2003, p. 7-13.

⁷⁸ ZOSIMUS 1837, II, 21, p. 85-86; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 306-307.

⁷⁹ THEOPHANES 1839, A.M. 5818 (A.C. 326); Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 590-591.

⁸⁰ CEDRENUS 1838, p. 517; Cf. *Fontes*, III, p. 120-121: «*Pendant le vingt année [de règne], le pieux Constantine, partant à la lutte contre les Germaniques et les Sarmathes et les Gothes, a obtenu une grande victoire, à l'aide du pouvoir de la croix et a emené ceux-ci finalement au esclavages*».

⁸¹ MĂRCULEȚ 2002, p. 72.

⁸² GRAMMATICUS 1843, p. 86; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 646-647; Cf. CEDRENUS 1838, p. 517; Cf. *Fontes*, III, p. 120-121: «*Des ces pierres précieuses, donc, l'empereur a fait un objet [de parrure] et l'a envoyé aux populations de delà du Danube, gravant sur lui l'inscription «le don appartient à celui les plus grand»; cet objet est devenu pretexte de carnage entre eux à cause de l'inscription*».

métaphorique qui habille le texte, qui paraphrase jusqu'à l'identité celui homérique, les informations qui les contient, nétoyées de leurs fioritures littéraires, nous relèvent un incontestable succès diplomatique romain, daté par les auteurs mentionnés dans l'an 327.

En même temps avec les actions diplomatiques présentées, Constantin a réalisé aussi une série de constructions avec caractère militaire-stratégique sur la ligne du Danube. Parmi celles-ci on compte la construction d'un pont en pierre de grandes dimensions qui liait la forteresse Oescus (Gygen/Ghighen en Bulgarie), de la rive droite du Danube, de la cité Sucidava (Celei) située sur la rive gauche, inauguré avec grand pompe à 5 juillet 328⁸³. L'imposante construction avait, sans doute, le but, autant de faciliter la transition rapide en Dacie des armées impériales, mais aussi pour assurer une permanente et sûre liaison entre l'empire et ses nouvelles acquisitions territoriales situés au nord du Danube. Conformément à ces constatations, nous tirons la conclusion que, la construction du pont de Oescus-Sucidava représente la confirmation certaine du fait qu'à la date de sa construction les territoires du sud de la Dacie, de l'ouest de l'Olt étaient entrés sous la domination ferme de l'Empire Romain.

Une fois achevés les préparatifs présentés, Constantin a repris les opérations de reconquête de la toute Dacie méridionale⁸⁴. Une nouvelle campagne militaire était entreprise au nord du fleuve par les forces impériales pendant la deuxième moitié de l'an 328. Dirigée avant tout contre les Visigothes de la Plaine Valaque et du sud de la Moldavie, les plus dangereux et les plus puissants ennemis de l'empire du Bas-Danube, la campagne romaine de l'an 328 achevait l'action de reconquête de la Dacie méridionale. «Constantin le pieux – relate Théophanes Confessor – a passé le Danube, après qu'il a construit à travers celui-ci un pont en pierre, et il a asservi les Scythes (les Visigothes, n.n.)»⁸⁵.

Les informations des chroniqueurs byzantins, prises comme nous avons déjà souligné des sources plus anciennes, qui font référence à l'action romaine de reconquête de la Dacie méridionale, nous permettent de tirer la conclusion que celle-ci s'est réalisée en deux étapes distinctes: a) dans une première étape consommée entre les années 324/325-326, l'Empire Romain s'est assuré la souveraineté sur les régions méridionales du droit de l'Olt et de la zone du Banat actuel, des régions contrôlées par les Taïfales et les Sarmathes, assurant, en même temps, aussi la prééminence dans les relations avec les Visigothes de la Plaine Valaque et du sud de la Moldavie; b) dans une deuxième étape déroulée entre 327-328, sous l'autorité de l'empire sont entrées les régions de gauche du Danube, respectivement du Sud de la Valachie et de la Moldavie actuelle, contrôlées par les Visigothes. Ainsi, au bout de quelques grandes opérations militaires et des démarches politiques-diplomatiques couronnées de succès, étendues pendant les ans 324/325-328, l'Empire Romain réussissait englober sous ses dominations la totalité des régions de la rive gauche du Danube, rivéraines au fleuve, de l'aval de son confluent avec Sava ou la Tise et jusqu'au bord du Nistre.

La reconquête de la Dacie méridionale par Constantin le Grand trouve sa confirmation totale dans quelques sources écrites de l'époque. Nous retenons parmi celles-ci l'affirmation que l'empereur Julien l'Apostate (361-363) attribue au Constantin pendant une rencontre imaginaire avec les empereurs morts. À cette occasion, Constantine aurait affirmé que «par les faits commis contre les usurpateurs je suis au-dessus de Trajan; et je suis dans doute son égale reprenant ses pays qu'il vient de les conquérir avant (la Dacie, n.n.), si non par hasard il vaut mieux regagner une chose que le gagner»⁸⁶.

La consolidation de la domination romaine sur la Dacie méridionale. L'action de reconquête des territoires Nord-danubiens a été suivie par une intense activité constructive, de nature militaire-stratégique, en vue de la consolidation de la présence romaine en Dacie. Pour ce but, Constantin fortifie et élargit le système de fortifications qui flanquait la rive gauche du Danube, quelques-unes restées sous le contrôle de l'empire même après le retrait aurélien. Plus de vingt têtes de ponts, depuis du Banat jusqu'au Danube maritime – Moldova Nouă, Moldova Veche, Putinei, Pojejena, Dierna, Drobeta, Hinova, Desa, Caronini, Gornea, Drencova, Sucidava, Piuia Pietrei, Constantiniana Daphne, Barboși et des autres – sont reconstruites ou construites de nouveau. Aux cités de la rive gauche s'ajoutaient les

⁸³ BARNEA, ILIESCU 1982, p. 107-111; ODAHL 2006, p. 204.

⁸⁴ Cf. TUDOR 1941-1942, p. 134-148.

⁸⁵ THEOPHANES 1839, A.M. 5820 (A.C. 328); Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 590-591.

⁸⁶ *Fontes*, II, p. 30-31/ Împăratul Iulianus.

fortifications insulaires tel que: Ostrovul Corbului, Ostrovul Mare, Ostrovul Banului, ou celles situées à l'intérieur comme Romula (Reșca) ou Pietroasele⁸⁷.

Des puissantes garnisons étaient installées dans les cités de la rive gauche du Danube. Ainsi, à Drobeta avaient la garnison un *cuneus equitum Dalmatarum Divitensium* et un *auxilium primorum Daciscorum*, à Dierna-Zernis était installé un *Praefectus legionis tertiaedecimae Geminae*, et à Sucidava un *Praefectus legionis quintae Macedonicae*, toutes ces unités militaires se trouvant «*sub dispositione viri spectabilis ducis Daciae Ripensis*»⁸⁸. Avec certitude, de la même époque de Constantin le Grande, à Constantiniana Daphne avaient leur garnison deux unités militaires: *Constantini Daphnenses* et *Balistari Daphnenses*, trouvés «*sub dispositione viri illustris magistri militum per Thracias*»⁸⁹.

L'empereur établie comme principales bases de ses futures campagnes en Dacie, trois points importants pour traverser le Danube: Drobeta, Sucidava et Constantiniana Daphne, la nouvelle cité construite par lui près de la confluence de l'Argeș avec le Danube, située devant la cité Transmarisca (Turtucaia-Tutrakan)⁹⁰. Par motifs d'ordre stratégique Sucidava était liée d'Oescus, comme nous l'avons montré, d'un imposant pont en pierre⁹¹. En même temps, la route qui partait de Sucidava vers Romula, et delà plus loin vers la Transylvanie, était refaite dans une partie importante, jusqu'à moins de la limite nordique des possessions impériales⁹². L'intense activité constructive, avec caractère stratégique, entreprise par Constantin le Grand trouve sa réflexion dans quelques sources du temps. Ainsi, l'historien Sextus Aurelius Victor (le IV^e siècle), consigne brièvement mais édifié que «*sur le Danube on a fait un pont; on en a construit en plusieurs lieux, convenablement, des camps fortifiés et des châteaux militaires*»⁹³.

La protection des possessions Nord-danubiennes de l'empire a été assurée par Constantin par un ample système de fortifications formé d'un *vallum* de terre avec une fossé longue d'environ 700 km, connue sous le nom de *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* (Le Sillon de Novac de Nord), qui partait de Drobeta, parcourait l'Olténie et la Valachie, coupait *limes Transalutanus* à Urluieni (le département Argeș) s'arrêtant probablement au camp fortifié de Pietroasele (le département Buzău)⁹⁴. Il est très possible que cette vague aurait en un correspondant même au Sud de la Moldavie, dans toute la portion trouvée entre Siret et le Nistre, probablement ce *vallum* attribué par des spécialistes à Athanarich. La vague a été renforcée avec beaucoup de camps fortifiés comme ceux de Drobeta, Hinova et Pietroasele et des tours d'observation comme celles de Gârjei ou de la colline de Bucovăț, située dans territoire du village Sărbătoarea. Ainsi il naissait un puissant système de fortifications, un véritable *limes transdanubien* qui, après notre avis, représentait la plus avancée ligne de défense de *limes danubien* à proprement parler⁹⁵.

Même si quelques têtes de points situées à l'ouest de Drobeta sont restées au delà du système de fortifications, par la soumission des Sarmathes de la zone de Banat, l'Empire Romain s'assurait la prépondérance même dans cette région. Par suite, quelques spécialistes

⁸⁷ FLORESCU 1972, p. 23-26; TOROPU 1976, p. 23-29; DIACONU 1980, p. 1063-1069; PETOLESCU 2000, p. 325-342; TUDOR 1968, p. 17-79, 289-376; BĂRZU, BREZEANU 1991, p. 191, avec la bibliographie du problème; POPILIAN 2001, p. 608-610.

⁸⁸ *Notitia Dignitatum*, Or. XLII, 12, 16, 24, 28, 37, 39; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 210-213. Pour autres unités militaires qui ont stationnés temporairement à Drobeta, Sucidava ou d'autres centres Nord-danubiens, voir: POPESCU 1976, p. 298-308, 351, 354-356, 359-361, nr. 284-297, 401, 403-406, 413-416; TOROPU 1976, p. 19-23.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, Or. VIII, 45-46; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 208-209.

⁹⁰ Pour la construction de la cité Constantiniana Daphne par Constantin le Grand, voir: PROCOPIUS 1939, IV, 6, en *loc. cit.*, p. 62, 102-103; Cf. MADGEARU 2000, p. 133-136, avec les débats sur la localisation de la cité et la bibliographie du problème.

⁹¹ TUDOR 1934, p. 107-124; TUDOR 1941-1942, p. 134-149; TUDOR, 1966, p. 33-35; TUDOR, 1971, p. 155-192; TUDOR, 1978, p. 416-422; TOROPU 1972, p. 20-32; GHERGHE, AMON 2007, p. 359-363.

⁹² Cf. BĂRLEA 1990, p. 69, où il considère que «*cette route a été refaite jusqu'à Apulum*».

⁹³ VICTOR 2006, XLI, 18: «*Pons per Danubium ductus; castra castellaque pluribus locis commode posita*»; Cf. *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 527, CCLXXVII, 15, anno 328: «*Κωνσταντίνος ὁ ἐὺσεβὴς τὸν Δανούβιον πλειστάκις ἐπέρασεν καὶ γέφυραν αὐτῷ λιθίνην ἐποίησεν*»; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 24-25, 584-585. Pour quelques de ces constructions, voir aussi: PROCOPIUS 1939, IV, 7, en *loc. cit.*, p. 65, 106.

⁹⁴ Cf. ZAHARIADE 1988, p. 39; Cf. TOROPU 1976, p. 28, où il considère que l'empereur Constantin le Grand a construit ou réamanégé seulement la portion d'entre Hinova et *limes Transalutanus*.

⁹⁵ MĂRCULEȚ 2002, p. 75; MĂRCULEȚ 2003, p. 18; Cf. TOROPU 1976, p. 28, où il considère que *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* (*Sillon de Novac de Nord*) a été élevé après 332.

qui se sont occupés de ce problème tirent la conclusion que, «l'empire s'est assuré la possession effective d'une étendue loppin de terre située entre le Danube de Banat et les bouches du Nistre»⁹⁶. Les territoires étendus entre *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* (*Le Sillon de Novac de Nord*), ce *limes transdanubien*, et le Danube, constituant la soi-disante *ripa Gothica*⁹⁷, entrée sous la possession de l'empire, devenaient une véritable *zone tampon* entre l'Empire Romain et *Barbaricum*⁹⁸. Constantinople exerçait aussi même le surveil et un contrôle militaire sur les territoires situés entre *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* (*Le Sillon de Novac de Nord*) et les Carpathes⁹⁹.

Les facteurs qui ont conféré une telle importance à la Dacie méridionale ont été nombreux, mais leur action a été une jumelée convergente. Parmi ceux-ci, le déplacement du centre de poids, économique et politique, de l'État romain en *pars Orientis*, pendant la première moitié du IV^e siècle et *translatio imperii Romani* de Rome sur la rive européenne du Bosphore, à Byzantion-Constantinople (324-330), ont augmenté l'importance stratégique de la frontière sur le Danube, de la confluence avec le Sava jusqu'aux bouches. La garantie de cette defebse éficiente arouvait, ainsi, une importance vitale, autant por la sécurité des provinces nord-balkaniques, mais même pour la capitale de l'empire. L'importance géopolitique des territoires de la rive gauche du fleuve, au sud de l'ancienne Dacie, situés „près du bout «du couloir de la stèppe», cette route parcourue par des envahisseurs nomades” qui, après le passage du Danube, qui „ne représentait pas un obstacle insurmontable”, avaient largement la route à travers les Balkans vers Constantinople¹⁰⁰, a imposé aux autorités impériales une complèxe politique, diplomatique et militaire pour attirer et mentenir ces régions sous son contrôle ou, au moins, dans sphère d'influence de l'empire. Pendant la troisième partie du règne de Constantin le Grand ce contrôle désiré sur la Dacie méridionale avait se transformer, comment on a vu, dans une domination directe de l'empire.

Quelle a été l'organisation donnée par Constantin le Grand aux possessions de l'Empire Romain du sud de la Dacie, nous ne la savons pas exactement, mais une série de chercheurs ont formulé des différentes réponses à ce problème. En ce qui nous concerne, nous considérons qu'elle corresponde à celle suggérée par *Notitia Dignitatum* (le V^e siècle), une source qui nous présente une situation existente dan une époque juste suivante au règne de l'empereur¹⁰¹. Sur la foi des informations succinctes transmises par cette source, nous tirons la conclusion, qu'après la reconquête, les régions du droit de l'Olt correspondantes au sud de l'Olténie et du Banat actuel, ont été mises sous la juridiction du gouverneur de la Dacie Ripensis, soyant donc incorporées à la diocèse Dacie, pendant que les régions du gauche de l'Olt, respectivement celles du sud de la Valachie et la Moldavie actuelle, ont reçu, il paraît une organisation propre et ont été incorporées dans la diocèse Thracie¹⁰².

L'an 332 ouvre une nouvelle étape dans la politique nord-danubienne de Constantin le Grand, déterminé par l'augmentation de la menace germanique pour les pouvoirs romains du sud de la Dacie¹⁰³. Dans les conditions du renforcement du péril et de la préssion germaniques, l'empereur passe maintenat aux actions militaires, quelques unes de grande ampleur, contre les barbares, pensant ainsi affirmer sa domination sur la Dacie méridionale même avec les armés.

La tension périlleuse des rapports entre les populations barbares établies au nord du Danube, qui menaçaient même les positions de l'empire en zone, va offrir à l'empereur le motif d'une intervention militaire décisive pour trancher déféinitivement le problème. L'action militaire romaine a été déterminée par l'éclat, pendant l'an 331, d'un violent conflit entre les Sarmathes de la région du Banat, clients (*foederati*) de l'empire d'un part, les Visigothes et les Taïfales d'autre part, qui voyant bloqué leur accès ver de sud du Danube, se sont précipités sur les voisins de l'ouest. Selon les opinions de quelques spécialistes, il paraît que, loin de limiter leurs attaques aux territoires controlés par les Sarmathes, pendant l'hiver des ans 331-332

⁹⁶ BĂRZU, BREZEANU 1991, p. 192; Cf. TUDOR 1968, p. 458.

⁹⁷ *Excerpta Valesiana*, VI, 35; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 48-49.

⁹⁸ MĂRCULEȚ 2002, p. 76; MĂRCULEȚ 2003, p. 18.

⁹⁹ TOROPU 1976, p. 28.

¹⁰⁰ OBOLENSKY 1963, p. 50; MĂRCULEȚ 1999, p. 38-39; Cf. MARCELO 2002, p. 6-7; Cf. MUSSET 1965, p. 58-65; Cf. MUSSET 2002, p. 49: «La stèppe eurasiatique est devenue, commençant avec le IV^e siècle, le principal couloir par où sont venus les cavaliers nomades en route vers l'Ouest».

¹⁰¹ *Notitia Dignitatum*, Or. VIII, 45-46, Or. XLII, 12-39; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 208-213.

¹⁰² Cf. TOROPU 1976, p. 28; Cf. PETOLESCU 2000, p. 328-331.

¹⁰³ Cf. FLETCHER 1852, p. 114.

quelques bandes visigothes-taïfales auraient débouché quand même au sud du Danube frappant quelques régions des provinces rivéraines au fleuve de la diocèse Thracie¹⁰⁴. En ce qui nous concerne, dans les conditions de l'absence de toutes les informations qui le concernent, nous considérons que l'attaque visigothe-taïfale au sud du Danube reste seulement l'un hypothétique, fait qui nous détermine avoir des sérieuses réticences concernant la véracité de sa production.

Devant l'attaque visigothe-taïfale, les Sarmathes argaragantes (*Sarmathes argaragantes*), le rameau dominant, ont armé même leurs asservis Sarmathes limigantes (*Sarmathes limigantes*), sollicitant en même temps l'aide militaire de l'empire. Connaissant par intuition l'importance du moment, l'empereur a répondu favorablement à la demande des Sarmathes et a disposé le déclenchement d'une puissante et à l'instaurant offensive militaire contre les Visigothes et les Taïfales, opération qui, par ampleur et, surtout, par ses conséquences, a dépassé le caractère d'une simple action de représailles.

Le déroulement des opérations militaires, bien qu'on ne le connaît pas avec exactitude, quand même, il pourrait être, au moins, approximativement reconstitué conformément aux sommaires informations dont nous disposons. Au début de l'an 332, en plein hiver ou au début du printemps, une puissante armée romaine, commandée par le *caesar* Constantin II, le fils de l'empereur, et par le général Valerius Maximus, *praefectus pretorio Orientis*, déclenchait les opérations militaires contre les Visigothes et les Taïfales. Très probablement, l'entière armée impériale, ou la plus grande partie, a traversé le Danube à Sucidava, a avensé dans l'itinéraire Sucidava-Drobeta-Dierna, où il n'est pas exclu qu'elle s'était rencontrée avec autre corps militaires, qui avaient débouché en Dacie par les autres deux points (Dierna et Drobeta), et d'ici a pénétré dans les zones contrôlées par les Sarmathes, où se déroulaient des luttes entre les barbares. À une date pas précisée exactement par les sources, étendue après notre avis, entre le 18 février et le 20 avril 332, l'armée romaine écrase dans une lutte destructive les forces visigothes-taïfales, commandées par «*le roi*» visigothe Ariaricus, auxquelles il provoque des immenses pertes¹⁰⁵. À ces pertes s'ajoutaient de nombreux prisonniers faits par l'armée romaine, qui vont être colonisés en diverses provinces de l'empire, y compris dans celles micro-asiatiques.

La violence des représailles et des dimensions des dévastations romaines, corroborées aux températures très froides de la saison, achevaient dramatiquement pour les deux populations germaniques, surtout pour les Visigothes, l'écrasante défaite subie devant les forces romaines. Conformément aux informations transmises par Anonymus Valesianus, «*par suite aux opérations militaires conduites par le caesar Constantin, environ cent milles d'hommes (des Germaniques, n.n.) sont morts de froid et de faim*»¹⁰⁶. Les pertes enregistrées par les barbares, bien évidemment exagérées par la source analysée, restent quand même considérables, fait confirmé par l'évolution même ultérieure aux rapports des Germaniques avec l'empire.

La catégorique victoire romaine trouve sa confirmation ainsi d'autres sources des IV^e et V^e siècles, bien que les références à elle sont très lapidaires. Par exemple, Sextus Aurelius Victor affirme que les «*peuples des Gothes [...] ont été écrasés*»¹⁰⁷, et Paulus Orosius (le V^e siècle), conclue, sans doute inspiré des sources plus anciennes, que l'empereur Constantin «*a détruit [...] même les plus courageux et les grandes peuples de Gothes, juste en milieu du pays des Barbares, c'est à dire dans la région des Sarmathes*»¹⁰⁸.

Faisant abstraction des exagérations évidentes des historiens antiques, réalisées avec le but de louer la victoire et le pouvoir de l'empire, dans notre opinion il reste certainement le fait que la destructive défaite subie par les barbares a donné un coup destructif même à leur potentiel militaire. Nous croyons que la plus édifiante confirmation de notre opinion c'est celle

¹⁰⁴ GIBBON, 1843, p. 371

¹⁰⁵ Pour quelques propositions concernant la datation du conflit entre l'Empire Romain et les Visigothes et les Taïfales, voir: SCHMIDT 1969, p. 227-228, où il propose comme date 18 février 332; ILIESCU 1970, p. 49, la note 12, où il opte pour le 12 avril 332; BARNEA, ILIESCU 1982, p. 118; PETOLESCU 2000, 339, qui avance comme date le 20 avril 332; ODAHL 2006, p. 224, où il avance «*le printemps de 332*»; Cf. GIBBON, 1843, p. 371-372.

¹⁰⁶ *Excerpta Valesiana*, VI, 31: «*Ita per Constantinum Caesarem centum prope milia fame et frigore extincta sunt*».

¹⁰⁷ VICTOR 2006, XLI, 13; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 24-25.

¹⁰⁸ OROSIUS 1883, VII, 28, 29: «*Mox Gothorum fortissimas et copiosissimas gentes in ipso barbarici soli sinu, hoc est Sarmatarum regione, delevit*»; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 194-195.

que les invasions des Visigothes au sud du Danube ont été interrompues pour plus de trois décennies (332-364/365), une période où ceux-ci sont restés dans une totale défensive et obéissance envers Constantinople, y compris pendant les périodes de crise politique et de luttes internes dans l'empire. Aux barbares vaincus, Constantin a imposé un *foedus*, devenu juste la base juridique du pouvoir de l'empire sur la Dacie méridionale. En qualité de *foederati*, même les Visigothes étaient considérés les asservis de l'empire, une chose que les auteurs antiques, apologétiques de Constantin, qui n'ont pas hésité l'exagérer en manière intentionnée. Par exemple, le contemporain de l'empereur, Eusebius de Caesarea soutient que celui-ci, «*a soumis entièrement au pouvoir romain les tribus barbares, lui, le premier a apporté sous le joug des peuples des Scythes (des Visigothes, n.n.) [...]. Il les a obligé reconnaître les Romains pour des maîtres, bien qu'ils ne le voulaient pas. Levant le trophée de victoire et, contre à ceux-ci, en peu de temps, il a subjugué tous. Il les a assagi sur place, avec ses soldats, ceux qui étaient obstinés [...]. Par suite, comme ça, les Scythes ont reconnu alors qu'ils sont les esclaves des Romains*»¹⁰⁹. Les Visigothes s'engageaient aussi participer à la défense de l'empire. En qualité de *foederati*, ils s'obligeaient fournir à l'armée impériale, quand les autorités constantinopoléennes les auraient sollicité cette chose, jusqu'à 40.000 hommes recevant en échange des subsides annuelles (*annonae foederaticae*) en nourriture et argent. Ils recevaient, en même temps, la permission de faire du commerce dans les cités romaines des deux rives du fleuve¹¹⁰. Pour obliger les Germaniques à respecter le traité, les autorités romaines les imposaient à envoyer à Constantinople, comme otages, des quelques membres à l'aristocratie visigothe, «*parmi lesquels même de fils du roi Ariaricus*»¹¹¹, très probablement, le futur *judex* Athanarich.

Après les événements du début de l'an 332, Constantin a donné une nouvelle organisation aux territoires de la Dacie méridionale. Ainsi, pendant que les régions de l'ouest de l'Alutus restaient sous la domination complète de Constantinople, conformément aux stipulations du traité de 332, les territoires nord-danubiens de l'est de cette rivière, compris dans les frontières de l'empire, respectivement le Sud de la Valachie et de la Moldavie actuelle étaient confiés pour garde et défense aux Germaïques, dans leur qualité de *foederati*, qui gardaient toute leur autonomie et administration¹¹². Par suite à ces mesures, les régions de l'est de *limes Transalutanus*, étaient ainsi incorporées, du point de vue administratif-territorial, dans le système d'un *condominium* romain-germanique. Mais l'empire exerçait sur ceux-ci un rigoureux contrôle militaire par intermédiaire de ses forces cantonnées dans les cités de la ligne du Danube ou de l'intérieur gardées sous sa domination.

L'importance de la victoire de l'an 332 résulte clairement inclusivement du faste avec lequel elle a été fêtée en empire. Constantin recevait pour la deuxième fois le titre de *Gothicus Maximus*, et à Constantinople on lui élevait une colonne avec l'inscription: «*Fortunae reduci ob devictos Gothos*». Avec la même occasion était battue une médaille d'or avec la légende «*Debellatori gentium barbarorum – Victoria Gothica*» et en exergue *GOTHIA* et on a émis des monnaies de bronze, qui célébraient le succès de l'armée avec la légende: «*Gloria Exercitus*»¹¹³.

Après une courte période d'accalmie, pendant l'été de l'an 334 des graves événements consommés au Danube réclamaient Constantin en zone. La présence de l'empereur était réclamée par le violent conflit interne éclaté parmi les Sarmathes du sud-ouest de la Dacie (de la zone du Banat et de la Tise inférieure), qui a opposé la branche des *Sarmathes argaragantes*, qui détenait le pouvoir, à la branche des *Sarmathes limigantes*, subordonnés aux premiers mais plus nombreux et plus puissants, qui pouvait compromettre par son dénouement tout l'échafaudage politique et territorial construit par Constantine en région¹¹⁴.

L'importance accordée par l'empereur à résoudre le problème sarmathe réside juste dans sa présence dans le voisinage de la zone de conflit. Constantin a établi son quartier général à Sirmium, point stratégique d'où il pouvait surveiller toute la région, pouvant intervenir en

¹⁰⁹ EUSEBIUS 1844, IV, 5, 1-2; Cf. *Fontes*, II, vol. II, p. 14-15.

¹¹⁰ SOZOMENOS 1855, p. 21; Cf. FHDR, II, p. 222-223; Cf. HÖNN 1940, p. 133-135; Cf. CHRIST 1988, p. 752-754; Cf. BARNEA, ILIESCU 1982, p. 118-119; Cf. POPILIAN 2001, p. 611.

¹¹¹ *Excerpta Valesiana*, VI, 31: «*tunc et obsides accepit, inter quos Ariarici regis filium*»; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 48-49.

¹¹² MITREA, PREDA 1966, p. 155-160; TOROPU 1976, p. 28.

¹¹³ BARNEA, ILIESCU 1982, p. 119; ZAHARIADE 1988, p. 39; ODAHL 2006, p. 224.

¹¹⁴ GIBBON, 1843, p. 372-373; Cf. FLETCHER 1852, P. 114.

même temps rapidement et efficacement dans chaque point du sud-ouest de la Dacie et de la ligne du Danube, de la confluence avec la Tise et jusqu'aux cataractes (Cazane).

Mais Constantin a évité s'engager directement dans la dispute entre les deux parties, optant pour une expectative active, politique et militaire¹¹⁵. Son attitude a été, sans doute, le résultat d'un calcul politique pragmatique et froid qui lui montrait que si chaque groupement sarmathe aurait gagné, il sortait si affaibli du conflit interne qu'il ne présentait pour une longue période de temps aucun péril pour les positions et les intérêts de l'empire. Par suite, l'empereur s'est limité finalement recevoir dans l'empire une grande partie des Sarmathes argaragantes, vaincu par le groupement rival. Ceux-ci, estimés exagérément par les unes des sources à «*plus de trois cents milles gens d'âges et de sexes différents*», qui ont été dispersés et colonisés en différentes provinces de l'empire, comme la Scythie Minor, la Thracie, la Macédonie et même en Italie¹¹⁶.

La région du Danube inférieure, y compris les territoires de la Dacie méridionale, a continué bénéficier de maxime attention de Constantin et après le rétablissement de la paix en zone dans l'an 334, pendant les ans suivants l'empereur a achevé l'œuvre de renforcement de leur système défensif¹¹⁷. Après cette date, la défense des possessions romaines de la Dacie méridionale, la soi-dite «*ripa Gothica*», est revenu à Flavius Dalmatius, le neveu de l'empereur, un talentueux militaire, investit comme *caesar* dans l'an 335, à qui a été donné l'administration de la Thracie. Les informations comprises dans *Excerpta Valesiana* confirment cet opinion, montrant clairement que «*Dalatianus, le fils de son frère Dalmatius, l'a fait caesar [...]. Dalmatius défendait la ripa Gothica*»¹¹⁸.

Après les actions politiques-militaires des années 332 et 334 la possession romain sur la Dacie méridionale devenant incontestable pour plus de trois décennies. Des nombreuses sources dont nous disposons – des ouvrages des historiens contemporains ou tardifs, des sources épigraphiques, des découvertes archéologiques etc.¹¹⁹ – confirment cette réalité et, implicitement, le statut politique-juridique de ces territoires.

Considérations finales. Les résultats auxquels nous sommes arrivé réalisant cet étude nous permettent la synthétisation à plusieurs conclusions:

Le déplacement du centre d'influence, économique et politique de l'État romain en *pars Orientis*, pendant la première moitié du IV^e siècle et *translatio imperii romani* de Rome sur le bord européen de Bosphore, à Byzance-Constantinople (324-330), ont augmenté l'importance stratégique de la frontière au Danube depuis confluence avec la Sava jusqu'aux bouches. Par suite, environ les années 324/325, dans la politique européenne de l'Empire Romain s'ouvrait une nouvelle étape: reprenant l'initiative militaire et politique, Constantin le Grand abandonne la défensive active du Bas-Danube en faveur d'une politique offensive de grandes proportions dirigée contre les populations barbares établies au nord du fleuve, qui avait mener à la reinclusion dans les frontières de l'Empire Romain de la Dacie méridionale, de la région du Banat et jusqu'aux bouches du Danube et le bord du Tyras (Nistre).

L'action romaine de reconquérir la Dacie méridionale s'est réalisée en deux étapes distinctes: a) *pendant une première étape consommée entre les années 324/325-326, l'Empire Romain s'est assuré la domination sur les régions méridionales du droit de l'Olt et de la zone du Banat actuel, contrôlées par les Taïfales et les Sarmathes, assurant en même temps, la prééminence aussi dans les relations avec les Visigothes de la Plaine Valaque et du sud de la Moldavie; b) dans une deuxième étape déroulée entre 327-328, sous la domination de l'empire sont entrées les régions du gauche de l'Olt, respectivement du sud de la Valachie et de la Moldavie actuelle, contrôlées par les Visigothes. Ainsi, au bout des amples opérations militaires et des démarches politiques-*

¹¹⁵ ODAHL 2006, p. 226; TREADGOLD 2004, p. 61, les deux auteurs soutiennent que l'empereur aurait vaincu les Sarmathes Limigantes.

¹¹⁶ *Excerpta Valesiana*, VI, 32: «*sed servi Sarmatarum omnes adversum dominos rebellarunt, quos pulsos Constantinus libenter accepit et amplius trecenta milia hominum mixtae aetatis et sexus per Thraciam, Scythiam, Macedoniam, Italiamque divisit*». Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 48-49.

¹¹⁷ TREADGOLD 2004, p. 61.

¹¹⁸ *Excerpta Valesiana*, VI, 35: «*Dalmatianum, filium fratris sui Dalmati, Caesarem fecit. [...] ripam Gothicam Dalmatius tuebatur*»; Cf. *Fontes*, II, p. 48-49; Cf. GIBBON 1843, p. 369: «*He fixed Dalmatius on the Gothic frontier, to which he annexed the government of Thrace, Macedonia and Greece*».

¹¹⁹ POPESCU 1976, p. 295, 298-310, 349-357, 359-367, 370-372, 375-375, 397-398, no. 278, 284-301, 399-410, 413-423A, 426-427, 428A-430, 439-440; Cf. IORGA 1998, p. 111: il conteste la durabilité de l'œuvre de reconquête réalisée par Constantine le Grande au sud de la Dacie.

diplomatiques couronnées de succès, étendu pendant la durée des années 324/325-328, l'Empire Romain réussissait englober dans ses possessions la totalité des régions de la rive gauche du Danube, riveraines au fleuve, de l'aval de sa confluence avec la Sava et la Tise et jusqu'au bord du Dnistre.

Les dominations nord-danubiennes de l'empire ont été protégées par Constantin à l'aide d'un vaste système de fortifications formé d'un *vallum* de terre avec un fossé long d'environ 700 km, connu sous le nom de *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* (*Sillon de Novac de Nord*), qui partait de Drobeta, traversait l'Olténie et la Valachie, entrecroisait *limes Transalutanius* à Urluieni s'arrêtant probablement au castrum de Pietroasele, mais ayant, très probablement, un autre correspondant dans le sud de la Moldavie d'entre le Siret et le Nistru. Il prenait ainsi naissance un puissant système défensif, un véritable *limes transdanubien* qui représentait la plus avancée ligne de défense du *limes danubien*. Les territoires englobés entre *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* et le Danube, constituait la soi-nommée *ripa Gothica*, entrés sous la domination de l'empire, qui devenaient une véritable *zone tampon* entre l'Empire Romain et *Barbaricum*. Constantinople exercerait aussi la surveillance et un contrôle militaire sur les territoires situés entre *Brazda lui Novac de Nord* et les Carpates.

Après la reconquête, les régions du droit de l'Olt, correspondantes au sud de l'Olténie et du Banat actuel, ont été mises sous la juridiction du gouverneur de la Dacie Ripensis. Les régions du gauche de l'Olt, respectivement celles du sud de la Valachie et Moldavie actuelle, ont reçu probablement une organisation propre et elles ont été subordonnées du gouverneur de la diocèse Thracie.

L'an 332 ouvre une nouvelle étape dans la politique nord-danubienne de Constantin le Grand. Dans les conditions du renforcement du péril et de la pression germanique sur les dominations romaines du sud de la Dacie, l'empereur passe maintenant aux actions militaires, une de grandes ampleurs, contre les barbares, pensant ainsi affirmer même à l'aide des armées sa domination sur la Dacie méridionale. Pendant l'an 332, l'empire écrase les Visigothes et les Taïfales, auxquels il est imposé un *foedus*. À cette occasion, Constantine recourt à la réorganisation des territoires possédés au nord du Danube. Ainsi, pendant que les régions de l'Ouest d'Alutus restaient sous la domination complète et directe de Constantinople, conformément aux prérogatives du traité de 332, les territoires nord-danubiens de l'est de *limes Transalutanius*, respectivement le sud de la Valachie et de la Moldavie actuelle, étaient confiés pour surveillance et défense aux Germaniques, dans leur qualité de *foederati*, mais qui préservaient tout leur autonomie et autoadministration, soyant englobés ainsi, du point de vue administratif-territorial, dans le système d'un *condominium romain-germanique*. Mais l'empire exercerait un rigoureux contrôle militaire par l'intermédiaire de ses forces cantonnées dans les cités de la ligne du Danube ou de l'intérieur restées sous sa domination.

Pendant l'année 334 Constantin solutionne le problème sarmathe, colonisant dans l'empire une grande partie des Sarmathes argaragantes du sud-ouest de la Dacie, expulsés par leurs adversaires, les Sarmathes limigantes. Après les actions politiques-militaires des années 332 et 334 la domination romaine sur la Dacie méridionale devenait incontestable pour plus de trois décennies. La défense des possessions romaines de la Dacie méridionale, la soi-nommée *ripa Gothica*, est revenue à Flavius Dalmatius, le neveu de l'empereur, un talentueux militaire, investi comme *caesar* dans l'an 335, à qui a été confié, autant l'administration de la Thracie, mais aussi la commande militaire au Danube.

NEW CONSIDERATIONS ON THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE FORTRESS OF HARSOVA (CONSTANTZA COUNTY)

Constantin NICOLAE,
Daniela BĂNOIU,
Vlad NICOLAE

Abstract

The first phase of construction of the fortress of Harsova can probably be traced back to the second half of the first century AD. Destroyed and rebuilt several times both in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages, the fortress was functional until 1829 when, according to the Adrianopol Treaty, it was destroyed by the Turks.

The fortress consists of a citadel placed on top of *Fortress Hill* and a small defense on *Belciug Hill*, both connected by a large trapezoidal enclosure, with imposing towers placed at the northeastern and northwestern corners. The modern city is built on top of the remains and, unfortunately, the stone was taken out of the fortress walls and reused in modern constructions. In certain areas, the walls have been completely destroyed. Remains of the fortress can still be seen in a few places.

The first aim of the present study is to correlate the little information offered by written historical records with the data gathered during archaeological research and with significant archaeological findings that were made in a rather random manner. Another objective of this analysis is to validate the importance of a series of historical data, some of which have been for a long time unjustly considered implausible.

The need to address this problem also arises from the fact that in recent years there has been a significant development in the archaeological research in this area which led to a better understanding of the true significance of these vestiges both from a scientific point of view as well as from a cultural perspective.

The earliest image of the Harsova Fortress is described by the Turkish traveler Evlia Celebi in 1651. He portrays a strongly enforced fortress situated on the cliffs facing the Danube which was surrounded by a wall 3000 steps long, with two gates on its western and eastern sides. An identical description is made by the Count of Langeron in the year 1809. He writes that the fortress is surrounded by a defensive wall which protects a stone citadel and a tower, both situated on the right bank of the Danube.

In 1826 H. von Moltke sketches the first known plan of the fortress (Fig.1). Two lithographs dating from the same period were also found, one of them depicting the image of the citadel itself (Fig.2) and the second (Fig.3) offering a panoramic view of the entire fortification. By projecting these two images into the X-Y plan we find a striking similarity between the two images, von Moltke's plan and the remains of ancient Roman walls still visible among modern constructions in the present-day city (Fig. 4).

At the end of the nineteenth century and in the early twentieth century, remains of the fortification system were still visible. They are illustrated on an army map from 1900 (Fig.5) on top of which Pamfil Polonic drew the perimeter of the largest enclosure (Fig.6). About the citadel itself the well known topographer notes that the visible remains belong to the Turkish fort while the roman fortress remains unidentified. At the same time D.M Ionescu draws on an existing city plan only the western wall of the same enclosure but this is probably because it was better preserved than the rest of the remains (Fig.7). In the first part of the twentieth century there isn't any known written record referring to the fortress despite the fact that digs have been carried out in the area in 1939 by Victor Bratulescu and in 1943 by Grigore Florescu.

In 1963, during his archaeological campaign at Harsova, Andrei Aricescu suggests that both the large fortification (the object of his study) as well as the small one, which is placed on the opposite hill, can be dated in the Roman period. In his opinion the small fortification represented the roman castrum while the large one was the civil settlement. Because of the fact that his hypothesis is based on simple observations of archaeological remains without any further detailed analysis, his point of view is mainly speculative and should be approached cautiously.

In the years 1987-1989 more ruins and two Romano-Byzantine towers were discovered during a rescue dig performed on the northeastern tower. More ruins have been uncovered in 2003, following a decision of the City Hall to invest in the area where the NV tower was placed.

In addition, we have to take into consideration several random discoveries inside the perimeter of the larger fortification, along the Carsium, Lunei, Venus and Independentei streets.

The second part of this report intends to give a preliminary account on the fortification system of Harsova which deals sequentially with its composing elements: the citadel, its enclosures and its towers.

The Citadel of the Fortress Hill. According to most specialists, this is where the Roman fortress, the Romano-Byzantine fortress and the Medieval fortress are situated. The first specialist who tries to establish the origin of the walls in this area is Grigore Florescu. Based on his findings, he spoke of three walls belonging to the Turkish fortress, and at a depth of 4.50 meters he found remains of Roman walls. Using information from A. Aricescu, Emil Condurachi drew the first modern plan of the fortress (Fig.8). The smallest precinct is dated in the tenth century, the middle one in the third century and the largest one is thought to belong to a construction of stone made in the year 103 A.D. His plan is quickly accepted by other specialists and even completed (Fig. 9). What is more, they propose certain dimensions for the walls and gates, despite the fact that the site was not sufficiently investigated. The excavations in the latest campaigns demonstrate a complex situation; a simple analysis on all walls discovered cannot lead to any conclusion (Fig.10). It has been proven from a stratigraphical point of view that the basis of the largest enclosure, considered the first phase of the construction, can be dated back to the 9th-11th centuries (Fig. 11). In 2007 we uncovered the foundation of a "U" shaped tower placed directly on the rock, on top of which lay later walls. The tower is the first architectural element from the Romano-Byzantine era ever discovered here (Fig. 12).

The big eastern enclosure and the northeastern tower. A wall starts from the citadel in the N-NV direction, heading towards the center of the modern city on a distance of 230m. The present state of research cannot lead to any conclusion about the purpose of this wall. It can be easily identified between the Carsium and Calarasi streets because of a substantial difference in height. At its end, Gh. Cantacuzino discovered another wall, 3,30m wide, dated between the 4th -6th centuries (Fig. 13).

The big northern enclosure and the N-V tower are aligned on an E-W direction on a length of 620 m, on the southern side of Carsium Street, parallel with the Danube, closing the valley between the two cliffs that enclose the fortress. Construction works carried out on Carsium Street revealed fragments of stone and Roman mortar from a wall, however, it was not possible to identify the actual wall. In 2003, 15 sections were opened at the west-end of the street, crossing Luna and Venus streets (Fig. 14), where several walls, belonging to a small area fortification, were discovered. Most of them were attached to the exterior wall of the cliff (Fig.15). In S9 we identified a wall heading east, which may actually represent the northern enclosure (Fig. 16). The walls are from different eras (Fig. 17, 18).

The big eastern enclosure and the fortification from the Belciug Hill. The enclosure starts from the northwestern tower and continues, heading to the Danube, over a length of 444m, closing towards the fortification from *Belciug Hill*. Through field survey but also by chance, we have found two different walls, probably corresponding to different periods. One of the walls has been observed while construction works were in progress on the western side of Venus Street. A stone carved with heraldic symbols was recovered in front of the modern church, along the path of this wall (Fig. 19). During constructions, the wall has been broken two times by workers (Fig.20-22). The access gate mentioned in historical records must be somewhere on its path. The second wall goes under modern houses, on the eastern side of Venus Street, and can be easily seen on Gogoasa family's property (Fig. 23). Unfortunately it cannot be seen any further. At the end of the street there is a small plateau about 68m long and 35m wide at the southern edge of which you may find ruins that probably belong to the fortress.

The perimeter of the fortress and field discoveries mentioned earlier concord with the historical sources listed above and together they represent irrefutable evidence that at Harsova existed one of the most powerful defense systems on the line of the Danube, hitherto unknown and insufficiently investigated.

A fortress of such a large scale, which occupies a good part of the city's current area can be explained not only by the need to defend the most important crossing on the Danube near the city but also by the existence of an abundance of construction material. Careful observations of the two cliffs where the fortifications lay show that the stone was extracted from the very place where the constructions were made, namely the Fortress and Belciug hills, where traces of stone exploitation are still visible.

In the current state of research we cannot say when the fortress from Harsova was built. Although there is confirmed archaeological evidence of Roman and Romano-Byzantine structures on Fortress Hill and the NE tower, in the absence of systematic research, it is difficult but not impossible to admit that such constructions exist in other sectors. On the other hand the existence, in the middle of the 17th century, of the larger enclosure raises a series of questions, among which the most important is whether or not, in the 15th century, when the Turks occupied the place, the defense was already built.

For now, one thing is clear: we are in front of a fortified ensemble which encloses an area of about 22 ha, confirmed by historical records for more than three and a half centuries.

LE THEME BYZANTIN, LA THRACE, IÔANNOUPOLIS ET LA QUESTION DES TERRES BULGARES DU NORD-EST A LA FIN DU X^e – PREMIERES ANNEES DU XI^e SIECLES¹²⁰

Valeri YOTOV (Bulgaria)

Nous connaissons le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis grâce au *Taktikon Scorialensis* (*Taktikon Oikonomides* – OIKONOMIDES 1972), ainsi qu'à 11 sceaux de ses trois (ou quatre?) stratèges. Il est clair qu'il s'agit d'une alliance territoriale de l'ancien thème de Thrace et de celui d'Iôannoupolis après la campagne militaire de l'empereur Jean Tzimiskès¹²¹, favorable à Byzance (969–976)¹²². Il est probable que le thème englobait les terres au sud et au nord du Haimos (Stara planina) – des alentours de la capitale de l'empire, Constantinople, jusqu'aux environs de l'ancienne capitale du Premier royaume bulgare, Preslav (BOŽILOV 1988, p. 24; STOIMENOV 1988, note 108).

Il y a, en revanche, des opinions divergentes en ce qui concerne *le moment* de l'existence du thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis la *succession* de ses stratèges¹²³.

– Ivan Božilov (BOŽILOV 1988, p. 22 (B, 2), p. 24–26): a) 971–976 – juste « après la conquête de la ville bulgare Veliki Preslav (et son changement de nom en Iôannoupolis), l'empereur (Jean Tzimiskès) aura créé la stratégie de Thrace et Iôannoupolis; b) protospathaires Théophane, Nicéphore Xiphias (« le gouvernement des deux premiers a été assez court ») et, en dernier, Léon Saracénopoulos (« période plus longue »).

¹²⁰ Cet article est une variante revue d'une première publication dans *Trakia i Xemimont*, 1, Varna, 2007, p. 183–189.

¹²¹ Le premier thème sur la péninsule Balkanique à être créé, selon Constantin Porphyrogénète (*De thematibus*, 44, 16; 45, 18), par Constantin IV aux temps après le passage du Danube par les Bulgares, probablement en 680. Voir les notes et les renvois : OSTROGORSKI 1952, p. 65.

¹²² Sur les questions concernant les changements de l'administration byzantine en Bulgarie du Nord-Est il y a une littérature abondante: OIKONOMIDES 1972 ; BOŽILOV 1988, p. 18–27; JORDANOV, TĀPKOVA-ZAIMOVA 1988, p. 119–126; STOIMENOV 1988, p. 39–66; JORDANOV 1993; *Histoire de Dobroudja*, 2004, p. 78–81.

¹²³ Je ne m'arrête pas ici aux discussions concernant le changement du nom de Dristra en Théodoroupolis et le gouverneur – *katapano* Sisinius, tout comme je ne discuterai pas la stratégie mentionnée dans *le Taktikon Scorialensis*, la Mésopotamie de l'Ouest.

– D. Stoimenov (STOIMENOV 1988, p. 51): a) 972/3–974/5 – l’un des arguments serait la datation du *Taktikon Scorialensis*, « années 972–973 »; b) le premier gouverneur serait le protospathaire Léon Saracénopoulos, suivi des protospathaires Staurakios (néanmoins, tous les savants sont d’avis que la lecture du sceau de cet officier est incertain) et Nicéphore Xiphias.

– I. Jordanov (JORDANOV 1993, p. 117: lors du commentaire sur le thème Dorostolon; 128–132): a) le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis daterait généralement de la période 971–986; b) les gouverneurs en seraient les protospathaires Léon Saracénopoulos, Théophane, Staurakios et Nicéphore Xiphias.

– A. Madgearu (MADGEARU 2007, p. 70–71: lors du commentaire sur le thème Iôannoupolis) : a) ?–975, surtout en 975–986 ; b) tout comme pour I. Jordanov, les gouverneurs en seraient les protospathaires Léon Saracénopoulos, Théophane, Staurakios et, en dernier, Nicéphore Xiphias (975–986).

Hormis les sources écrites et les légendes des sceaux byzantins, les commentaires et les conclusions de ces auteurs reposent sur des *raisonnements* plus ou moins réussis¹²⁴.

Les difficultés empêchant l’éclaircissement définitif du problème furent maintes fois signalées (STOIMENOV 1988, p. 40; BOŽILOV 2004, p. 78). En effet, les sources dont nous disposons permettent des solutions différentes tant pour l’époque d’existence du thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis que pour la succession de ses stratèges ; cependant, certaines opinions sont inacceptables.

La possibilité que le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis ait été le premier que Jean Tzimiskès aura créé (idée soutenue par le seul I. Božilov) se fonde surtout sur une logique voulant que les changements soient liés aux étapes de la conquête des régions bulgares¹²⁵. J’estime comme I. Jordanov (JORDANOV 1993, p. 117, 143–137) et D. Stoimenov (STOIMENOV 1988, p. 48) que les changements militaires et administratifs eurent lieu après la fin des actions militaires (août 971) et non pas pendant la guerre même. Cela étant, je donne dans ce qui suit ma propre hypothèse sur la succession des changements.

Dorostolon

La première stratégie organisée par Jean Tzimiskès avant son voyage vers Preslav en août 971, et de là vers Constantinople, est Dorostolon (la ville bulgare conquise Dristra, à laquelle on redonna l’ancien nom). L’administrateur de la stratégie Dorostolon fut sûrement Léon Saracénopoulos, comme il est indiqué sur deux sceaux de Preslav (JORDANOV 1993, p. 117–119). Il n’est pas de grande importance s’il est le premier stratège ou non.

Dans le *Taktikon Scorialensis* il n’y pas de stratégie Dorostolon ; ce toponyme est écrit Dristra. I. Božilov accepte que Léon Saracénopoulos fût le dernier gouverneur du thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis, afin de réconcilier la contradiction issue du fait que ce dernier était aussi stratège (BOŽILOV 1988, p. 25–26). Il convient de renvoyer à la note analytique de D. Stoimenov, selon laquelle, « vu le temps d’existence de l’ordre administratif, non mentionné dans le *Taktikon (Taktikon Scorialensis)*, la période de son existence peut se situer dans les années 972–973 »¹²⁶. Autrement dit, le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis n’existait pas en 971. Au contraire, le nom du thème devrait être écrit Dorostolon dans le *Taktikon Scorialensis*¹²⁷.

Il est hors de doute que Léon Saracénopoulos était la personne bénéficiant du crédit de la part de Jean Tzimiskès et qui dirigeait les nouveaux territoires. Il est probable aussi qu’il les organisait (ou les réorganisait), d’où les changements dans les intitulés et les toponymes. Sur deux sceaux, Léon Saracénopoulos est stratège de Dorostolon. L’ancien nom de la stratégie montre qu’il est question d’un moment que l’on peut situer juste après la conquête, avant que l’on ne revienne au nom bulgare déjà consacré, Drastar. Auparavant, Léon Saracénopoulos avait été le gouverneur des *ikanat* de l’ouest et avait participé à la campagne militaire contre

¹²⁴ De tels raisonnements sont plus nombreux chez I. Božilov et D. Stoimenov. Voir par exemple I. Božilov: « les changements ont suivi une logique qui ne peut être négligée lors de la délimitation militaire administrative d’un pays », ou à autres endroits: BOŽILOV 1988, p. 24; BOŽILOV, GJUZELEV 2004, p. 75. Ce genre de raisonnement est discuté par D. Stoimenov; voir STOIMENOV 1988, note 140.

¹²⁵ Après l’article *Belejki varhu vizantijskata admistracia...* (BOŽILOV 1988), la même datation et la succession des gouverneurs du thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis sont discutées par I. Božilov dans *Bălgarskiat apokalipsis (976–1018)*; BOŽILOV, GJUZELEV 1999, p. 309; BOŽILOV 2004, p. 75.

¹²⁶ STOIMENOV 1988, p. 50. La première datation du *Taktikon Scorialensis* de 975–979 est corrigée plus tard par Oikonomidès en 971–975 : TĀPKOVA-ZAIMOVA 1976, p. 38 et note 11.

¹²⁷ L’autre possibilité suppose que le changement des noms des villes soit de brève durée (quelques mois seulement ?).

Sviatoslav comme commandant de l'unité dont la garnison se situait dans la partie européenne de la Byzance (JORDANOV 1993, p. 95, 168–174).

Iôannoupolis

Après la conquête de Preslav (le 5 avril 971), Jean Tzimiskès laisse des garnisons dans l'ancienne capitale des Bulgares (nommée déjà Iôannoupolis) et dans les forteresses conquises et se dirige vers Drastar. Les troupes laissées en garnison sont appelées en renfort lors du siège de Drastar. Cela signifie vraiment qu'il y a eu une coordination qui, selon moi, aurait pu être d'ordre militaire et tactique, mais dont il est peu probable qu'elle eût des conséquences administratives, par exemple une réorganisation allant jusqu'à la création de thèmes à vocation stratégique.

Quant aux protospathaires à la tête de Preslav pendant le bref laps de temps entre la conquête et la fin du siège de Dristra, les suppositions sont contradictoires: Jean (JORDANOV 1993, p. 146–147, n° 291–297), connu par 7 sceaux de Preslav; Katakalon ou Pierre (JORDANOV, 1993, p. 134–135, n° 252–258). Le protospathaire Jean fut probablement le stratège de l'ancienne capitale bulgare pas tout de suite après 971, mais au XI^e siècle, après l'installation durable de la domination byzantine, quand on rencontre le nom Preslav¹²⁸. I. Božilov propose d'autres raisons pour une telle thèse (BOŽILOV 1988, p. 22–23). S'il est question de Katakalon, on ne saurait le dire, car la lecture est incertaine.

Mais il y a encore autre chose. J'estime qu'au cours du siège de Drastar, le soi-disant « édifice administratif » de la stratégie à Preslav (Iôannoupolis pendant ces mois) ne fonctionnait pas comme centre de destination de la correspondance¹²⁹. Autrement dit, il est normal d'avoir des sceaux de l'empereur Jean Tzimiskès et de certains personnages connus grâce aux chroniques comme ayant participé à l'expédition militaire. À cette marche prennent part le maître Bardas Skléros, le drongaire Léon, le parakoimomène Basile, le *proédarios* Basile, Théodore de Mistie, le *stratoperdathès* Pierre, le maître Jean, fils de Roman Kurkua, Anema, le patrice Roman, fils de l'empereur Constantin (voir les chroniques de Léon le Diacre et de Jean Skilitzès: GIBI, V, p. 245–276, GIBI VI, p. 198–340). Dans la grande collection de 552 sceaux il n'y a pour autant aucun exemplaire à les mentionner. Certes, l'absence de témoignages n'est pas un argument en soi, mais elle intrigue.

La stratégie d'Iôannoupolis fut créée après la fin de la guerre, peut-être lors du retour de l'empereur de Dristra « dans les terres des Byzantins », lorsqu'il prit avec soi le roi bulgare capturé Boris II. Son gouverneur sûrement attesté (le premier peut-être) fut le protospathaire Pierre, plus tard stratège de Drastar.

Iôannoupolis et Dorostolon

Après un certain temps, la stratégie de Dorostolon fut rattachée à Iôannoupolis et le premier stratège est de nouveau Léon Saracénopoulos, ce qui résulte de ses 19 sceaux. (JORDANOV 1993, p. 136–137, n° 259–277). Vu que le nom du thème plus haut en rang est généralement écrit à la fin, ce stratège aurait probablement résidé dans la ville danubienne, ce qui explique la grande quantité des sceaux à son nom découverts à Preslav¹³⁰.

Drastar

Après 972, l'on revint au nom Dristra et une stratégie se constitua, comme l'attestent le *Taktikon Scorialensis* et les nombreuses occurrences du nom de la ville chez Jean Skilitzès et Jean Zônaras. Stratège de Dristra aurait été éventuellement Pierre, auparavant gouverneur d'Iôannoupolis (JORDANOV 1993, p. 117–119, n° 218–219).

Thrace et Iôannoupolis

Un nouveau changement eut lieu dans les années suivantes. Les stratégies de Thrace et Iôannoupolis furent englobées en une seule unité administrative. La constitution de cet ensemble fut probablement dictée par la séparation de Dorostolon (déjà Drastar) du thème uni Iôannoupolis et Dorostolon.

¹²⁸ I. Jordanov admet deux possibilités pour le temps où Jean était le stratège de Preslav : immédiatement après sa conquête en avril 971 ou après 1000; voir JORDANOV 1993, p. 146–147, n° 291–297.

¹²⁹ I. Jordanov admet que Jean, stratège de Preslav, a participé au siège de Dristra et écrit à son subordonné à Preslav (?) – JORDANOV 1993, p. 16, p. 147.

¹³⁰ Le thème Dorostolon est de plus haut rang et est inscrit après Iôannoupolis. Voir VASILEVSKI 1997, p. 101 (*Katepanstvo i dukzstvo v Paristrion prez XI v.*). Selon Jordanov Léon réside à ce titre à Dristra, tout en estimant que la ville principale était Iôannoupolis; voir JORDANOV 1993, p. 117.

Quant à la chronologie des gouverneurs du thème, j'accepte la succession exposée par I. Jordanov. Le premier stratège fut le même Léon Saracénopoulos, attesté par 6 sceaux de la stratégie à Preslav et un autre figurant dans la collection de l'Ermitage à Saint-Pétersbourg. Font suite Théophane, Staurakios (incertain) et Nicéphore Xiphias (JORDANOV 1993, p. 128–132).

Je pense que le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis est probablement l'une des formations les plus durables (voir plus bas).

Il n'est pas clair jusqu'à quand continue la stabilité du gouvernement byzantin dans les nouveaux territoires. L'historiographie bulgare du temps de V. Zlatarski et de P. Mutaftchiev accepte que ces terres avaient été conquises par les comitopoules, avec Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie en tête, alors que l'historiographie roumaine estime en général que Byzance ait conservé son influence sur le bas Danube. Comme je l'ai déjà noté souvent, il ne s'agit que de réflexions qui ne trouvent que difficilement appui dans les sources historiques¹³¹.

Pour « la chute » ou « l'abandon » de la Bulgarie du Nord et du Nord-Est conquise par les Byzantins dans les dernières décennies il n'y a pas d'autres données à l'exception de la notice, « étonnante » pour certains chercheurs (JORDANOV 1993, p. 145), de Jean Skilitzès et de Jean Zônaras concernant la marche du patrice Théodorokanos et du protospataire Nicéphore Xiphias en 1000 au nord du Haimos. Jean Skilitzès: « En 6508, 13 indiction (l'an 1000), l'empereur envoya une forte armée contre les forteresses bulgares au-delà du Haimos sous le commandement du patrice Théodorokanos et du protospataire Nicéphore Xiphias. L'armée conquiert le grand et le petit Preslav, ainsi que Pliska, et rentra invincible et victorieuse ». Jean Zônaras: « il (l'empereur Basile II) conquiert le grand et petit Preslav et Pliska ». Ces passages sont d'ailleurs les seules sources qui invitent à admettre que l'État de Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie s'élargit vers le nord-est. Une autre source est la soi-disant « Notice du toparque goth » (= « Anonyme de Haze ») qui a tant retenu l'attention des savants. Dans cet ouvrage, il est question d'un voyage d'un dignitaire byzantin au fleuve du Dnjepr et d'événements le poussant à s'adresser à un roi au nord de Danube. I. Božilov, lequel s'est occupé plus en détail de ce document incertain, estime que le « gouverneur d'au-delà du Danube » était Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie et cette opinion s'imposa dans l'historiographie bulgare (BOŽILOV 1979, p. 125–126; *Histoire de la Bulgarie* 1981, p. 401–402; I. BOŽILOV 2004, p. 75). Si l'on admet l'historicité de ce document, je partage l'opinion de V. Tăpkova-Zaimova que dans ce gouverneur mal défini (« gouvernant au-delà du Danube ») il faudrait plutôt voir le prince russe (TĀPKOVA-ZAIMOVA 1976, p. 44–51). Je ne m'arrête pas ici sur la thèse erronée, selon laquelle Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie rétablit le pouvoir bulgare également dans les terres de la Bulgarie récente au-delà du Danube. Même si on accepte que la « Notice » est une oeuvre authentique, elle reste assez solitaire et entre en contradiction avec toutes les autres données sur la mise à la disposition de ces terres aux Petchenègues, sur la puissance des princes russes et sur les possibilités de Byzance de contrôler l'embouchure et le bas Danube.

Il n'est pas clair non plus pourquoi l'on répète obstinément que la marche de Nicéphore Xiphias et de Théodorokanos aurait rétabli le pouvoir de Byzance dans la Bulgarie de Nord-Est et aurait entraîné la libération du Grand et du Petit Preslav, ainsi que de Pliska. Car l'on néglige une circonstance assez importante: les sources ne disent rien pour Drastar, autant dire que la ville était tenue par les Byzantins¹³².

Il est sûr que le contrôle des terres bulgares du nord-est continua à être stable même après la mort de Jean Tzimiskès (976)¹³³.

L'une des hypothèses pour la datation d'une inscription grecque de Silistra concernant la construction d'une église prend en compte la période 976–981 (soit une époque à laquelle la ville est byzantine – SALAMON 1971, p. 487–496); d'autre part, le traité anonyme de 982 révèle

¹³¹ L'une des analyses les plus réussies de cette période est celle due à I. Božilov. Aboutie, il est vrai, mais dans la partie concernant les premières actions des komitopoules et ceux qui ont suivi Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie comme autocrate (comme celui-ci est nommé dans l'inscription de Bitolia). Voir I. Božilov, *L'apokalipsis bulgare (976–1018)*; BOŽILOV, GJUZELEV 2004, p. 312–324.

¹³² La marche en 1000 est par terre. S'il y avait des possessions des Bulgares le long du Danube et le littoral de la mer Noire, alors, à en juger d'après la pratique byzantine usuelle, la flotte aurait dû y participer.

¹³³ I. Božilov accepte aussi que la « libération » éventuelle des terres bulgares du nord-est eut lieu après 986, à l'été 990 au plus tard.; BOŽILOV 1979, p. 125.

que la province « Bourdjan » était une « partie de Byzance et payait impôt à l'empereur byzantin » – STOIMENOV 1988, p. 54).

Quelques sceaux de la stratégie de Preslav indiquent (selon leur éditeur) d'une manière encore plus catégorique jusqu'à quand, après 971, ce centre fonctionna activement et jusqu'à quel moment les terres restèrent sous le contrôle byzantin. Deux sceaux appartiennent à Stéphane Kontostéphanos et deux à Léon Méliissinos (JORDANOV 1993, n° 159–160, 161–162). Ces données trouvent appui dans les chroniques. Il est question des chefs militaires byzantins du temps des marches de l'empereur Basile II contre Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie. Stéphane Kontostéphanos est accusé comme ayant été le principal coupable de la défaite près de « Trayanova vrata » (986 – Porte Trajane, dans les Balkans). D'après I. Jordanov, il y a quelques possibilités de reconstituer quelques étapes dans la carrière des deux chefs militaires (JORDANOV 1993, p. 88–90), mais il est presque sûr que la découverte de leurs sceaux à Preslav est l'un des derniers témoignages de l'existence de leurs destinataires (stratèges ou autres) dans l'ancienne capitale bulgare. Cela se rapporte à un moment situé après la défaite du défilé près de « Trayanova vrata ». Jusqu'en 987/8 ces terres étaient donc byzantines.

Par conséquent, le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis existe probablement jusqu'à 987/8, comme le suppose I. Jordanov. Mieux encore : à mon avis, le thème continue à exister, quoique nominalement, pendant la dernière décennie du X^e siècle. Je trouve convaincante la supposition de I. Jordanov, selon laquelle en 1000 Nicéphore Xiphias était stratège du thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis (même si certains territoires du thème échappaient au contrôle) et qu'en tant que stratège il participa avec le patrice Théodorokanos à une campagne pour la libération des terres au nord du Haimos, lesquelles faisaient partie du thème qui lui est soumis. L'autre possibilité, plutôt « banale », comme le dit l'auteur même, serait d'en voir le père et son fils (JORDANOV 1993, p. 132, note 3). L'ancienne capitale bulgare Preslav s'appelle en 1000 Iôannoupolis, ou bien elle existe du moins dans le nom du thème. Il n'y a rien de troublant lorsque Jean Skilitzès et Jean Zônaras mentionnent d'autres noms, le Grand et le Petit Preslav, car ils écrivent leurs oeuvres au milieu du XI^e siècle, quand ces épithètes sont déjà en usage (JORDANOV 1995, p. 76–77). D'après moi, tout cela conforte l'opinion que, bien que les Byzantins aient perdu le contrôle sur certaines terres au nord du Haimos, comme il résulte de la notice sur la campagne de 1000, Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie n'est pas parvenu à rétablir le territoire complet du Premier Royaume bulgare. Il n'est pas un hasard que les campagnes de l'empereur Basile II le Bulgaroctone lui-même soient à l'ouest ou au nord-ouest. De plus, Roman, le fils du roi Pierre, malgré les obscurités qui règnent sur son destin après sa fuite de la captivité byzantine (976), est roi des Bulgares, bien qu'à titre nominal, et domine même la ville éloignée de Skopje. De plus, il est important de noter qu'à la fin du X^e et vers le début du XI^e siècle, nous apercevons beaucoup d'exemples de décisions indépendantes prises par les pouvoirs locaux¹³⁴ : c'est peut-être ce qui provoqua la marche de 1000. Un fait non commenté par les historiens est par exemple la production des imitations coulées des *foles* anonymes byzantins de la classe A (969–1028). Ce phénomène non éclairci « passa » par la datation du troisième quart du XI^e siècle (JORDANOV 1980, p. 9; PENCHEV 1990, p. 190), tandis que les trouvailles des forteresses Skala et Odarci n'en permettent pas, en particulier pour les petits modules (type « Zlataritzta »), une datation avant les premières décennies du même siècle (YOTOV 1998, p. 130–134; PARUSHEV 1999, p. 132–133 : l'opinion corrigée de V. Penchev – PENCHEV 2000, p. 40–48). C'est E. Oberländer-Târnoveau qui, le premier, attire l'attention (bien que de façon plutôt liminaire) que ces monnaies ont été probablement émises à l'époque de la révolte des komitopoules¹³⁵.

Il est important de noter aussi qu'à la différence de la description des marches vers le sud, où l'on mentionne presque chaque gouverneur de région ou de forteresse, pour la marche au nord du Haimos, aucune personne n'est attestée – au point que l'on dirait qu'il manquait des commandants à Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie.

¹³⁴ Rappelons ceux qui sont venus de Constanca et d'autres forteresses d'au-delà de l'Istar pour demander pardon à Jean I^{er} Tzimiskès et se rendre prisonniers avec leurs forteresses en 971: le frère et le fils de Krakra, lesquels ont cédé Pernik et 35 forteresses à Basile II. Dans les décennies suivantes, les révoltes de certaines villes et régions sont fréquentes.

¹³⁵ OBERLÄNDER-TÂRNOVEANU 1983, note 6 : « les émissions anépigraphes de *folles* anonymes classes A-1 et A-2 ont été frappées par les autorités bulgares pendant la révolte des *komitopouloi* ».

Quelques notes également sur Nicéphore Xiphias. Il est communément accepté que Nicéphore Xiphias gouverne le thème de Thrace et Iôannoupolis en 986–988, c'est-à-dire avant la seconde conquête des terres bulgares de l'est par les Byzantins. Cette proposition est tirée de l'opinion que pendant la campagne de 1000 au nord du Haimos, la stratégie de Thrace et Iôannoupolis n'existait déjà plus. Est-ce pourtant vrai ? D'après Jean Skylitzès, en 1003, Nicéphore Xiphias est stratège de Philippopolis : « À Philippopolis, le protospathaire Nicéphore Xiphias était stratège, car Théodorokanos s'était retiré à cause de la vieillesse »¹³⁶. De l'avis de la plupart des auteurs, on comprend que de 986–988 à 1003 (soit plus de 15 ans) le protospathaire et gouverneur d'un territoire d'une telle importance, englobant des territoires de Constantinople jusqu'au Danube, n'a pas élevé en rang. Dans l'histoire de Jean Skylitzès, Nicéphore Xiphias occupe une place importante comme chef militaire de l'empereur avec des missions spéciales, dont quelques-unes méritent notre attention. En 1014, lors de la bataille près de Belassica (Kleidion), Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie rejeta dans un premier temps les attaques byzantines et « l'empereur avait déjà perdu l'espoir de passer, lorsque Nicéphore Xiphias, alors stratège de Philippopolis, le persuada d'y rester... Il retourna avec ses soldats et contourna la montagne assez haute au sud de Kleidion... et passant par des endroits impraticables et escarpés, le 29 juin, 12 indiction, surgit de la hauteur au dos des Bulgares. Effrayés par son apparition soudaine, ceux-ci prirent la fuite »¹³⁷. Grâce à cet exploit, il fut élevé au rang de patrice. Jean Skylitzès : « L'empereur ... envoya dans la région de Maglen une armée avec, aux commandes, les patrices Nicéphore (Xiphias) et Constantin Diogène, lequel est devenu stratège de Solun après Votaniat ». En 1016, Nicéphore Xiphias est l'un des plus actifs chefs militaires de Basile II dans les terres bulgares et prend part à la conquête de certaines villes et forteresses. En 1019, il reçut la mission de détruire complètement toutes les forteresses en Serbie. En 1022 il est stratège de l'Anatolie, où il participe avec Nicéphore II Phokas à un complot contre l'empereur ; après l'échec de cette entreprise, il fut pardonné « grâce à ses mérites dans la guerre contre les Bulgares ». Il est mort entre 1028 et 1034.

Il faut nous demander quel âge il aurait pu avoir en 986, compte tenu du fait qu'en 1016 il avait les moyens d'organiser un passage difficile par la montagne, que dans la même année il était tenu pour chef militaire actif, ayant participé à beaucoup de campagnes, qu'en 1019 il avait assumé des tâches importantes dans la conquête de plusieurs forteresses et qu'en 1022 il finit par prendre l'initiative d'un complot contre l'empereur. Si par exemple, il avait 50 ans en 1014, en 1000 il aurait eu 36 (un âge tout à fait normal dans le contexte en question), mais en 986 (lorsque, à en croire certains exégètes, il gouvernait la Thrace et Iôannoupolis – un thème situé à proximité de Constantinople et du bas Danube) il aurait dû avoir 22 ans (!). Je rappellerais que d'après le *Stratégikon* de l'empereur Maurice, il y avait beaucoup d'exigences à l'égard des militaires byzantins, parmi lesquelles un âge de 40 ans environ. Nous rencontrons la même exigence quelques décennies plus tard dans le traité attribué à l'empereur Nicéphore II Phokas (KUCHMA, 1979, p. 65).

Vue de cette manière, la carrière de Nicéphore Xiphias semble aider plutôt que d'empêcher la conclusion sur les questions concernant le thème byzantin Thrace et Iôannoupolis.

¹³⁶ Être stratège de Philippopolis n'est pas rétrogradation. Le patrice Théodorokanos est stratège de Philippopolis avant Nicéphore Xiphias. D'après les sources, il est dans un premier temps commandant de la marche au nord du Haimos. Dans ces années, Philippopolis était le centre de dislocation des armées pendant les campagnes contre Samuel I^{er} de Bulgarie. Ayant en vue la promotion tardive de Nicéphore Xiphias comme principal chef militaire de Basile II, il est évident qu'il était stratège de Philippopolis.

¹³⁷ Le passage de ronde du détachement commandé par Nicéphore Xiphias dura 3–4 jours. Voir CVETKOV 1992, p. 87–91 et la littérature indiquée.

NOTE
NOTES

STRUCTURES ANTIQUES DECOUVERTES PAR PHOTOINTERPRETATION ARCHEOLOGIQUE

Cristina CRĂCIUN

Résumé

L'utilisation combinée des prises de vue aériennes et des images disponibles sur le service public Google Earth peut contribuer à une meilleure compréhension des structures antiques.

On y analyse les cas suivants :

1. La route antique Tomis-Anadalchioï vers nord ouest (trajet partiellement visible sur les prises de vue aériennes et la récupération du trajet jusqu'au nord du village Poiana grâce aux images Google Earth et aux orthophotoplans. Le *quadriburgium* de Poiana surveillait le croisement de cette route avec une autre, qui avait la direction sud-ouest/nord-est. La structure linéaire visible à l'ouest de la petite fortification pourrait être ou non en relation avec *clausura* Castelu-Nisipari visible sur les photos aériennes et les cartes anciennes. La série des *quadriburgia* Mircea Vodă, Castelu, Poiana peut être mise en relation avec une route sur le bord nord de la vallée Carasu.

2. La route antique, Durostorum-Axiopolis, qui doublait *via militaris* du bord du Danube. On y met en relation la fortification d'Almalău, antérieure typologiquement au IV^e – VI^e siècles ap. J.-C. avec les routes Durostorum- Marcianopolis et Durostorum-Axiopolis. En discutant le trajet de cette dernière route antique, reliée aux nombreuses *semitae* et *castra* du *limes* on y présente les routes reconnues sur les prises de vue aériennes, qui s'acheminaient vers le sud du lac Dunăreni, surveillées par la fortification tardive de Viile.

D'autres croisements des routes visibles sur les prises de vue aériennes à Pietreni, Izvoru Mare, Ion Corvin font penser à un système routier plus arborescent, qu'on doit expliquer au niveau de notre connaissance actuelle, par le caractère palimpseste des données des images aériennes et la longue histoire romaine, romaine tardive et même byzantine de la Dobroudja

3. La fortification rectangulaire à double enceinte de Cobadin est visible seulement sur les images Google Earth et les orthophotoplans, en étant bien endommagée par l'érosion du sol. Cette typologie est spécifique aux enceintes funéraires de type *Viereckschänze*, inconnues dans la Dobroudja, et aux *castra*. Les artefacts trouvés sur le lieu, les deux structures rectangulaires, plus petites, à l'ouest et à l'est de celle grande, à double enceinte, l'ensemble des données épigraphiques qui montre Cobadin aux confins des *territoria* des Tomis et Callatis avec le reste de la région et enfin, l'argument d'une route antique dans la proximité, à Viișoara, représente, de notre point de vue, un ensemble de données qui peut soutenir l'existence d'un *castrum* romain dans ce point.

On souligne la préoccupation constante des Romains pour assurer la ligne qui sépare la Dobroudja maritime de la partie continentale, du commencement du contrôle romain sur le territoire de la Dobroudja jusqu'à la configuration administrative et l'organisation militaire de la province conquise.

ABOUT THE WAY THE METOPES OF TROPAEUM TRAIANI MONUMENT WERE PLACED

**Ghiorghe PAPUC,
Vitalie BODOLICĂ**

Abstract

In 1977 the Monument Tropaeum Traiani from Adamclisi was inaugurated; at that time the adopted solution being a modern restauration that consisted in fixing the copies of the original pieces on a metallic framework.

The authors accept the theory of Radu Florescu regarding the existence of a middle layer of metopes on the core of the Triumphal Monument and do not agree to the 1984 theory of Mihai Sâmpetru, published in the volume Tropaeum Traiani, II, - Roman Monuments, about the placement of the metopes on the upper part of the monument, under the figured attic.

MEDIEVAL PLOUGH COULTERS FROM THE COLLECTION OF THE MUSEUM FOR NATIONAL HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY CONSTANȚA

**Cristina PARASCHIV-TALMAȚCHI,
Gabriel CUSTUREA**

Abstract*

During the last decade the Museum for National History and Archaeology Constanța has purchased a number of iron plough coulters and blades. Among them seven pieces have drawn our attention; by shape and dimensions they seem to date from the medieval epoch beginning. The lack of archaeological context, a situation often to be found in cases of purchased pieces, determined us in this case also to appeal to specialty bibliography and to analogies identification as references for our objects chronological framing.

The plough coulters described at positions no. 1-3 in the catalogue seem to correspond with this kind of discoveries from Garvăn, Tulcea county (length 18 cm, maximum width 9.2 cm), dated to the 11th century and Dodești (Vaslui county) – with an earlier dating to the 5th – 7th centuries. The coulters from Ghenci (Căuș com., Satu Mare county) – 16 cm long and 9 cm wide – dated to the 8th – 9th centuries can also be framed here. The piece at position no. 4 would frame among the discoveries from Dragosloveni (Dumbrăveni com., Vrancea county) – 10th cent and the one at position no. 5 is similar to the coulters discovered in Dragosloveni (10th century), Budești (Cotești com., Vrancea county) – 10th – 11th century and Elisaverca (Dondușeni county, Moldavia Republic) – 11th – 13th centuries. The coulters at position no. 6 seems to have analogies with the ones mentioned in Capidava (Topalu com., Constanța county) – first half of the 11th century, Dragosloveni – 10th century, Bârlogu (Negrași com., Argeș county) – end of the 9th century, probably Cornățel (Urechești com., Bacău county) – 10th – 11th centuries and Pogonești (Ivești com., Vaslui county) – 8th – 9th centuries. The piece no. 7 seems to be similar to the ones discovered in Giurcani (Găgești com., Vaslui county) – 8th – 9th centuries, Mânăstirea (Mălușteni com., Vaslui county) – 9th century, Echimăuți (Rezina county, Moldavia Republic) – 9th – 11th centuries and probably Budești (Vrancea county) – 10th – 11th centuries.

* Rezumatul a fost tradus în limba engleză de *Corina Apostoleanu*.

The pieces at positions no. 1-3 in our catalogue are the symmetric type coulters, tongue shaped and with coupling clutch larger than the blade; two of them present a prolonged blade (1 and 3), different from a third one (2) which has a much higher coupling clutch than the short and thickened blade. They are specific for objects of type plough without socket rod (sole). The pieces at positions no. 4-7 are of symmetric coulters type, triangle shaped and with large clutch, specific for tools of type plough with socket rod.

For the agricultural inventory from the 8th – 12th centuries the plough coulters are of special importance and that is why we considered necessary to put our pieces in scientific circuit. The presence of the three symmetric iron tongue shaped coulters must be stressed, rather rarely discovered instruments in our country, but representing pieces of frequently used tools at the beginning of the medieval period in a large space. We hope that the given information, without considering the dating proposed by us to be final, will contribute to outline different aspects regarding agriculture occupations.

CAPSULES OF THERIAC DISCOVERED IN DOBRUDJA

Gabriel CUSTUREA

Abstract

The author presents six capsules of theriac discovered at Isaccea, nos. 1, 3, 4 and Târgușor-Ester, nos. 2, 5, and 6. These kind of pieces had been discovered at Constanța, Silistra and Mangalia and published 50 years ago.

Together with the original pieces we also find counterfeits, two of them being described by the author (nos. 5, 6). *Testa d'oro*, *Struzzo d'oro*, *Cedro Imperiale* and *Aquila Nera* are names of Venetian chemist's shops found on the territory of Romania, where these kind of products were mentioned.

The existence of these kind of objects, together with some small value weights, certifies the practice of a trade with medicines and cosmetics and the existence of some Venetian coins certifies, at the same time, the relations of this province with the city of Venice.

CERCETĂRI
INTERDISCIPLINARE

RECHERCHES
INTERDISCIPLINAIRES

THE HUGE AND FAST BLACK SEA TRANSGRESSION IN THE EARLY DOBROGEA NEOLITHIC RESULTING IN TWO SPECIES *SPONDYLUS GAEDEROPUS* AND *SPARUS AURATA* ON THE ROMANIAN SEA –SHORE

Abstract

Starting from the XIX th century, it was ascertained that some geological characteristics as well as the flora and fauna of the Crimea peninsula were similar to those from the south of Dobrogea, the so-called Cadrilater.

At the beginning of the XX th century, the Tsarist Marine outlined by mapping the existence of some underwater valleys on the north – west of the Black Sea that continue the Danube valley to the east (towards Crimea) and to the south of Nistru, South Bug and Nipre.

The modern researches that followed, undertaken by the English, French, Russian, American and partly the Romanian Marine stood out that around 7000 years BP, the Black Sea was an easily salmaster lake (the Sarmatic Lake) that connected with the Mediteranean Sea through the Bosfor Strait, and due to the level difference a real cascade of salt water from the Mediteranean sea rushed into the Sarmatic Lake causing a level raising of the Black Sea with more than 100 meters .

So, a large territory from the north and north-west of the Black Sea, an extension of the nowadays low field, was covered by water and the Black Sea developed very special and well known characteristics.

Sea waters coming from Mediterana through the Marmara Sea and the Bosfor Strait have also brought a mediteranean fauna (even today the fauna in the Black Sea is more mediteranean than sarmatic) among which the two species mentioned in the title. They have lived on the Romanian sea shore for millenniums until the end of the post-glacier climate “climate optimum”, the last part of the Eneolithic (Copper epoch).

LABORATORY ANALYSIS OF ARTIFACTS FROM ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE SATU NOU – „VADU VACILOR” (OLTINA COM., CONSTANTA COUNTY)

Leonid CĂRPUȘ, Cornelia CĂRPUȘ

Abstract

The authors present the analysis results on pit Nr. 5 materials, represented by: bone fragments, shell valves, organic soil, pollen, burnt wood fragments. The samples were analyzed in a medical laboratory with specific methods.

Bone materials macroscopic analysis has shown on one hand the presence of hemoglobin traces and on the other of a natural paint, probably thrown into the pit. Some bones presented burning traces. As result of the catalatic-positive reaction, it was established that the blood cells do not belong to the bones, but to aerobic bacterium existing in the soil.

The present shells, belonging to a variety of species, were also analyzed depending on climate factors they have developed in. The larger part of examined pollen belongs to crucifer family plants.

NUMISMATICĂ
NUMISMATIQUE

„SCYTHIAN TYPE” COINS FROM A PRIVATE COLLECTION IN CONSTANȚA

Gabriel TALMAȚCHI
Gheorghe ANDREESCU

Abstract*

The two authors present 18 bronze coins issued for five Scythian basileis, namely Kanites, Charaspes, Akrosas, Ailios and Sariakes. All these coins belong to a private collection and they have been gathered along time, by a deliberate selection. The four pieces, issued for Kanites, correspond to Herakles, The Great God Type, Demeter and Core, as well as Apollon. There are two pieces issued for Charaspes, and they correspond to Dioscuri Type. The piece for Akrosas, belongs to Zeus type. The three coins issued for Ailios belong to one coin type, the Dioscurii one. Finally, the five samples issued for Sariakes belong to the types with the Great God and Demeter as well. All the coins in the catalogue have been discovered in the area situated around Mangalia (the ancient Callatis) or to the South of this town, along the sea coast. Actually, these sites correspond to the majority of this type discoveries.

The authors, taking into consideration the 18 coins described in the catalogue, make a serious analyse of the different aspects regarding iconography, epigraphy, metrology and cronology, as well as the situation of these coin types in the framework of this kind of discoveries known until now. There are also analysed the checks present on the observe side of these coins, integrated into the „universe” of checks present of the „Scythian” type coins as well as on those identified in some mints on the Dobrujan West-Pontic side. There are also suggested in this manner some common features between some coin types and the pieces made on the West Coast of Pontus Euxinus.

As concerning the relationships between these Scythian kings and the Greek cities, the authors are of the opinion they probably had political and economical contracts, as they both had will enough for this, as it has been proved. The coins issued for the Scythian leaders in Dobruja were probably discreetly present in the framework of the Dobrujan economical and trade relationships, being put into circulation precisely due to their Greek features, as work technique, presentation style and iconographical patterns. The possible payments of the Greeks could have done in exchange for agricultural goods using these coins, not the official and „common” ones of the Greek mints, but issued on purpose for this change, with a special dedication. In the same time, they could have been issued also for political purpose above all.

The very important aspect is their presence in Dobruja and they were used by some „kingdoms” led by Scythian basileis, probably more or less simultaneous as existence.

Explanation of plates:

Plate I: „Scythian” type coins issued for Kanites, Charaspes and Akrosas discovered in Dobruja.

Plate II: „Scythian” type coins issued for Ailios and Sariakes discovered in Dobruja.

* Rezumatul a fost tradus de *Corina Apostoleanu*.

ASPECTS OF THE PRESENCE OF THE GETHIAN-DACIAN COINS ON THE PONTIC TERRITORY IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW DISCOVERIES

Gabriel TALMAȚCHI

Abstract*

The last years have brought *via* the special bibliography numerous discoveries important for our subject, enlarging the perspective of this component, incorporate part of the monetary aspects from the 2nd - 1st century B.C.

The author intends a presentation rather succinct of some more recent or older discoveries but unpublished until today, items coming from archaeological excavations as well from incidental diggings. These discoveries are included, specially, in various private collections, and less in the collection of the Numismatic department of the Museum in Constanța or other public collections. However, an important part of them have been included in museum collections or they are to be bought as part of the extensive process of salvation, preservation and revaluation of the national historical patrimony goods. All the information include discoveries mostly from 1994-2007 and have a special importance as concerning the monetary aspects specific for the 2nd - 1st century B.C. in Dobruja. In the framework of the new isolated discoveries, we mention *the Dumbrăveni type* (one emission) at Dunăreni (Aliman commune, Constanța county), the second one from Histria (Istria commune, Constanța county), in the area – „Movilele dese”-; *Adâncata-Mânăstirea type* (two items from Ceamurlia de Jos, Tulcea county and two items from Dunăreni (Aliman commune, Constanța county), *Vârteju – București type* (two items from Hârșova and Sibioara, Constanța county); *Inotești Răcoasa type* (an almost destroyed coin discovered at Ulmetum, at the edge of Pantelimon commune, Constanța county, during the archaeological diggings in 2006 and the *Dobrugea passim*; *the Alexander the 3rd type-Phillippe the Arrydhæus* (two items from Dunăreni (Aliman commune, Constanța county), another two items from Floriile (Aliman commune, Constanța county), a coin from Moșneni (23 August commune, Constanța county), an item from Parcheș (Tulcea county), two items from Pecineaga (Constanța county) and *Măcin type* (from Poiana Teilor, Izvoarele commune, Tulcea county, in “Valea Teilor” area). All the items discovered at Dunăreni are coming from „Gura Zăvalului” area, from a settlement dated in the 4th - 1st century B.C. The item from Moșneni was found at about 2.5 km SV from the settlement and the last one a Dobrujan *passim*. The author notices the Gethian-Dacian pieces discovered in the diggings appear in irrelevant situations or having no connection with the very period of penetration and circulation of these coins. It is possible to be only an occurrence or a real fact? It is possible that during the Roman epoch (in different periods, but mostly in the early period, against the background of a monetary penury, in more or less official transactions), mostly in the rural area, to use such samples only in the situation of “silver coin”. Or, they were kept as “silver coins”, which, in a certain moment could be valorized. These kind of samples are very dulled, generally not preserving iconographical details or legends on the obverse or the reverse side, being easier to be used lately. The imitation *Alexander the 3rd - Phillip the 3rd Arrydhæus type* drachmas have a weight similar to the Roman Imperial denarii in circulation.

Not last it is to be noticed the thesaurus discovered at Somova. In 2006, in the area of Somova (Somova commune, Tulcea county), near the area „La batace”, where there are attested a settlement and a necropolis dated from Latène period, where at the entrance of a cave (or rather a grotto) was discovered a thesaurus including some dozens of Gethian-Dacian silver coins. It seems there are 24 *Vârteju - București type* coins, 13 *Inotești - Răcoasa type* coins, 16 items of *Măcin type*, and not last three *Moskon type* silver coins (two drachma and a half of drachma). Starting from this discovery, the author suggests, on one side, as a hypothesis, a location for *Moskon basileus* in the area of the great settlement from Somova, and, in the same time, its maintenance as a tribal centre to the end of the 1st century B.C. On the other side, regarding the date of the *Moskon*, type coins, there have been proposed three chronological moments: the end of the 4th century - the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.; the 3rd century B.C.

* Rezumatul a fost tradus în limba engleză de Corina Apostoleanu.

and the 2nd century B.C. (this last datation has been done in accordance with the weight standard used for their emission). Taking into consideration the association of the *Moskon* type coins with Gethian-Dacian coins specific to the second stage of the Northern Danube mint, we are inclined to attribute as well their emission beginning with 2nd B.C.

The second deposit discovered at Hârșova (Constanța county) is not so important as that one mentioned previously, but relevant for understanding the monetary aspects inside the local communities. It seems that the deposit was found by an inhabitant in 1993-1994. The deposit includes six drachmas imitations *type of Alexander the 3rd - Phillip the 3rd Arryphaeus* and appeared after a heavy rain in a new crack in the soil in the upper part of the hill at Celea Mică, on the steep edge of a slope.

NEW BYZANTINE MONETARY DISCOVERIES IN DOBRUDJA (5th – 7th CENT)

Gabriel CUSTUREA

Abstract

The author publishes a number of 267 Byzantine coins from the 5th – 7th cent. discovered in Dobrudja. The pieces come either from archaeological sites like Adamclisi, Capidava, Hârșova, Pantelimonul de Sus, either from private collections.

Some pieces worth being individualized. Piece no. 2 is a rare issue from Justinus I, the "officina" of pieces no. 102 and no. 111 is original and piece no. 202 has a different reading legend to the MIB, II catalogue.

The author is also making some remarks concerning the circulation of the early Byzantine coin on the territory of Dobrudja. Starting with the monetary reform of Anastasius I, the emperors' issues spread in the towns and the big fortresses and only sporadically in the rural area. From the analyze of the spreading discoveries one can notice that from a number of 101 sites, in 40 among them only one coin has been discovered. We notice, therefore, a weak monetary circulation in the rural area. After the first half of the 6th cent., the monetary circulation gets a "isolated" character, limited to towns and their surroundings. Only after the years 616-619 this phenomenon becomes symbolic up to its total disappearance after 680. The multiplication of the precious metal coins during the second half of the 7th cent. shows the military aspect of the monetary penetration in the epoch.

RECENZII
COMPTES RENDUS

***Rome and the Black Sea Region. Domination, Romanisation, Resistance, Black Sea Studies 5*, edited by Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen, Aarhus University Press, 2006, 186 p.**

Centre for Black Sea Studies a fost înființat în luna februarie, 2002. Ca centru de cercetare interdisciplinară are scopul de a studia lumea circumpontică, prin accentuarea relațiilor etnice, a contactelor culturale și economice, a fenomenelor politice și sociale din zona de legătură dintre Europa și Asia.¹ Activitatea acestuia s-a remarcat și prin organizarea de conferințe internaționale, fiecare cu o temă privitoare la spațiul pontic. Unele comunicări, prezentate în acest context, au fost publicate în seria *Black Sea Studies* (BSS), care a ajuns de curând la numărul 7. Am ales să prezentăm BSS 5, apărut în anul 2006.

Rome and the Black Sea Region. Domination, Romanisation, Resistance reunește nouă articole, inițial comunicări susținute la cea de-a V-a Conferință Internațională a centrului amintit, care a avut loc la Esbjerg, între 23-26 ianuarie 2005. Asemenea conferinței, volumul are ca fir conducător tema „Impactul Romei asupra spațiului circumpontic”.

Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen, editorul lucrării, în *Introducere*, familiarizează cititorul cu domeniul și punctele de abordare folosite de autorii articolelor. Esențial pentru înțelegerea raporturilor lumii romane cu zonele din jurul Mării Negre este sistematizarea lor în trei termeni cheie, anunțați încă din titlu. Aceștia sunt însoțiți de câteva detalii geografice și cronologice, care creează premisele proiectării fenomenelor tratate în contextul mai larg al istoriei romane.

Dimensiunile clarificate de T. Bekker-Nielsen se referă la trei noțiuni interconectate: dominația (cucerirea romană), romanizarea (ca justificare a dominației) și rezistența (ca răspuns la romanizare). Fraza aleasă de T. Bekker-Nielsen pentru a caracteriza raporturile Romei cu spațiile supuse și pentru a ilustra universalitatea și valabilitatea acestui tipar în orice perioadă și în orice spațiu, este foarte potrivită pentru întreg conținutul volumului: „all history is contemporary history” (Benedetto Croce). Într-adevăr, autorii prezintă, ca analogii la subiectele tratate, exemple similare din modernitate și contemporaneitate.

Articolele sunt organizate în funcție de conținutul lor și se succed logic dând cursivitate și unitate volumului.

În primul, *From Kingdom to Province: Reshaping Pontos after the Fall of Mithridates VI*, Jacob Munk Højte prezintă etapele parcurse de Pontos, de la un regat cu o viață urbană neesențială, materializată în coloniile grecești de pe țărmul mării, puternic influențate de elenism, la o provincie romană în care urbanizarea a depășit litoralul și a pătruns în interiorul continentului. Autorul analizează schimbările pe care cucerirea romană le-a determinat în regiunea amintită. Prima observație ar fi aceea că densitatea de locuire a crescut, apărând nu numai noi centre urbane, ci și așezări rurale. Observațiile se bazează pe rezultatele cercetărilor arheologice făcute în siturile din zona promontoriului Sinope și din Paphlagonia. O altă schimbare impusă de noua configurație politică a fost și cea legată de modul de măsurare a timpului. Era bithyno-pontică a fost abandonată poate și din cauza legăturii cu regalitatea (anul de pornire era cel în care Zipoites devenise rege al al Bithyniei, în 297/96 a.Chr.). Aceasta nu a fost însă o modificare impusă, ci s-a produs la inițiativa autorităților locale.

Metamorfozele Pontos-ului, în special cele petrecute la nivel social, sunt sesizabile în inscripții, datorită a ceea ce el numește „the epigraphic habit”. Corelând informațiile epigrafice și arheologice cu cele numismatice, autorul concluzionează că în majoritatea orașelor transformările au avut loc concomitent și treptat, chiar dacă unele procese sunt mai puțin vizibile și mai greu de datat.

Liviu Petculescu conturează, în *The Roman Army as a Factor of Romanisation in the North-East Part of Moesia Inferior*, unul din factorii care au purtat romanizarea în teritoriile cucerite, referindu-se la partea de NE a Moesiei Inferior. Sunt tratate în special consecințele cuceririi și reorganizării militare a provinciei. Spre deosebire de spațiul amintit în primul articol, în care prezența militară era redusă, întărirea *limes*-ului moesiac a presupus și cantonarea de unități auxiliare și chiar legiuni în centrele fortificate aflate pe linia Dunării. Astfel, zona romanizată

¹ Informații despre activitatea acestui centru, precum și publicațiile sale, în format pdf., pot fi accesate pe site-ul: <http://www.pontos.dk/>

cel mai puternic a devenit cea întinsă de-a lungul fluviului, spre deosebire de litoral, unde romanii s-au lovit de tradiționalismul orașelor grecești și al teritoriilor lor. Influența militară de pe *limes*-ul danubian, mult mai extinsă, ajungea atât în partea centrală, cât și în cea litorală a Moesiei Inferior. Această implicare a armatei în teritoriile ce țineau de orașele grecești sau de centrele din mijlocul provinciei este ilustrată de izvoarele epigrafice, principala sursă cu care autorul își susține aserțiunile.

Următorul grup de articole surprinde punctele de vedere ale celor cuceritori, modul în care noii veniți erau percepuți și mai ales deschiderea către romanitate sau respingerea sa de către populațiile indigene din provincia romană Bithynia – Pontus.

Astfel, Daniela Dueck introduce și explică în *Memnon of Herakleia on Rome and the Romans* conceptul de *identitate multiplă*, tratat sau numai amintit în încă două din articolele componente ale volumului. Este un fenomen specific mai ales ariei circumpontice, unde tradiția elenistică, bine înrădăcinată în aspectele sociale, culturale, politice, religioase locale, a venit în contact cu cea romană. Existența uneia nu a exclus-o pe cealaltă, populația din zonă fiind perfect adaptabilă și la influențele nou venite, tocmai datorită posibilității de asumare a unei identități multiple: cea locală, cea greacă și cea romană. Și Jesper Majbom Madsen ilustrează capacitatea locuitorilor provinciei Bithynia-Pontus de a avea o „suprastructură” a unei identități deja existente. Însușirea unei identități romane nu aducea cu sine o criză existențială, ci doar completa trăsăturile locale formate anterior. Jørgen Christian Meyer ne oferă un contraexemplu: poporul evreu. Autorul vorbește despre incapacitatea acestuia de a se adapta la noua situație impusă de imperiul roman. Identitatea sa este exclusivă și singulară având la bază motivații religioase – destinul comun dat de Dumnezeu evreilor și cărțile sfinte. Mai multe detalii despre aceste două contribuții vom furniza mai jos, deoarece ținem să păstrăm ordinea stabilită în cuprinsul volumului.

Revenind la articolul Danielei Dueck, amintim câteva aspecte analizate în acesta: opera *Περὶ Ηρακλεία* a heracleeanului Memnon, al cărei rezumat ne-a parvenit prin Photios, patriarh al Constantinopolului în secolul IX; evenimentele la care Memnon s-a referit în lucrarea sa (cele relevante pentru Heracleea sunt preponderente); constatările de natură politică, socială, morală pe care acesta le face; asemănări și deosebiri între textul său și cele ale altor autori antici (Strabon) în ceea ce privește relațiile romanilor cu heracleenii și cu alte populații cucerite. Autoarea oferă, deci, imaginea unui heracleean despre patria sa, pe care el o vede ca punct central în raport cu periferia, simbolizată de restul lumii. Perspectiva este opusă cu cea a scriitorilor romani, care văd în provinciile cucerite periferia, iar în Roma centrul.

Jesper Majbom Madsen are ca punct de plecare, în *Intellectual Resistance to Roman Hegemony and its Representativity*, izvoarele literare antice ale autorilor locali din Bithynia-Pontus. Madsen vorbește despre rezistența intelectuală și reprezentanții săi din provincia amintită, manifestată prin mișcarea literară denumită „the Second Sophistic”, între secolele I-III p.Chr. Este numită astfel deoarece promotorii săi s-au inspirat din stilul literar folosit de atenieni mai ales în secolul V a. Chr. Cei care se încadrează în acest curent pledează pentru păstrarea culturii grecești în orașele cu tradiție elenistică din zona menționată, fără sa nege cucerirea romană și acceptând unele modificări politice, sociale și religioase aduse de ea. Este într-adevăr o formă de rezistență, nu numai prin conținutul scrierilor ce îi aparțin, ci și prin simplul fapt că, prin numele adoptat, amintește de perioada de aur a literaturii și a culturii grecești în general. Nu este însă o formă de negare sau inadaptare a întregii populații, ci un fenomen izolat, care vine în contrast cu tendința elitei locale de a se considera romană. Astfel, Plutarch, Dion din Prusa și Philostratos din Athena critică influența culturii romane și pe grecii care au îmbrățișat-o uitându-și originile. Ei însă recunosc și acceptă superioritatea militară romană. Arrianus din Athena și Cassius Dion din Nikaia oferă imaginea unor intelectuali locali integrați în sistemul administrativ-politic roman, fiecare deținând funcția de guvernator în diferite provincii. Deși Dion dezaprobă, într-o oarecare măsură, practicarea cultului imperial și critică domnia lui Domitian, el se consideră ca aparținând elitei romane, când folosește pronumele „noi”, pentru rangul senatorial. Aristeides este favorabil romanității apreciind capacitatea Romei și a conducătorilor ei de a menține un imperiu atât de întins, spre deosebire de imposibilitatea de supraviețuire a imperiului constituit de Alexandru cel Mare. Prin urmare, opiniile autorilor antici sunt diferite și nu corespund de fiecare dată cu atitudinea întregii elite locale. Numele romane, preponderente, sunt un indiciu că elita trece printr-un proces de romanizare sub toate aspectele, chiar și sub cel al onomasticii.

La fel ca Højte și Madsen, Thomas Corsten are în vedere, în *The Rôle and the Status of the Indigenous Population in Bithynia*, importanța numelor locuitorilor din Bithynia. Punctul său de vedere este, însă, diferit. Cercetătorul consideră că preponderența numelor romane în inscripțiile funerare ilustrează o schimbare completă a vechii elite, tracă la origine, cu una romană, care acumula din ce în ce mai mult pământ, în defavoarea nobililor indigeni. Procesul de trecere a proprietăților funciare din mâna elitei locale în cea a noii pături romane a început din secolul III a.Chr. și s-a desăvârșit în timpul lui Augustus. Articolul este însoțit și de un *Appendix*, care cuprinde inscripții descoperite la Nikaia, Nikomedia, Prusa și Kios.

Următoarele două contribuții prezintă, după cum constata T. Bekker-Nielsen în introducere, spațiul circumpontic din perspectiva unor romani stabiliți acolo.

Provincia lui Plinius cel Tânăr, la care se referă articolul lui Greg Woolf, *Pliny's Province*, este Bithynia-Pontus. Izvorul literar folosit este cartea a 10-a a *Scrisorilor* lui Plinius cel Tânăr, care cuprinde corespondența dintre acesta, în calitate de guvernator al provinciei, și împăratul Traian. Din punct de vedere al poziției față de cea de-a zecea carte a *Scrisorilor*, G. Woolf face parte din rândul cercetătorilor care îi contestă caracterul de simplă corespondență personală, pe care Plinius nu a gândit-o ca publicabilă. G. Woolf își argumentează punctul de vedere, concluzionând că scopul volumului epistolar era propagandistic, de oglindire a unei relații perfecte dintre împăratul ideal și guvernatorul ideal. Autorul consideră că Plinius nu prezintă o provincie, ci o creează atent, conturând portrete pozitive ale conducătorilor romani și evitând să amintească și tulburările care au avut loc. În acest mod, scriitorul oferă o imagine parțială și reflectă clar numai atitudinea și ideologia clasei din care face parte.

Cel de-al șaptelea articol, *Local Politics in an Imperial Context*, este semnat de editorul lucrării, T. Bekker-Nielsen. Prin utilizarea izvoarelor scrise, dar și a unor descoperiri epigrafice, acesta distinge patru moduri de a obține influență, respect și anumite facilități în spațiul provincial roman. Prin urmare, direcțiile politicii locale, sunt trasate de tipul de putere deținut:

-puterea banilor era exercitată de așa-zii binefăcători, care își ofereau ajutorul financiar orașelor aflate în criză, provocând, în cele din urmă, acumularea unor datorii imense și imposibilitatea centrelor urbane de a le plăti.

-puterea micilor funcționari era importantă datorită funcțiilor cheie pe care le dețineau; ei controlau accesul la superiorii lor; prin prisma permanenței postului ocupat, aveau, de asemenea, avantajul de a cunoaște mai bine situația orașului în care trăiau, spre deosebire de magistrații numiți anual.

-puterea Romei se manifesta la nivel judiciar, domeniu în care provincialii intrau cel mai des în contact cu centrul imperiului. Influența Romei în această sferă era asigurată de legăturile avute de nobilii locali cu oficialii romani, relații care îi favorizau în fața legii.

-puterea zvonului, cum o numește autorul, era accesibilă oricui, indiferent de statut social, funcție sau avere; utilizarea sa în spațiul asiatic este confirmată în corespondența dintre Cicero și fratele său Quintus.

T. Bekker-Nielsen mai prezintă și două studii de caz, *Reading the Riot Act in Ephesos* și *Friends in High Places*.

În *Cultural Contact and Cultural Change: Colonialism and Empire*, Anne Marie Carstens conceptualizează o serie de sintagme, care pot fi incluse în aria tematică a unui fenomen mai larg, cel al romanizării. Principala rezultată a acestui proces se manifestă atât la nivel material cât și la nivel mental, prin modificări succesive. Metamorfoza se produce datorită influențelor diferite, care îmbracă elementele tradiționale, locale ale unei populații, prin permanent contact cultural. Printre conceptele analizate se numără: cultura, stilul, identitatea (culturală), aculturația etc. Utilizând considerațiile lui Chris Gordon, din *Archaeology and Colonialism-Cultural Contact from 5000 B.C. to the Present* și exemple referitoare la un caz concret – arta greco-persană, A.M. Carstens concluzionează că ridicarea și menținerea unui mare imperiu nu se pot baza exclusiv pe puterea politică, dominație și supunere, ci și pe puterea creativă pe care o deține cultura.

J.C. Mayer, în *What Have the Romans ever Done for Us? How to win wars and also peace*, tratează două caracteristici ale politicii Imperiului roman, aparent incompatibile, dar în mod surprinzător legate printr-o relație cauză-efect. Nici un imperiu nu poate rezista fără măsuri brutale și coercitive. După cucerire urmează pacea. Dar, poate pacea să fie menținută fără mijloace militare? Se complac oare toate popoarele supuse în această postură de inferioritate,

în ciuda avantajelor oferite de cuceritor? Răspunsul dat de autor este negativ, exemplificat și cu evenimentele contemporane din Irak („americanizarea Irakului”). Totuși, lumea antică era una deschisă interconexiunilor culturale. Atât elenismul cât și romanitatea s-au impus în majoritatea cazurilor. Există însă o excepție: poporul evreu, care s-a opus atât elenizării cât și romanizării. J.C. Mayer tratează acest fenomen interesant apelând, după cum am specificat, la conceptul de *identitate multiplă*, dimensiune la care poporul iudaic nu s-a putut adapta. Cercetătorul definește și etapele prin care romanii, prin romanizare, au reușit să construiască o identitate bine conturată, adoptată de cei cucerțiți, de-a lungul timpului: cucerire (dominație), consolidare, adaptare, integrare deplină.

Apărut într-un format de calitate și în bune condiții grafice, volumul devine un instrument foarte util pentru cei care sunt interesați de istoria spațiului pontic în perioada romană.

Subliniem, de asemenea, importanța inițiativei centrului danez de a aduce laolaltă și de a publica studii ale cercetătorilor din diferite instituții și institute de profil din străinătate, atât de necesare lămuririi aspectelor privitoare la antichitatea circumponică.

Irina NASTASI

Alix BARBET, *La peinture murale en Gaule romaine*, Ed. Picard, Paris, 2008, 391 pag., 565 photos couleur + carte.



L'ouvrage sur lequel nous allons nous arrêter en ce qui suit couronne pour son auteur plusieurs décennies d'activité prestigieuse mise au service d'une discipline relativement récente, quoique le sujet de cette discipline remonte bien loin dans le passé, aux débuts de l'antiquité même. Il faudrait préciser premièrement que la peinture murale antique, dont les plus anciens exemples connus remontent au milieu du II-e millénaire av. J.-C., c'est-à-dire depuis quand datent les fragments du décor du palais détruit d'Akrotiri, sur l'île de Thera, ou Santorin d'aujourd'hui, a fait l'objet d'une approche scientifique systématique seulement au XIX^e s., lorsque les vestiges de Pompéi venaient d'être mis au jour. Mais la peinture murale romaine, dont le centre initial d'intérêt a été localisé dans la ville ensevelie par la lave du Vésuve, n'est pas liée uniquement à la péninsule italique.

dont la Gaule fut l'une des plus fleurissantes, ce chapitre des aspects particulièrement originaux et spectaculaires, lence seulement aux années 70 du XX^e s., grâce justement aux efforts soutenus de l'auteur de ce livre. Car du nom d'Alix Barbet se lieit non seulement un impressionnant volume d'ouvrages et études scientifiques, qui dépassent déjà 200 titres, mais aussi toute une série d'activités concrètes, au sein du Conseil de l'Europe ou d'autres organismes internationaux, pour le sauvetage et la mise en valeur de plusieurs ensembles de peinture murale, au point d'être perdus à jamais pour les chercheurs et le grand public. De son nom se lieit davantage la création du Centre d'Etudes des Peintures Murales Romaines de Soissons (CEPMR) le premier de ce type de la France et l'un des premiers au monde, aussi bien que la formation de plusieurs séries de chercheurs et de restaurateurs qui allaient partager la passion pour la mise en valeur des peintures murales.

Ayant en vue tout cela, on peut dire que l'ouvrage que nous allons présenter est l'un des plus beaux accomplissements d'une véritable profession de foi, dirigée constamment vers un aspect partiellement ignoré par beaucoup à cause de la fragilité de toute découverte de fragments de décor mural peint.

Dans une brève *introduction* nous est présentée une évaluation globale du volume des ouvrages déjà existants sur les peintures murales de la Gaule, accompagnée par l'observation constante qu'il n'existe pas encore pour la plupart des provinces de l'empire romain un répertoire complet sur les découvertes de ce type. Dès le début le lecteur est introduit dans la problématique de la terminologie, c'est à dire si l'on peut parler d'une peinture exclusivement autonome, spécifique uniquement à la Gaule romaine, ou au contraire, la peinture de cette province suivait, d'une manière plus ou moins fidèle, les modèles venus d'Italie. Dans la même logique de la démarche peuvent se préciser les problèmes dans les autres provinces, où la découverte des ensembles des peintures murales devient de plus en plus actuelle.

L'auteur assume directement l'initiative d'aborder la substance de son ouvrage, l'analyse des dates, des styles, des tendances originelles provinciales, etc..., dans une manière semblable à celle de bâtir une maison. En premier lieu, ont été établies des fondations solides, c'est-à-dire qu'en accord avec les informations stratigraphiques accessibles, les analogies connues dans le milieu hellénistique et romain, ont été interprétés les plus anciens ensembles picturaux. Ensuite, gardant toujours la métaphore du début, ont été érigés les échafaudages de la construction, c'est-à-dire qu'ont été élaborées des hypothèses capables d'assurer la cohésion des dates et des constatations, apparemment isolées, afin de les comparer et de les analyser ensembles. Enfin, les lecteurs pourraient avoir à la fin la perspective d'un édifice solide, en train de s'articuler devant leurs propres yeux, car « *le chantier reste ouvert, de toute façon, à chacun d'y ajouter sa pierre... et non pas de la jeter* », comme l'indique l'auteur même, consciente du risque de son entreprise, essayant d'aborder une synthèse trop fragile par son ampleur.

Structurée en deux parties, la première intitulée *Etude chronologique*, la deuxième *Peinture de genre*, le livre comprend à la fin de chaque chapitre une série de conclusions, permettant ainsi une meilleure coordination du riche matériel documentaire.

Les premiers chapitres sont consacrés au *Cadre de l'étude et méthodes* (I) et à la *Réalisation technique des peintures* (II). En premier lieu sont présentées d'une manière synthétique les analyses les plus significatives concernant les découvertes de peintures murales, à partir de l'ouvrage d'Adrien Blanchet, « *Etude sur le décor des édifices de la Gaule romaine* », publié en 1913, qui avait le mérite d'établir un inventaire relativement complet des ensembles connus jusqu'à la date de la parution du livre. Ensuite sont discutées les diverses méthodes d'étude des fragments de peintures, surtout lorsqu'ils n'ont pas été récupérés d'une manière systématique. Il y a souvent des cas où les fragments de différentes séquences décoratives des peintures de la plinthe, c'est-à-dire la zone inférieure des parois, ne collent pas avec ceux de la zone moyenne et supérieure et en absence de ces morceaux clés, la restitution complète du décor d'une paroi et ensuite celui de l'édifice entier, reste impossible. Pour éviter ces situations désagréables et frustrantes, surtout lorsqu'il s'agit d'hypothèses de restitutions complètes, sont passés en revue les procédés techniques qui puissent aider considérablement la récupération des fragments découverts *in situ*. A ce point le relevé, exécuté à l'échelle 1/1 sur plastique transparent, ainsi que les détails des photos prises lors de la découverte, s'avèrent essentiels. Une fois parcourues ces opérations et les morceaux clés identifiés, les correspondances entre les zones décoratives des parois deviennent plus faciles à déterminer. Dans le deuxième chapitre sont présentées d'une manière détaillée, la technique de la fresque, à partir des sources écrites, mais aussi par rapport aux réalités effectives enregistrées sur le terrain qui ne respectent que partiellement les sources classiques. Ensuite sont détaillées les techniques d'application du mortier, du support pictural les tracées préparatoires des schémas décoratives, lorsqu'ils sont visibles.

Le III^e chapitre, *Naissance de la peinture murale du Ve siècle au I^{er} siècle. av. J.-C.*, est consacré à la tradition préromaine du décor monumental peint en Gaule, avant la conquête. Une place à part dans l'analyse est occupée par l'ensemble monumental découvert à La Rocquepertuse, où un sanctuaire consacré à des dieux-héros gaulois avait partiellement un décor peint, exécuté directement sur pierre. Dans le même contexte sont analysés d'autres découvertes en provenance de Glanum, Nîmes et Saint-Chaptes. Ensuite est discuté le *premier style* de la peinture pompéienne et les découvertes par lesquelles il est illustré en Gaule, c'est-à-dire celles

enregistrées sur l'île Sainte Marguerite et Lyon. Le deuxième style est discuté dans le contexte des découvertes de Glanum, Nîmes, Ensérune, etc..., c'est-à-dire la partie sud de la Gaule, située au voisinage des frontières d'Italie, d'où venaient la plupart des artisans itinérants.

Un rôle important dans l'ouvrage occupe le IV^e chapitre, *Naissance, diffusion et évolution du III^e style pompéien* car justement ce style a été considérablement enrichi par les apports extrêmement originaux des ateliers de la Gaule romaine. Sont passées en revue par ordre chronologique, sous la forme de fiches dossiers de chaque site, les découvertes de Lyon, Saint Romain en Gal, Orange, qui illustrent le « III^e style sévère », l'étape la plus ancienne en Gaule, pour passer ensuite aux autres sites localisés en Narbonnaise, Lyonnaise, Aquitaine et la Belgique, qui témoignent de l'éblouissement de la peinture murale dans toute cette zone de l'empire, due à l'influence constante exercée aussi par les ateliers provinciaux de Lyon.

Dans les chapitres V, VI et VII est analysée l'évolution de la peinture murale entre la dernière moitié du I^e s. apr. J.-C. et les III et IV^e s., période pendant laquelle se développe la tradition originelle d'une véritable école provinciale. L'auteur met en évidence qu'à partir même de la dynastie flavienne était en train de se produire une révolution stylistique remarquée au niveau d'un répertoire décoratif élaboré au début par les ateliers italiens mais richement transformé et adapté par les artisans et ateliers locaux, qui allaient s'affirmer pleinement partout. Il s'agit surtout du développement d'un motif décoratif très connu par ailleurs, la bordure ajourée, ainsi que la nouvelle distribution des motifs figuratifs à l'intérieur des compositions. D'autre part, une évolution extrêmement originelle allait connaître aussi le motif du « candélabre », avec plusieurs variantes typologiques propres aux provinces gauloises. La peinture murale tardive, du III et IV^e s., est interprétée par l'auteur sous le signe d'un maniérisme archaïsant, avec des personnages grandeur nature au milieu de vastes compositions figuratives, adoptées aussi par les mosaïques de l'époque, ce qui aurait pu suggérer des options stylistiques communes de la part des commanditaires. Ces options témoignent d'une préoccupation constante de leur part de se synchroniser avec les exigences artistiques venues de Rome, où toute une série de découvertes, comme celles du *Pedagogium* ou de la Piazza Cinquecento, viennent d'offrir justement la clé de cette nouvelle tendance dans la peinture murale monumentale.

La deuxième partie de l'ouvrage, *La peinture de genre*, comprend un répertoire exhaustif des thèmes iconographiques examinés par rapport aux divers emplacements décoratifs. L'auteur fournit de riches dossiers descriptifs pour chaque site analysé ce qui permet au lecteur d'avoir un tableau complet des découvertes et de les comparer d'une manière cohérente.

Le VIII^e chapitre, *Décor en plein air*, passe en revue plusieurs types de jardins ou d'espaces ouverts qui comprennent aussi des paysages aquatiques, en tant que sujets pour le décor peint. Sont analysés les jardins comme motifs décoratifs intervenant dans les compositions intérieures, *hortus conclusus*, ainsi que le décor peint des jardins réels, *viridarii*, développés souvent autour d'un portique monumental. Une sorte de catégorie de motifs à part est constitué par les peintures à sujets aquatiques, présentes surtout sur les parois des bassins ou des espaces organisés autour des bassins.

Le chapitre IX est consacré aux peintures de plafonds et des voûtes, analysées par rapport aux types de compositions décoratives. L'auteur discute plusieurs catégories d'entre elles dont les compositions linéaires les compositions isotropes ou en réseaux (avec différentes variantes typologiques), les compositions centrées, les compositions centrées à diagonales et médianes affirmées, les compositions centrées à cases écartées et symétriques, les compositions rayonnantes, les compositions libres et les compositions indéterminées. Parmi les conclusions de ce chapitre, l'auteur met en évidence une importante diffusion, surtout à partir du II^e s. apr. J.-C., des compositions en réseaux, développées selon des formules originelles locales, indépendamment des modèles italiens. Une seule exception à cette tendance pourrait être enregistrée toutefois en Narbonnaise où les compositions centrées semblent s'organiser par rapport à de trames venues de la peinture campanienne.

Dans le X^e chapitre, *Transformations des thèmes au fil des siècles*, sont analysés les thèmes iconographiques proprement dits et les modifications qui leurs ont été apportées au cours du temps, en accord avec de différentes exigences artistiques locales. Dans ce contexte sont passées en revues les palettes chromatiques, et les genres picturaux, dont les dauphins sur candélabres, le trompe l'œil, les paysages idyllico-sacrés, les scènes aquatiques, les natures

mortes (fruits et vases) les oiseaux, les portraits (*imagines clipeatae*, masques, têtes joufflues, têtes de Méduse) et les scènes figurées (frises et prédelles, tableaux, scènes de grand format, scènes de culte, scènes mythologiques, scènes de spectacle).

L'ouvrage comprend, en dehors des conclusions finales, un glossaire élaboré de termes, un index de noms et de lieux, avec des renvois précis au glossaire où cela est nécessaire.

Ceea ce se desprinde din parcurgerea acestei cărți, ea însăși un monument impresionant de erudiție și de limpezime logică, este o extraordinară actualitate a picturii murale romane. În fond, așa cum remarca pe bună dreptate autoarea, pictura romană nu poate fi interpretată prin ea însăși, izolată de contextul mult mai larg al artei și al mentalităților. În acest sens, se poate spune că există o punte deschisă peste timp între pictura murală romană provincială din Galia și pictura de șevalet a unor artiști de talia lui Cezanne sau Puvis de Chavannes, în direcția unor preocupări constante în abordarea naturilor statice sau a temelor clasicizante, de pildă. Este de descifrat și în acest din urmă caz evocat de autoare, o neobosită căutare de repere valorice clare aflate de fapt la temelia oricărei arte

Ce qui reste à la fin de la lecture de cet ouvrage, un véritable monument d'érudition et logique impeccable, c'est l'actualité extraordinaire de la peinture murale romaine. En effet, elle ne pourrait pas être interprétée par elle-même, d'une manière isolée, « *elle n'existe pas en soi* » comme l'auteur nous le dit, mais elle s'inscrit dans un contexte beaucoup plus large des réalités artistiques et des mentalités qui traversent les époques. En ce sens, comme l'auteur le suggère déjà, il existe un lien évident entre l'héritage de la peinture de la Gaule romaine et les préoccupations artistiques d'un Cézanne, dans les natures mortes ou d'un Puvis de Chavannes, dans les portraits, par exemple. Il y a ici, comme dans beaucoup d'autres cas d'ailleurs, l'expression d'une formidable unité des valeurs solides de l'art qui essayent de se retrouver à travers le temps. Ce livre vient de le démontrer pleinement.

Radu CIOBANU

IN MEMORIAM

CONSTANTIN PEDA (1 noiembrie 1925 – 28 martie 2008)

În luna martie a anului 2008 a trecut în lumea umbrelor un prieten apropiat al arheologiei și numismaticii dobrogene, distinsul profesor dr. Constantin Preda. A plecat dintre noi o personalitate marcantă a istoriografiei naționale, încărcată de un deosebit prestigiu național și internațional, câștigat în decenii de cercetări.

Constantin Preda s-a născut la data de 1 noiembrie 1925 în satul Morunești, comuna Morunglav (jud. Olt). Școala generală și liceul le-a urmat între anii 1938-1946 în municipiul Râmnicu Vâlcea, pentru ca studiile universitare să le parcurgă între anii 1947-1951 la Facultatea de Istorie, secția de Istorie Veche a Universității București. În anul 1951 a fost angajat la Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan” din București (la Cabinetul Numismatic), al cărui director va ajunge începând cu 1 octombrie 1981.

Activitatea arheologică a lui Constantin Preda însumează un mare număr de cercetări, în colectiv sau individual, legate în special de Dobrogea, dar și de alte puncte de interes aflate pe harta arheologică a teritoriului românesc. Această apropiere de valorile istorice și arheologice s-a manifestat începând încă din vremea studenției - spre exemplu la Histria (1950-1954). De asemenea, a efectuat cercetări la Sinoe (1952), Tariverde (1955-1959) și Mangalia (începând din 1959), studiind printre altele mediul grecesc sau greco-indigen, situația societății geto-dacice din Muntenia, Moldova și Dobrogea sub diferitele sale aspecte, evoluția centrelor urbane de la Callatis și Tomis în epocile greacă, romană și romano-bizantină etc. Săpăturile arheologice desfășurate în necropola de la Callatis datată în secolele IV-VI p.Chr. au fost încununuate (ca și mare parte din alte cercetări ale domniei sale) cu un volum apărut în anul 1980.

Din anul 1983 devine președinte al Societății Numismatice Române, funcție pe care a deținut-o până la decesul său. După anul 1989, devine șeful Cabinetului Numismatic al Bibliotecii Academiei Române. De altfel, cea mai de seamă activitate a desfășurat-o în domeniul numismaticii. Se remarcă în acest sens, mai întâi, prin lucrarea „*Monedele geto-dacilor*” (unde sunt studiate exhaustiv toate tipurile monetare specifice monetăriei geto-dacice, stabilindu-se arii de influență și manifestare ale unor importante uniuni de triburi pre-Burebista, și unde se face o mai bună distincție dintre monedele celtice și cele geto-dacice). În anul 1998 apare volumul „*Istoria monedei în Dacia preromană*” care reprezintă o sinteză de mare amploare privind prezența și circulația documentului monetar, de la semnele premonetare la denarul roman imperial pe teritoriul Daciei preromane.

Dobrogea și descoperirile sale monetare au rămas mereu sub directa sa atenție. În acest sens a descoperit și cercetat marele tezaur de la Mangalia (1968), tipurile monetare emise de monetăria Histriei în epocă preromană și romană pe baza descoperirilor rezultate din săpăturile arheologice desfășurate în cetate și împrejurimi între anii 1914-1970, emisiunile de argint ale basileului Moskon, circulația monedelor romane imperiale și a celor bizantine etc.

A obținut titlul de doctor în istorie în anul 1971 cu lucrarea „*Monedele geto-dacilor*”. Pe parcursul deceniilor de activitate științifică, datorită meritelor sale remarcabile, i s-a acordat de două ori premiul „Vasile Pârvan” al Academiei Române (în anii 1968 și 1975).

A îndeplinit și funcțiile de redactor șef al revistelor *Dacia*, *Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică* și al *Buletinului Societății Numismatice Române*, respectiv redactor responsabil adjunct al revistei *Thraco-Dacica* până la dispariția sa. Nu în ultimul rând amintim și participarea sa la realizarea *Enciclopediei arheologiei și istoriei vechi a României* (trei volume) apărute în calitate de coordonator și autor.

Printre multiplele și variatele activități amintim și pe cele din domeniul universitar, unde profesorul Constantin Preda a condus lucrări de doctorat la Facultatea de Istorie a Universității din București, a predat cursuri universitare la Universitatea din Târgoviște (1996-2003) și la Universitatea „Hyperion” (1992-2005).

Meritele sale au fost recunoscute și prin distincția primită din partea Președinției României, Ordinul „Meritul Cultural” în grad de ofițer, în anul 2003.

Profesorul Constantin Preda va rămâne pentru cei care l-au cunoscut un exemplu de determinare, hărnicie și altruism, oferind tuturor celor interesați ajutor și consiliere de

specialitate. Nu încheiem fără a sublinia încă o dată deosebitele merite și contribuții științifice aduse la evoluția arheologiei românești, dar mai ales la cea a numismaticii naționale și internaționale. Fără discuție că dispariția sa lasă un gol important în cercetarea de specialitate, adăugându-se listei, din nefericire bogată, a celor care ne-au părăsit în ultimul timp din lumea numismaticii de vârf românești.

Sit sibi terra levis!

Gabriel TALMAȚCHI