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THE HALMYRIS TETRARCHIC INSCRIPTION

The Site. Since 1981 large-scale archaeological excavations have been carried out at the fort located 2.5 km east of the today Murighiol commune, where the ancient Halmyris (gr. Ἀλμύρις; lat. Salmorus / Halmyris, Thalamonium) has been identified. Three main periods in the existence of the site have been evidenced: Getic (4th – 1st centuries B. C.); early Roman (1st – 3rd centuries A. D.) and late Roman (4th – 7th centuries A. D.) spanning from the 4th century B. C. to the 7th century A. D.¹

The Finds*. Among other epigraphical finds two fragmentary marble plaques were uncovered during the 1986 and 1987 excavations.

Fragment a: a light grey marble plaque (0.24 m x 0.28 m x 0.08 m) with six letters, found during the 1986 excavations in [] U 2 in the debris of a second half of the 6th century building. The text reads:

\[ \text{SŁICA} \]

Fragment b: light grey marble plaque (0.75 m x 0.52 m x 0.08 m) found during the 1987 excavations in [] H 1. The text has six lines. It reads:

\[ \text{MAXIMIA} \\
\text{Hprivation} \\
\text{MAXPERSICIŞ} \\
\text{VMGENTEŞ} \\
\text{5} \text{MREIPVBŁ} \\
\text{R} \]

* We are glad to express our gratitude to Dr. Alexandru Suceveanu who kindly offered fragment b to us for publication, and who contributed in tracking down new ways in the work of restitution, to Dr. Alexandru Barnea for his valuable remarks, to Dr. C. C. Petolescu for his pertinent observations, to Dr. Everett L. Wheeler, for his competence with which he discussed many aspects involved in the inscription, to Dr. Maria Barbulescu and Dr. Octavian Bounegru for their valuable remarks concerning the text. We also thank Cornel Draghia for much competence and work in processing the text of the inscription.

Both fragments were found in upper layers, at a distance of about 40 m from one another (Fig. 1) in a secondary position, suggesting that the initial inscription was broken into pieces which were later re-used within the structure of the stone and clay walls.

Fig. 1. The Halmyris Inscription Restored.

General description. The height of the letters on both fragments is 0.07–0.08 m. The identical thickness, colour and structure of the marble as well as the almost perfect joining of the edges of the fragments, from which the reading reipublicae appears clearly, show that the two pieces belong to the same inscription.

In l. 2 of fragment b before icis there is the lower part of a letter proceeding rather from an N, H or I, than a P, R or T which seem unlikely because of the limited space to the next letter; the reading should therefore be nicens or rather hicens.

l. 6: the top of a loop of a letter proceeding from an R.

Joining the two fragments gives the following text:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{m} & \text{aximi}a \\
\text{hicis max} & \\
\text{max persici} & \\
\text{um gentes} & \\
\text{5 m reipublicae} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

A major aspect of the restoration of the text is that the two joined fragments represent the right lower part of a monumental inscription. This view is supported by the absence of any traces of other letters after the words gentes (l. 4) and reipublicae (l. 5). The asymmetrical position of a hedera under the word reipublicae of the previous line suggests that it belongs to the last line of the inscription.

There is a series of four Tetrarchic inscriptions along the Lower Danube containing basically the same text as the Halmyris piece. They serve as good comparison items to our inscription.


Transmarisca (Tutrakan), Moesia Secunda (CIL III 6151): IMPERATORES CAESS GAIVS AVR VAL DIOCLETIANVS / ET M AVR VAL MAXIMIANVS PI FELICES INVICTI AVGG ET FL VAL / CONSTANTIVS ET GAL VAL MAXIMIANVS NOBB CAESS GERMANICI / CI MAXIMI V SARMAT MAX IIII PERSICI MAX II BRITANICI MAXIMI / POST DEBELATIS HOSTIVM GENTIS (sic!) CONFIRMATA ORBI SVO / [TRANQVILLITATE PRO FVTVRVM IN AETERNVM REIPVBLICAE PRAESIDIV / M CONSTITTVERVNT (294–299).


Unlike the other four Tetrarchic inscriptions the Halmyris text is written up in the Dative case as clearly shown by the imperial victory titles hicis (l. 2) and Persicis (l. 3) respectively. Restitution. The wording on the Halmyris fragments evidences that they were part of a dedicatory inscription set during the Tetrarchic period just like in the other Danubian cases cited above.

L. 4 contains the word gentes preceded by the letters um coming from a most likely [hosti]um according to the known wording in the case of Sexaginta Prista, Transmarisca and Durostorum; in the Donje Butorke inscription such a word is missing. The complete and correct reading of l. 4 should therefore be [post debellatas hosti]um gentes.

In l. 5 before reipublicae there is the lower left part of an m and the reading [aeternu]m appears to be the only solution. The Sexaginta Prista, Transmarisca and Durostorum inscriptions bear: post debellatas hostium gentes confirmata orbi suo tranquillitate pro futurum in aeternum reipublicae praesidium constitueruntroot referring to the building efforts after the victories won over the enemies. The Donje Butorke inscription has a more simple and direct wording following the imperial salutations: pro futurum in aeternum reipublicae praesidium constituerunt.4 The spacing of the words on the Halmyris fragments shows that after the wording [post debellatas hosti]um gentes in l. 4 a continuation of the text with the 34 letters of confirmata orbi suo tranquillitate including the interstices at the beginning of l. 5. is not possible, as long as there is no room for these words before [in aeternu]m. The complete wording in the Halmyris inscription appears therefore to have had a shortened variant such as: [post debellatas hosti]um gentes / [pro futurum in aeternu]m reipublicae . . .

As to the succession reipublicae [praesidium], after hedera following the letter e (from reipublicae) the space is apparently too wide to accept the continuation of the line. Or, if l. 5 does not continue with [praesidium], which is very likely, this word would be obligatorily placed in l. 6 of the fragment before the most possible and probable [constitu]eunt of which only the upper part of the loop of an R is

---

2 The final three lines of the Durostorum inscription are restored by Russu as: [gentes confirmata orbi suo tr[angil] / [litate in aeternum Durostori praei] / [dium constituerunt] which definitely does not fit the known Tetrarchic pattern of the other three inscriptions along the Danube.

3 It is significant that this particular expression seems to be unique in the Tetrarchic epigraphy and it is characteristic only of the Lower Danubian region for this kind of building activities.

4 Cermanović – Kuzmanović 130 1.6–8 (Donje Butorke).
preserved. The two words placed in the same line appear as such in the case of Donje Butorke and Sexaginta Prista while at Transmarisca the last line has *constituerunt* only.\(^5\)

Thus, lines 4–6 of the text in the Halmyris inscription must have been:

\[
5\text{ [post debellatas hosti\textit{um} gentis}
\]

\[
5\text{ [pro futurum in aetern\textit{um} reip\textit{ublicae}
}\]

\[
5\text{ [praesidium constitue\textit{unt}]
\]

This would represent a third variant of wording in the Sexaginta Prista, Transmarisca and Durostorum series of inscriptions on the one hand and the Donje Butorke on the other.

The restitution of the Tetrarchic imperial titulature in the Halmyris inscription raises apparently no major difficulty as compared to the other four Tetrarchic inscriptions. A general remark is that on the Halmyris fragment the imperial victory titles are not followed by the usual iterations. Table I shows the Emperors’ titles and iterations recording victories between 284–305 and Table II compares the imperial victory titles in the five Danubian inscriptions and other sources.

The first common title of the Tetrarchs to be supposed in the Halmyris inscription is *Germanicis maximis* and is to be placed in l. 2.\(^6\) There are two variants of reading in this line both with some implications as to the text of the inscription. On the lower left side of I there are traces of a letter proceeding from an N or H. If l. 2 had had *Nobilissimis Caess*, as in the Donje Butorke inscription, the reading *[Germa]nicis max* would have been possible and therefore the lower part of the letter could have belonged to an N. In the abbreviated variant, *Nobb Caes* the title *Germanicis max* would fall much to the left.

Another solution in this case is an H which necessarily brings about an almost certain and previous T, therefore *[t]hicis max*. What would this imply? Such a restoration could produce but the title *[Got]hicis max*. The title is rarely attested in inscriptions, papyri and literary sources. In a recent study,\(^7\) P. Brennan tried to present the relations of the Tetrarchic regime with the Goths as peaceful enough, except for the conflict between 292–294, for Diocletian not to assume officially the Gothic title.\(^8\)

A list of *P. Thead. 2, 2* dated 11-03-303 which contains an imperial letter of 300 clearly records the title *Gothicus*. *P. Oxy. 889* with the titulature *[Ge]rmanikos megistos, Gounthik[os megistos] initially dated 12-12-300 has been recently ascribed to Constantine.\(^9\) In accordance with G. M. Parassoglu, the

---

5 Cermanović – Kuzmanović 130 l. 8 (Donje Butorke); Kolendo 1966, 148 l. 6–7. (Sexaginta Prista); CIL III 6151 l. 6–7 (Transmarisca); AE 1936, 10 l. 8–9 (Durostorum). It is noticeable, however, that in the Donje Butorke inscription the lapidary left some space between the letters P and R of the word praesidium large enough to obtain a symmetry of the text.


7 P. Brennan, *Diocletian and the Goths*, Phoenix 38, 1984, 2, 142–146; cf. Barnes 1976, 187 note 53; CIL VIII 7003. The CIL authors restore *[Par]thicis, Persicis Sarmati [cis]*; cf. W. Ensslin, Valerius (Diocletianus), RE XIV 2, 1948, 2430; see Brennan’s commentary, 143; *[Par]thicis* by this time appears as an anachronism used not only in the literary sources and *[Go]thicis seems the only reasonable restitution; cf. CIL VIII 21 447; 21 448 = Eph. Ep. VII no. 523–524. In CIL VIII 21 450 = Eph. Ep. V no. 1038 *[Gothico]* is conjecturally restored, the full title falling into the break of the inscription. It is true that *Gothicus Maximus* does not appear in the preamble of the Edictum de Pretiis of November–December 301 considered as the most complete Tetrarchic titulature. On the other hand, the equivalence of the titles *Carpicus with Gothicus* (Kolendo 1966, 148) cannot be accepted; cf. Barnes 1976; 187 note 53; Brennan, 142 note 3.

8 Brennan, 143–144; Ensslin 1948, 1430 accepts the title for the Tetrachic team; as a consequence he restores the Cirta and Gunugu inscriptions with the salutation *Gothicus Maximus*.

last editor of the document, P. Brennan suggests *Armenicus* instead of *Gothicus* admitting, however, that the variant *Armenicus* would be a unique titulature in the period 301–306.\(^{10}\)

The titles *Gothicus* in the Durostorum inscription and *P. Thead*. 2, 2 are doubtful and in the Cirta and Gunugu restitutions very likely (Tab II). On the other hand, Laetanius alludes to a conflict with the Goths: *cum irridens diceret victorias Gothorum et Sarmentarum propositus*.\(^{11}\) If the panegyrist of 291 speaks only of the war with the Sarmatians\(^{12}\), that of 01-03-297 stresses *submittente se Gotho pace poscenda* which means a previous conflict with the Goths.\(^{13}\)

The title *Gothicus* although not much used in the official Tetrarchic epigraphy and missing particularly in the standardized *Editum de Pretiis* is, however, a constitutive imperial part of titulature and its record in the Halmyris inscription seems very likely.\(^{14}\)

The second Tetrarchic victory title is *Sarmatici Maximi*\(^{15}\) which in the Halmyris inscription could be accommodated at the beginning of l. 5.

In both inscriptions and papyri, *Persici Maximi* stands before *Britannici Maximi* which ends the series of imperial titles and iterations in the Sexaginta Prista, Transmarisca and Durostorum inscriptions. On the Halmyris fragment the spacing in l. 5 after the possible and very probable *series of imperial titles and iterations* in the Sexaginta, Transmarisca and Durostorum inscriptions.

14 Besides the epigraphical sources mentioned above see also: *CIL XIII 5249* (a. 294) at Vitudurum (Germania Superior) where the restitution *[Ger. max II]* before *Sar. max.*, *Pers. max.* for Diocletian’s and Maximian’s titulatures seems more probable than *Gothicus max*. It is true, on the other hand, that the salutation *Gothicus Maximus* seems to have been scarcely used in the Tetrarchic epigraphy as a result of some local victories, but its existence is doubtless; cf. Brennan: 146.


16 What is noticeable is the variation *Britannici* at Sexaginta Prista and *Britannici* at Transmarisca.

The Halmyris Tetrarchic Inscription

[[IMPP(eratoribus) CAESS(aribus) C(aio) AVRELIO VALERIO DIOCLETIANO]
[ET M(arco) AVR(elio) MAXIMIANO PIIS FEL(iciibus) INVICTIS AVG(ustibus)]
[ET FL(avio) VAL(erio) CONSTANTIO ET GAL(erio) VAL(erio)] MAXIMIA[NO]
[NOBB(ilissimis) CAESS(aribus) GERMANICIS MAX(imis) GOT]HICIS MAX(imis)
5 [SARMATICIS MAX(imis) BRITANNICIS] MAX(imis) PER[SIĆ]
[MAX(imis) QVI POST DEBELLATAS HOSTIVM GENTEȘ]
[PROFVTVRVM IN AETERNV][M REIPVBLICAÆ
[PRAESIDIVM CONSTITVÆ]R[VNT]

The Date. The Halmyris inscription is the fifth piece in the Tetrarchic series (Donje Butorke, Sexaginta Prista, Transmarisca, Durostorum) documented along the Danube with a text and wording basically identical. This must be the result of a previously standard model received by each provincial authority from the central government although it seems that there was a local drafting and interpretation of the text. It attests, however, the intense work of rebuilding and consolidation of the Lower Danubian sector of the limes and particularly the rebuilding of the Halmyris fort.

The history of the Halmyris fort is well reflected in the literary sources and has been more accurately evidenced by the archaeological investigations within the site. The second half of the 3rd century layers revealed a Vth level in the chronology of the site dated between 270–285 with coins from Probus and Aurelian. It is marked by the beginning of massive constructive interventions to the defence wall, gates, towers and other buildings. The VIth level has been dated, with Licinius’s and Constantius’s II coins to the first half of the 4th century.18

The Halmyris inscription makes these initial stratigraphical observations more specific and gives a coherent picture of the history of the fort in the late 3rd and early 4th centuries. The building interventions initiated under Aurelian and Probus and continued under the Tetrarchy seem to have been interrupted by a conflict with the Goths sometime between 292–294 when their inroads were stimulated by the massive withdrawals of troops from the Danube frontier dispatched to the Egyptian front.19

Although this conflict was merely reflected in the literary sources it seemed to have gained a certain scope; it could even have developed as inroads to the south of the Danube. The imperial visits along the Danube when Transmarisca was inspected on 18 October and Durostorum on 21 and 22 October 294,20 seem to have envisaged rebuilding work. It is very likely that they were the first to be affected by the Gothic inroads. If Brennan’s assumption21 proves to be correct that the local authorities involved directly in the conflict assumed the title Gothicus for the Tetrarchic team for “morale-boosting” purposes, one can suppose that Durostorum and Halmyris – just to give two known cases on the Danube – must have been the main resistance points against the Goths. On the other hand, the banishment from Asia Minor to Halmyris of Epictet and Astion, the two Christian martyrs, in 29022 must have taken place before the moment the fort was affected by the Goths’ invasion. The unexpected visit to Halmyris of Latronianus, the duke of the province, recorded in detail in the Passio Epicteti et Astyoni, had as a main purpose not expressly the martyrdom of the two Christians but the inspection of the state of the reconstruction work.

As can be seen from the stratigraphical evidence, level V coincides with a massive rearrangement of the fortified area and building interventions to the gates, towers and the defence wall. The previous 2nd–3rd centuries plan of the fort seems now to have been mostly abandoned although some elements of the planimetry were re-used.

20 Ensslin 1948, 2439.
21 Brennan 1984, 146.
The Halmyris inscription points out two distinct phases of the Vth level within the late 3rd and early 4th centuries’ fort: phase \( a \), starting with the Aurelian-Probus reigns when general rebuilding work of the fort was initiated. This seems to have been interrupted by the 292–294 conflict with the Goths; phase \( b \), during the Tetrarchy when the building interventions were largely resumed.

The numbers of the victory titles were omitted in both the Halmyris and Donje Butorke inscriptions. If the rendering of the victory titles without the iterations means a final but local record of the imperial titulature, then the Halmyris inscription seems to date between c. 301 and 305. The Tetrarchic series of the Danubian inscriptions is generally dated before 300 and the Halmyris piece seems, therefore, the latest of the series, suggesting a prolongation of the building efforts in these regions until the first five years of the 4th century. Diocletian’s journey upstream the Danube in 303 on his way from Nicomedia to Rome\(^{23} \) and the circuit of the *Ripa Thraciae* in 304\(^{24} \), combined with the victories over the Sarmatians and Carpi in 302 and over the Carpi in 303\(^{25} \), which Lactantius alludes to, as well as the finishing of the building work in the Halmyris fortress could have been a good opportunity for the setting of the dedicatory inscription through the disposition of the duke of Scythia. The position of fragment \( b \) close to the western gate suggests, on the other hand, that the inscription was exhibited above it.

---


\(^{24}\) C. Iust. 5. 73. 4 (8 June 302 in Durostorum).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPERIAL VICTORY TITLES</th>
<th>YEARS AND ITERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIARCHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus Max</td>
<td>I  II  III  IV V (I*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothicus Max</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmaticus Max</td>
<td>I  II  III (I*) VII (II*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persicus Max</td>
<td>I (I*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannicus Max</td>
<td>I (I*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpicus Max</td>
<td>I (I*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenicus Max</td>
<td>I (I*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicus Max</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adiabenicus Max</td>
<td>I (I*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegyptiacus Max</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thebaicus Max</td>
<td>I*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Victory titles and iterations borne also by Galerius as reflected in the titles of April 311.

Table 1. The victory titles borne by the Emperors between 285–305
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUNUGU CIL VIII 21450</th>
<th>DONJE BUTORKE Starinar 29/30, 134-5</th>
<th>SEXAGINTA PRISTA Eirene 5, 139-54</th>
<th>TRANSMARISCA CIL III 6157</th>
<th>DUROSTORUM AE 1936, 10</th>
<th>HALMYRIS</th>
<th>EDICTUM DE PRETIIS CIL 3. 802-3</th>
<th>MISENE CIL X 3343</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>299-300</td>
<td>298-299</td>
<td>294-299</td>
<td>292-299</td>
<td>c. 301-305</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus Max</td>
<td>Germanicus Max</td>
<td>Germanicus Max V</td>
<td>Germanicus Max V</td>
<td>Germanicus Max V</td>
<td>Germanicus Max VI</td>
<td>Germanicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothicus Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gothicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmaticus Max</td>
<td>Sarmaticus Max</td>
<td>Sarmaticus Max III</td>
<td>Sarmaticus Max III</td>
<td>Sarmaticus Max</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarmaticus Max III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persicus Max II</td>
<td>Persicus Max II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persicus Max II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannicus Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Britannicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carpicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Armenicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adiabenicus Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The victory titles as reflected in inscriptions