

NOTES ON GREEK INSCRIPTIONS (V)

Dragoș HĂLMAGI*

Cuvinte-cheie: *inscripții grecești, Pantikapaion, Istros, decrete onorifice, Leukon I, Aristagoras fiul lui Apatourios.*

Keywords: *Greek inscriptions, Pantikapaion, Istros, honorific decrees, Leukon I, Aristagoras son of Apatourios.*

Rezumat: *Articolul discută două inscripții grecești, cu noi sugestii de lectură și restituire:*

1. *Un decret de proxenie pentru Leukon I? O reluare a inscripției CIRB 37 (Pantikapaion);*

2. *Un alt decret de la Istros pentru Aristagoras, fiul lui Apatourios (ISM I 54b + 56).*

Abstract: *The present article reviews two Greek inscriptions, proposing new readings and restorations:*

1. *A proxyen decree for Leukon I? A reappraisal of CIRB 37 (Pantikapaion);*

2. *Another decree of Istros for Aristagoras, son of Apatourios (ISM I 54b + 56).*

A proxyen decree for Leukon I? A reappraisal of CIRB 37

A recent article on the use of Greek mercenaries in the Bosporean armies revisited an inscription from Pantikapaion discovered nearly two centuries ago, an Arkadian decree honouring Leukon I: CIG II 2103e = Syll. 99 = IOSPE II 4 = Syll.² 126 = Syll.³ 209 = CIRB 37¹.

In 1889 Paul François Foucart questioned Boeckh's interpretation: he adduced the prescript of a famous decree of the Arkadian league discovered in 1868² and, claiming that "rien ne prouve qu'au quatrième siècle la formule ἔδοξεν τοῖς Ἀρκάσιον ait été en usage [par la ligue arcadienne]", he put forward the hypothesis that the decree for Leukon I was issued by a homonymous city in Crete. Hiller von Gaertringen reframed Foucart's doubts in IG V 2's *fasti* (1913) and in the commentary of Syll.³ 209 (1915): "*nec tamen de hoc communi, cuius praescriptum n. 183 exhibet*" and conjectured instead that the inscription from Pantikapaion was set up by Arkadian mercenaries in the service of the Bosporean king.

Hiller von Gaertringen's interpretation was preferred at times, despite some

* Dragoș HĂLMAGI: "Vasile Pârvan" Institute of Archaeology, Bucharest; e-mail: dragoshalmagi@gmail.com

¹ IANCU 2023. I am indebted to Liviu Iancu for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this note.

² Syll. 167 = Syll.² 106 = IG V 2, 1 = Syll.³ 183.

considerable difficulties. There is no evidence the inscription was set up by soldiers or that Arkadian mercenaries were present in the Bosporan kingdom at that time. Moreover, it remains unexplained why these mercenaries called the king a *Pantikapaïtes* in a decree, in contrast with the language of other contemporary honorific inscriptions from the Bosporan kingdom, as well as from Athens, where Leukon's fame found its way into political speeches³.

The Greek decrees do not adhere to a fixed enactment formula. This is especially noticeable in the so – called “abbreviated decrees”, where the issuing bodies are mentioned in either the nominative or dative case following ἔδοξε. These variations were not solely intended to shorten the text, but also could have been shaped by political undertones lost to us today. The proxeny decrees of the league of Aïnis⁴ use either ἔδοξε τοῖς Αἰνιάνοις δεδόσθαι or τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰνιάνων ἔδωκε. CIRB 37 fits perfectly among the abbreviated decrees of Arkadian cities, for example those of Tegea⁵, Lousoi⁶ or Phigaleia⁷. The variation in wording can sometimes be disconcerting. 11 decrees on bronze plaques from Orchomenos⁸ were enacted as follows: ἔδοξε τᾷ πόλει (5 times), ἔδοξε τᾷ πόλει τῶν Ὀρχομενίων (2), ἔδοξε βωλαῖ καὶ πόλει (1), ἔδοξε τᾷ βωλαῖ καὶ τᾷ πόλει τῶν Ὀρχομενίων (2) and ἔδοξε Ἐρχομενίοις (1). The editors concluded that “le formulaire (...) se distingue par une variété extrême, qui paraît indiquer une singulière instabilité dans la constitution”⁹. If their interpretation might appear daring, the variation cannot be denied. In the light of our evidence, τοῖς Ἀρκάσιιν could refer to τᾷ βωλαῖ καὶ τοῖς μυρίοις τῶν Ἀρκάδων or only to the latter¹⁰.

The photograph published in 2004 (CIRB-album 37) allows the reading of two more letters: N and the top of a triangular letter are visible at the end of line 3. I suggest the following supplements:

ἔδοξεν τοῖς Ἀρκάσιιν Λεύκωνα
 [τὸν Σατ]ύρο Παντικαπαῖταν
 [Ἀρκάδων πρόξενον ἤ]να[ι]
 [καὶ εὐεργέταν αὐτὸν καὶ]
 5 [ἐγγόνους -----]

3 *vel* [εἰ]να[ι].

Translation: “It was resolved by the Arkadians that Leukon, [the son of Sat]yros, from Pantikapaion [shou]ld b[e] proxenos of the Arkadians and benefactor, himself and his descendants ...”

³ See the recent discussion in IANCU 2023.

⁴ IG IX 2, 3b–6f, 8.

⁵ IG V 2, 10, 11.

⁶ IG V 2, 388–394, 396.

⁷ THEMOS, ZAVVOU 2019, 107–109, no. 1.

⁸ PLASSART, BLUM 1914.

⁹ PLASSART, BLUM 1914, p. 472.

¹⁰ See also the proxeny decrees of other Greek leagues, e.g. IG IX 1², 1, 201 (Aitolian); SEG 24, 448 (Epirote).

The text was written in the Arkadian dialect (Παντικαπαῖταν)¹¹, but the name of the honoree was inserted in its original Ionic form ([Σατ]ύρο). Such variations are common in proxeny decrees: the first lines of IG V 2, 1 were written in Attic, and so were the names of the Athenian ambassadors in the one of decrees of Orchomenos¹². On a 4th century BC bronze plaque from Olympia, an Elean decree also includes the article before the patronymic: Θεοτιμίδην τὸν | Εὐδήμο Μενδαῖον | πρόξενον ἐπόησαν | τοῖ φαλειῶι.

Reading the inscription as a proxeny decree does not exclude the existence of Greek mercenaries in the armies of Leukon I. At the same time, the importance of economic ties and of the grain trade in particular, a major source of revenue, should not be underestimated. Another well-known decree of Leukon and his sons¹³ granted the Mytilenians a tax reduction similar to the one mentioned by Demosthenes in his speech against Leptines (20.31–32). While it is tempting to link CIRB 37 to Bosporean kingdom's ambitious commercial policies, the interactions between Bosporos and other Greek states were likely more complex and should not be reduced to a single narrative. Leukon's involvement in Arkadia might have had a different motivation, possibly mediated by his Athenian friends. The dichotomy grain versus mercenaries could be too narrow a framework.

Another decree of Istros for Aristagoras, son of Apatourios (ISM I 54b + 56)

The two fragments of the notorious decree honouring Aristagoras, ISM I 54, differ in thickness: the larger, upper fragment measures only 8 cm, while the smaller fragment measures 17 cm. ISM I 56 has letters of the same shape and size, probably cut by the same hand, and the stele is 16 cm thick. ISM I 54b and 56 apparently belong to the same inscription, for which I propose the following tentative edition:

vac. [τύχη ἀγαθῆ]
 [ἔ]δο[ξε τῆ βουλή καὶ τῶ δήμῳ· ἐπιμηνιεύοντος -----]
 Ἀρτεμ[ίδωρο----- ἐπειδὴ Ἀρισταγόρας Ἀπατουρίου]
e.g. προγόνω[ν γεγωνῶς εὐεργέτων καὶ αὐτὸς βουλόμενος ἐκείνους ἐν πᾶ]-
 5 σιν ὑπερ[βαλεῖν -----]
 ΟΝ καὶ πεν[τάκις -----]
 οὐδὲν διέλιπ[εν ----- πανηγύ]-
 ρεσι ἐκτενῆ ἔα[υτὸν -----]
 νους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Θ-----
 10 ἱερωσύνην ἱερῳσά[μενος -----]
 ΠΩΝ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ----- καιρῶν τε δυσχε]-
 ρῶν ἐπιγενηθέντ[ων ----- πα]-
 [ρά] τοῦ δήμου τειμ[ᾶς -----]
 [πο]μπὰς καὶ πα[νηγύρεις πανδήμους -----]

¹¹ The influence of Hellenistic koiné in Arkadia is scarcely documented before the second half of the 3rd century BC, when the most important cities entered the Achaian League (BUBENIK 1989, p. 161–167).

¹² PLASSART, BLUM 1914, p. 451–454, no. 1.

¹³ IG XII 2, 3 = Syll.³ 212.

15 -- --ήαις KA-----
 -----Σ-----
 ----- *vv. complures desunt* -----
 -----EIN-----
 -----αις ιδ[ίαις -----
 -----σάμενος [.]EMEΘ-----
 20 -----έκάστῳ αὐτῶν -----
 ----- *e.g. δι' ἃ δεδόχθα[ι τῆ βουλή καὶ τῶ δήμῳ ἐπαινέσαι]*
 [μὲν ἐπὶ τούτοις Ἀρισταγ[ό]ραν Ἀπατου[ρίου καὶ στεφανοῦσθαι αὐτὸν]
 [χρυσῶ στεφάνῳ ἀναγγέ]λλοντος τ[οῦ κήρυκος· ὁ δὴμος στεφανοῖ Ἀρισ-]
 25 [ταγόραν Ἀπατουρίου τὸ]ν εὐεργέτην [καὶ φιλότιμον ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν καὶ]
 [εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτὸν· τὸ] δὲ ψήφισμ[α τόδε ἀναγράψαι τοὺς ἡγεμόνας]
 [εἰς στήλην καὶ ἀναθεῖναι ἐ]ν τῷ ἐπιφ[ανεστάτῳ τόπῳ -----]
 [----- δε]δόχθ[αι -----]

Translation: “[It was re]sol[ved by the council and the assembly, when *epime-nios* was ...] Artem[idoros ... Since Aristagoras, son of Apatourios, was born] in a famil[y of benefactors and he wanted to surpass them in every way] ... fiv[e times] ... not ceas[ed ... festi]vals, [offered] hi[mself] zealously ... serv[ing] as priest ... the priesthood ... [and when times] wer[e difficu]lt ... ho[nours given by] the people ... [pro]cessions and fe[stivals for all people] ... his o[wn] ... each of them ... because of these things, [the council and the assembly] decid[e to honour Aristag]oras, son of Apatou[r]ios, on account of these and to crown him with a gold crown] while t[he herald anno]unces [“The people crown th]e benefactor [and honour-loving Aristagoras, son of Apatourios, for his virtue and goodwill towards the people” and (decide) that the *hegemones* shall engrave this] decre[e on a stele and erect it i]n the [most] cons[picuous place] ... [de]cid[e] ...”

Wilhelm Crönert's supplements¹⁴, later adopted by Dionisie Pippidi, are too short. Leaving them aside, other minor adjustments are necessary as well. Firstly, the honorand is Aristagoras, and Artemidoros must be either the father of the *epimenios* or the proposer of the motion. Moving on, I prefer δυσχε] | ρῶν in l. l. 11–12, drawing on ISM I 59, l. 6, πα | ρᾶ] in l. 12–13 *spatii causa*, and πα[νηγύρεις πανδήμους in l. 14, following Aristagoras' other decree, ISM I 54, l. 22. The citation of the formal motion in l. 21–22 must continue with the herald's proclamation and provisions for erecting the stele. The wording of the proclamation is inspired by ISM I 193, col. II, l. 12–18.

The decree ISM I 54b + 56 was issued some years after ISM I 54a: the five times mentioned in l. 6 could refer to the five previous instances when Aristagoras held the eponymous office or was honored by the assembly¹⁵. The second inscription placed greater emphasis on his service as a priest and, perhaps, omitted some of his previous achievements or arranged them in a different order.

The date of Aristagoras' decrees appears to be later than commonly assumed: the barbarians mentioned in ISM I 54a were often identified with Getae led by the

¹⁴ SEG 2, 452.

¹⁵ Two other honorific decrees, ISM I 31 and 61, mention „bronze statues and everlasting crowns” (εἰκόσι χαλκαῖς καὶ στεφάνοις αἰδίοις) previously awarded by the assembly.

king Byrebistas, who allegedly plundered Istros¹⁶ around 55 BC¹⁷. As already noted, the letter forms used here appear in other decrees of Augustan and later date¹⁸. Surely, such lettering could have been in use earlier, but the evidence for this is completely absent¹⁹.

The desperate situation in Istros, located in a region frequently raided by barbarians²⁰, is vividly depicted in a decree from *ca.* AD 15 for Quintus Iulius Vestalis²¹, who was sent by the emperor Tiberius “for the preservation and safety of the Greek cities in the left-hand parts of the Pontus”, and especially Istros, “because we are situated very close to the barbarians and have continuously fought them” (l. 7–8: πολε|[μεῖ]σθαι διὰ παντός)²² and “because we were intending to abandon the city” (l. 8–9: τὸ μέλλειν ἐνκαταλείπειν | τὴν πόλ[ι]ν), “as indeed we asked when sending an embassy to the emperor on this subject begging for relocation” (l. 10–11:

¹⁶ First suggested by LATISCHEW 1886, p. 202, n. 1, the hypothesis built on Dio Chrys. *Or.* 36.4 generated an immense literature, but found no confirmation in literary sources, inscriptions or archaeological evidence. Various burnt layers have been interpreted to confirm a catastrophic sack of the city at the hand of Byrebista’s armies. The most meticulously scrutinized layer affected Aphrodite’s temple and its surroundings (ALEXANDRESCU 2005), but it was pointed out long ago that it can be explained as one of the operations of filling and leveling of an area repurposed for new buildings (EFTIMIE 1959, p. 286–287; ȘTEFAN 1974, p. 48, 50). This conclusion can be further supported by ceramic finds from the same burnt layer showing no trace of fire or from much earlier periods (for example, AVRAM 2019, p. 330, no. 33: a Sinopean amphora stamp from the group VI B, dated to the mid–3rd century BC).

¹⁷ Following Dio, most scholars assumed that the attack took place approximately 150 years before AD 97, the traditionally accepted date of his journey to Olbia, which was later revised to AD 84 by BEKKER-NIELSEN, HINGE 2015.

¹⁸ PIPPIDI 1957, p. 173–176. The dossier consists of three fragmentary honorific decrees, two for Papas, son of Theopompos, (ISM I 55 and 146) and another one for Moschion, daughter of Diogenes (ISM I 29), which should be dated to this period, as well. Perhaps we can add another inscription to this list, ISM II 37, re-edited by AVRAM, HÄLMAGI 2019, p. 65–70, which I supplement now in l. 1–4: τύχ[η ἀγαθῆ· | ἰερωμένης] θεᾶς Ἀγριπ[πεινῆς Σεβαστῆς, μῆνός Ἀ|πατουρε]ῶνος ἕκτη, πα[νδῆμου ἐκκλησίας οὔσης | καὶ ἀρχαυε]τικῆς, ἐπιμη[νιεύοντος τοῦ δεῖνος. Dating decrees by *epimenios* is a well-known practice in Istros: one might wonder if the latter, found in Constanța under unknown circumstances in the 19th century, is not, in fact, a travelling stone. The restored lines closely resemble the opening of the first decree for Aristagoras, ISM I 54a and the letters also show a striking similarity.

¹⁹ The “second foundation” of the city (ISM I 191 and 193; *cf.* JONES 2016, p. 125) rather refers to the status of *civitas libera et immunis* granted by the Romans (MATEI-POPESCU 2014, p. 465–466). That being said, the date of ISM I 191 must be more recent, since the *album* contains two Roman names: -ανεινίος in l. 5 (e.g. Caninius) and Κέλεο in l. 25 (suggestion from Klaus Hallof), perhaps Τέτ(τιος) Κέλεο.

²⁰ We are particularly informed about the city’s conflicts with Ζαλμοδεγικός (ISM I 8), Ζολτης and the Θράκες (ISM I 15), and Ἀτης and the Σκίροι (SEG 65, 568), all dating to the 3rd century BC.

²¹ The inscription was edited by BĂRBULESCU, BUZOIANU 2014 and re-edited with an improved text and translation by JONES 2016. The editors proposed dating the event to AD 18 or 19 (see also BUZOIANU, BĂRBULESCU 2022, p. 212–214). However, MATEI-POPESCU 2014 and KANTOR 2017, p. 464; MATEI-POPESCU 2017, p. 23 argued more convincingly for a date around AD 15, during Lucius Pomponius Flaccus’ first tenure as *legatus pro praetore*. The reading and translation adopted here are slightly different from Jones’ edition.

²² Solution proposed by BUZOIANU, BĂRBULESCU 2019, which is most fitting in the context.

δεόμενοι τὴν ἐξο[ι κ]ησίαν ἤτοῦμεν). Upon arriving in the city, Vestalis found it “poor in inhabitants and weakened in every way” (l. 14–15: ὀλιγανδροῦ|σαν τὴν πόλιν κ[α]ι κατὰ πάντα ἀσθενοῦσ[α]ν), “encouraged the citizens, giving them high hopes coming from the deified Augustus” (l. 14–15: π[α]ρ[ε]κάλεσεν τοὺς πολεΐτας, χρηστὰς ἐ[λ]πίδας δ[ι]δοῦς τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ) “and alongside us, he withstood the barbarians who had pillaged our territory” (l. 15–17: κ[α]ὶ συν|υπέ]στη τοὺς ἐκπεπο[ρ]θηκότας τὴν χώρα[ν] ἡμῶν βαρ[β]άρους)²³. Vestalis is well known to us from Ovid’s letter praising his heroic exploits against barbarians on the Danube (*Pont.* 4.7), but the two campaigns were probably separated by a few years.

The history of clashes between Romans and various barbarian factions along the lower Danube is often obscured by the relative scarcity of sources and the ambiguous use of ethnic labels. Some light is brought by a decree recently discovered in the temple of the Pontic Mother of Gods at Dionysopolis and edited by Nikolay Sharankov (I. Dionysopolis 10), honouring Mokaporis, son of Auluporis²⁴, a *strategos* of king Rhoemetaces over Apsiuropolis (Axiopolis) and Daotica (l.3: Ἀψιουπόλεως καὶ Δαοτικῆς). Florian Matei-Popescu rightly emphasized that, prior to the Roman rule, the territories of the coastal Greek cities were bordered by the Sapaeian kingdom²⁵, which was organized into *strategiae*²⁶. I believe that Daotica was the region around Apsiuropolis²⁷, likely including Sacidava and Capidava²⁸. Troesmis and Aegyssos, the two Thracian fortresses recorded by Ovid, were probably part of another *strategia*. The Dionysopolitans honoured Mokaporis for his benefactions,

²³ I find κ[α]ὶ συν|υπέ]στη preferable to ἐ[π]ειδὴ? | ὑπέ]στη. If the Istrians had high hopes based on an earlier Roman military success (JONES 2016, p. 127, 130–131), why did they petition for relocation?. I am grateful to Mirena Slavova for an insightful discussion on the second aorists of ἵστημι.

²⁴ His son might be Sadalas mentioned in IGBulg V 5011 as στρατηγὸς ἐν Ἀρσῆῳ under king Cotys. I think the toponym should be understood Ἀρσῆον = Ἀρσειον (cf. I.Dionysopolis 12 *ad comm.*) According to PARISSAKI 2009, p. 323–324, it should be connected to Ἄρζος river, a tributary to Hebros (cf. Ptol. *Geog.* 3.11.6, 3. 11.12).

²⁵ Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.64: *arva et urbes et vicina Graecis Cotyi*.

²⁶ MATEI-POPESCU 2018. For a more detailed overview of Thracian *strategiae*, see PARISSAKI 2009.

²⁷ The evidence is circumstantial, coming from several dedications by other Thracian *strategoí*. Apollonios, son of Eptaikenthos, was στρατηγὸς Ἀνχιάλου καὶ Σηλητηκῆς καὶ Ρυσικῆς (IGBulg P 378; IGBulg II 743) and also στρατηγὸς τῶν περὶ Ἀνχιάλην τόπων (DAWKINS, HASLUCK 1905/1906, p. 178, no. 3) and ὁ περὶ Ἀνχιάλον στρατηγὸς (SEG 65, 549), Tiberius Claudius Theopompos was στρατηγὸς Ἀστικῆς περὶ Πέρινθον, Σηλητηκῆς ὄρεινης, Δενθελητικῆς πεδιασίας, while a votive inscription found in Çorlu (I.Perinthos 294) mentions another στρατηγὸς Ἀστικῆς περὶ Πέρινθον. His name was corrected to <Τιβ>έριος Ἴκο>ύλιος <Τ>οῦλα<λ>ος by MOMMSEN 1875, p. 252, n. 1, however Mordtmann’s copy gives ΜΕΠΙΟΣ, so perhaps the *praenomen* Νου]μῆριος should be restored instead.

²⁸ See AVRAM 2015, p. 145–147, who also ponders about the reconstructed ethnic name *Δαόται (p. 153–154) in contrast to Strabon’s Δᾶοι (7.3.12). There is a solution at hand, since we know that soldiers recruited from Δενθελητικῆ and stationed on the Rhine frontier identified themselves as *Dansala* (CIL XIII, 7049; 7050; 8308; 11870, cf. Δανθαληται in Steph. Byz. *s.v.*). Thus, *Δαόται could reflect a local plural marker *-ta employed alongside Δᾶοι. It is worth pointing out that this marker is prevalent among the ethnonyms of ancient Eurasian steppe communities and survives in modern Ossetic. However, the relations between Iranian languages and the diverse ancient languages along the Danube and in northern Thrace are unknown.

including a campaign on the left bank of the Danube against “the common enemy, the Iazyges” (l. 10–11: στρατευσάμενος δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ἰστροῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς κοινούς πολεμίους Ἰαζύγους)²⁹.

Istros’ *chora* was thus bordered by Thracian *strategiae* and by the *chora* of Tomis to the south. In this context, Ovid’s exile letters favour certain identifications. The Roman allies, the Sapaean kings and their forces, are *Odrysaes* (*Pont.* 1.8.11–20), *Thracas* (2.9.51–54), *Bistones* (1.3.59–60; 2.9.51–54), *Sithones* (4.7.19–30) and *Mysae* (4.9.75–80). Their enemies from beyond the Danube are predominantly the *Getae* (1.8.11–20, 4.7.19–30, 4.7.53–54, 4.9.75–80), but also *Sarmatae* (1.3.59–60) and possibly *Iazyges* (4.7.9–12). The portrayal of Getae and Sarmatians as savage warriors, mounted and wielding bows, is unsurprising³⁰. However, it remains uncertain whether these terms denote distinct factions or reflect literary devices typical of Greek and Roman authors³¹.

ISM I 66³², a fragmentary imperial letter³³ dated to the reign of Rhoemetalces, between ca. 11 BC and AD 12, might have mentioned repairs to the city walls (l. 11–12: τεῖ|χῆ ἐπισ[κευ-]). Aristagoras too repaired the city walls (ISM I 54, l. 7–10: ἀτειχίστου τῆς ἰ πόλεως ὑπαρχούσης καὶ κινδυνευόντων πάλιν τῶν πολειτῶν μ[ε]|τὰ γυναιῶν καὶ τέκνων, ταγείς ὑπὸ τῶν πολειτῶν τειχοποιὸς ἀνδρη[ό]|τατα μὲν καὶ γνησιώτατα τῆς ἐπιμελήας τῶν ἔργων προσέστη) and paid ransom for the citizens captured by barbarians (l. 12–15: κατὰ μέρος τῶν πολειτῶν ἀ|πὸ τῆς βαρβάρου καταπορευομένων εἰς τὴν πόλιν, τισὶν μὲν δεξιῶς ἀπ[αν]|τῶν τῶν κρατούντων τῆς χώρας βαρβάρων, τισὶν δὲ τῶν πολειτῶν εἰς| ἰ λύτρα προσιθείς). The tone and imagery resemble those in the decree for Vestalis, and perhaps ἡ κατασχοῦσα τὴν πόλιν περίστασις (l. 4) should be assigned to this tumultuous period, although pinpointing a more precise date remains impossible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALEXANDRESCU 2005 – P. Alexandrescu, *La fin de la Zone Sacrée*, in: P. Alexandrescu, avec le concours de l’architecte A. Sion et d’A. Avram et la collaboration de M. Alexandrescu Vianu, A. Baltreș, I. Bîrzescu, N. Conovici, P. Dupont, C. Georgescu, M. Măcărescu, K. Zimmermann, *Histria VII. La Zone Sacrée d’époque grecque*, Bucharest-Paris, 2005, p. 140–154.

AVRAM 2007 – A. Avram, *Le corpus des inscriptions d’Istros revisité*, *Dacia* N. S. 51 (2007), p. 79–132.

²⁹ The campaign can be associated with the military operations of Gnaeus Cornelius Lentulus Augur dated between 10 and 6 BC (SYME 1986, p. 289–292 cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.44; Flor. 2.28–29), or with the operations from AD 12 narrated by Ovid. See I. Dionysopolis 10 *ad comm.*

³⁰ On Getae and Sarmatians in earlier poems see, for example, *Tr.* 4.1.94–95 (audience of his poems), 4.10.109–110 (carrying bows), 5.7.13–14 (riding horses), 5.12.57–58 (learning their language). On barbarian names in Ovid, see also BATTY 1994, p. 96–101; RICHMOND 1995, p. 103–105; BOTEVA 2012, p. 12–13, 19–20.

³¹ The Getae and the Dacians are notoriously interchangeable in this period. Other instances are underexplored in modern literature: the Bastarnae coming as mercenaries to king Perseus became Γέται in App. *Mac.* 18.1–3 and later Θράκες in Cass. Dio 20, fr. 66.1.

³² Two new fragments were added by AVRAM 2007, p. 94, no. 66.

³³ In l. 1 perhaps καὶ δημιορχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ κτλ. See also IG XII 3, 174, l. 1–4, a letter from Augustus to the Cnidians, dated to 6 BC and found on Astypalaia.

AVRAM 2015 – A. Avram, *Aspects de la colonisation des Daces au sud du Danube par les Romains*, *Aristonothos* 9 (2015), p. 143–159.

AVRAM 2019 – A. Avram, *Les timbres amphoriques du remplissage de la fosse sacrée du téménos d'Istros*, in: N. Badoud, A. Marangou (eds.), *Analyse et exploitation des timbres amphoriques grecs*, Rennes, 2019, p. 323–337.

AVRAM, HĂLMAGI 2019 – A. Avram, D. Hălmaġi, *Nouveaux documents sur les cultes égyptiens à Tomis*, *Aristonothos* 15 (2019), p. 61–76.

BATTY 1994 – R. M. Batty, *On Getic and Sarmatian Shores: Ovid's Account of the Danube Lands*, *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 43/1 (1994), p. 88–111.

BĂRBULESCU, BUZOIANU 2014 – M. Bărbulescu, L. Buzoianu, *L'espace ouest-pontique sous l'empereur Tibère a la lumière d'un décret in édit découvert en Dobroudja*, in: V. Cojocaru, A. Coșkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca, 2014, p. 415–433.

BEKKER-NIELSEN, HINGE 2015 – T. Bekker-Nielsen, G. Hinge, *Dio Chrysostom in Exile: Or. 36.1 and the Date of the Scythian Journey*, *The Classical Quarterly* 65/2 (2015), p. 747–755.

BOTEVA 2012 – D. Boteva, *Ancient Literary Tradition on Moesi/Moesia (mid 1st c. BC-mid 1st c. AD)*, in: L. Vagalinski, N. Sharankov, S. Torbatov, *The Lower Danube Roman Limes (1st–6th c. AD)*, Sofia, 2012, p. 9–20.

BUBENIK 1989 – V. Bubenik, *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1989.

BUZOIANU, BĂRBULESCU 2019 – L. Buzoianu, M. Bărbulescu, *Brève intervention sur l'inscription de Săcele*, in: A. Avram, L. Buzoianu (eds.), *Varia epigraphica et archaeologica, volume dédié à la mémoire de Maria Bărbulescu*, *Pontica* 52, Supplementum 6 (2019), Constanța, p. 31–33.

BUZOIANU, BĂRBULESCU 2022 – L. Buzoianu, M. Bărbulescu, *La période de début du Principat dans les villes grecques ouest-pontiques à la lumière des sources littéraires et épigraphiques*, in: J. Boardman, J. Hargrave, A. Avram, A. Podossinov (eds.), *Connecting the Ancient West and East: Studies Presented to Prof. Gocha R. Tsetskhladze*, Leuven, 2022, p. 205–215.

DAWKINS, HASLUCK 1905/1906 – R. M. Dawkins, F. W. Hasluck, *Inscriptions from Bizye*, *ABSA* 12 (1905/1906), p. 175–183.

EFTIMIE 1959 – V. Eftimie, *Raport asupra activității șantierului Histria în campania 1956. Sectorul templului grec*, *Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice* 5 (1959), p. 283–288.

FOUCART 1889 – P.-F. Foucart, *Inscription de Panticapée*, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 13 (1889), p. 183–184.

IANCU 2023 – L. M. Iancu, *Grain and Mercenaries. A Reappraisal of the Relationship between Arkadia and Bosphoros in the Time of Leukon I*, in: L. Buzoianu, V. Lungu, D. Hălmaġi (eds.), *Aux sources des connaissances historiques: épigraphie, textes littéraires et documents archéologiques, volume dédié à mémoire de Alexandru Avram*, *Pontica* 56, Supplementum 10 (2023), Constanța, p. 391–409.

JONES 2016 – Chr. P. Jones, *An Inscription from Istros and Ovid's Last Poems*, *ZPE* 200 (2016), p. 122–132.

KANTOR 2017 – G. Kantor, *The date and circumstances of Quintus Iulius Vestalis*, *ZPE* 203 (2017), p. 85–91.

LATISCHEW 1886 – B. Latschew, *Zu Mittheil. X S. 317 N° 5*, *MDAI(A)* 11 (1886), p. 200–202.

MATEI-POPESCU 2014 – F. Matei-Popescu, *The Horothesia of Dionysopolis and the Integration of the Western Pontic Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*, in: V. Cojocaru, A. Coșkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Cluj-Napoca, 2014, p. 457–471.

MATEI-POPESCU 2017 – F. Matei-Popescu, *Ovid at Tomis: the Early History of the Left Pontus under the Roman Rule*, *Civiltà Romana, Rivista pluridisciplinare di studi su Roma antica e le sue interpretazioni* 4 (2017), p. 17–25.

MATEI-POPESCU 2018 – F. Matei-Popescu, *The Thracian Strategiae in Scythia Minor*, in: D. Boteva-Boyanova, P. Delev, J. Tzvetkova (eds.), *Society, Kings, Gods: in memoriam professoris Margaritae Tachevae*, Sofia, 2018, p. 107–118.

MOMMSEN 1875 – Th. Mommsen, *Observationes epigraphicae XVII–XVIII*, *Ephemeris epigraphica* 2 (1875), p. 250–269.

PARISSAKI 2009 – M.-G. Parissaki, *Étude sur l'organisation administrative de la Thrace à l'époque romaine. L'histoire des stratégies*, *Revue des Études Grecques* 122/2 (2009), p. 319–357.

PIPPIDI 1957 – D. M. Pippidi, *Notes d'épigraphie pontique. I. La date du décret histrien pour Aristagoras, fils d'Apatourios (Syll³, 708)*, *Dacia N. S.* 1 (1957), p. 165–177.

PLASSART, BLUM 1914 – A. Plassart, G. Blum, *Orchomène d'Arcadie. Fouilles de 1913. Inscriptions*, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 38 (1914), p. 447–478.

RICHMOND 1995 – J. Richmond, *The Latter Days of a Love Poet Ovid in Exile*, *Classics Ireland* 2 (1995), p. 97–120.

SYME 1986 – R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford, 1986.

ȘTEFAN 1974 – A. S. Ștefan, *Cercetări aerofotografice privind topografia urbană a Histriei. I. Epoca romană (sec. I–III e.n.)*, *Revista Muzeelor și Monumentelor–Monumente Istorice și de Artă* 43/2 (1974), p. 39–51.

THEMOS, ZAVVOU 2019 – A. Themos, E. Zavvou, *New hellenistic inscriptions from Phigaleia (Arcadia)*, in: C. Noreña, N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *From Document to History: Epigraphic Insights into the Greco-Roman World*, Leiden-Boston, 2019, p. 103–119.