

SOME CONSIDERATION REGARDING THE EVOLUTION OF DOBROGEA IN THE ANCIENT PERIOD

Drd. VOLUMIA ȘÎNGEORZAN

Universitatea Liber Internațional Moldova, Chișinău

ABSTRACT: *The physical-geographical and historical region, Dobrogea is located in the SE part of Romania, between the Danube and the Black Sea. As a historical-geographical province, it has experienced different stages of development over time. Through the Danube River and the Black Sea, it had connections with the whole world. In the 7th-6th centuries BC, the ancient Greeks settled on the shores of the Black Sea, founding cities-citadels known to this day - Histria, Callatis, Tomis. Later, the Daco-Romans also founded well-known fortresses - Aegyssus, Axiopolis, Dinogetia. As a result of the historical events that took place in this territory, today there are a number of overlapping cultures, which give originality to the region. With everything it offers within Romania, Dobrogea is the oldest province*

Key words: *province; ancient Greeks; Daco-Romans; historical events; originality;*

1. Historical incursion into the past of Dobrogea

Dobrogea, the historical province at the south-eastern tip of Romania, has a surface area of 15,570 km² (together with the Danube Delta) and its population totals just under 1 million inhabitants. Being situated between the Danube and the Black Sea, Dobrogea has experienced a relatively intenser economic development, in contrast to other regions of the country, due to its geographical location by the sea.

The Danube and the Black Sea, which are connected to the exterior of the area, had a special influence on the development of the social-economic life in this historical ruin of Romania. However, since ancient times, trade, commerce, or trade in goods has been the most important activity that has attracted traffic from other countries and contributed to the development of human settlements.

Some of the oldest settlements in Romania, built by Greeks and Romanians, also appeared at the edge of the sea, and they played an important role in the development of trade and the maintenance of autochthonous rule in the territory.

The Greek¹ colonists who came to Dobrogea in the 7th century AD, built a series of citadels and other settlements among them:

istria, Arganum, Tomis (C nstan a), arten li (Co tine ti), allati. From the Getho-Dacian and Roman eras, traces of human settlements have remained since the 6th century AD (Be tepe, arina uf, atu ou). There are many more remains that testify to the continuation of the Daco-Roman life in our modern cities: Aegyssu (Tulcea), Topalu, Dun rea, from the 2nd century BC, as well as Arrubium (M cin), al via (o aζmudia), n aga, Din g tia (Garv n), im nio, Tur aia from the II-III centuries BC.

Dobrogea is the westernmost Romanian province among all the Romanian provinces. At the beginning of the first century AD, the main folk living in D br g a were the Geths and the Sarmatian. The Black Sea and the Danube had the names that the folk living there gave them: “ ntu ytzi u ” and “ ar a armati um”. D br g a, sais Br t u, is called ytzia, but also the land of Getae, Sarmatian land, Scythian land. The Getae and the Sarmatian "set the law" in Dobrogea without caring about Rome or the roman military.

In Dobrogea², there is a succession of overlapping cultures and political shifts, in which the force of the invasion came either from the north or from the south, Dobrogea being the path between the north and the south, between the Carpathian Mountains and the sea.

Dobrogea remained, through the population, tradition, customs and culture, Romanian: the socio-economic and cultural, spiritual life of today confirms the fact that the majority of its inhabitants are the descendants of the Geto-Dacians, which left behind numerous vestiges on the ground of this historical province of Romania.

Brătulescu affirmed that "Dobrogea always filled the role of a territory of ethnographic and political integration of the folk and the political organizations of the Carpaths (...). In Argeș, in Ialomița, in Buzău, in Siret and Prut rivers, all the time, so many natural roads have climbed down the mountains and led shepherds and ploughmen to the land of Dobrogea"³.

Physical-geographical and historical considerations

The three great geographical units of the Dobrogea - the plateau, the delta and the seaside - each with its own physical-geographical conditions and resources, have determined, in time, the development of a self-sustained economic structure, a unique feature of this geographical unit. The plateau is dominated by the agricultural economy, the delta, the area of water and ponds, by the fishing economy, and the coast, with the towns and resorts along it, has become one of the most important touristic and balneoclimatic areas in Romania.

Dobrogea is the only historical province of the country where all the means of transportation have been developed: on the water, ground and in the air. The positioning of Dobrogea as a natural bridge of the Carpatho-Danubian space towards the Euxine Pont has allowed it to permanently maintain its functionalities in any given historical conditions.

The first historical event written in literary sources was the expedition of Darius I (Persian king during 521-486 BC), which happened at the end of the VI century BC⁴. Herodotus, the one to document this event, said the campaign was set between 514-512 BC, against the Scythians⁵. Darius crosses the Bosphorus with an army of 700,000 soldiers and builds, with the help of the Ionian Greeks who accompanied him, a bridge over the Danube, in the place that linked with his immense fleet (600 ships) with the

separation of the arms of the river, at Ialomița, Tulcea county. After that, Darius' army turns around, chasing after the Scythians who appeared to be retreating towards the neighboring lands and folk: the Malančanii, Andrăgăși, Nuri and the Agatirii. While the latter denied the Scythians access on their lands, the other ones ran away. The final episode of the war unfolds around the bridge, on which the Persian army, bullied by the Scythians, manages to retreat. According to Al. Vulpe, Thrace, including the Getae, was conquered and became Persian land known as *Artaxerxes' land*⁶. Thereby, the Danube was known, for the first time, as the frontier of a state, of a higher political structure than the tribes who lived on both its shores. Al. Andriescu mentions that only the Black Sea coast became a Persian province at this time and the north of Thrace and the left seaside of the Pont remained outside of the empire⁷. Same goes for the Getae, who lived on the left side of the Danube. Herodotus⁸ writes that „Before he reached the Hister, Darius defeated the Getae, who thought themselves to be immortal. For the Thracians, the inhabitants of Salmydessus and the ones who occupy the lands above the cities of Apollonia and Mesembria surrendered to Darius. The Getae were however, due to their reckless behaviour, enslaved, even though they were the bravest and most righteous of the Thracians.”

The Getae and the Odrysian kingdom. After the defeat in the second Persian war, in 479 BC, the Persians were forced to abandon Thrace in the following decade. One by one, the Persian forces are conquered by Athenians and Skurdas becomes, around 480-470 BC, the Thracian kingdom of Odrysians, under the king Teres I.

His descendant, Sitalkes (440-424 BC), manages to claim some of the fortresses situated on the coastline and also the territory between the Danube and the sea⁹. Thucydides claims that he Sitalkes spread his rule up to the Hister and assisted Athens in the Peloponnesian war (429 BC), against Perdicas, the king of Macedonia. According to Thucydides¹⁰, „[ital] Therefore, starting in the land of Odrys, he first called to arms Thracians that lived between the Rădăuți and Rădăuți mountains and the rest of his subordinate land.

He then called the Getae beyond the Haemus and the rest of the folk who lived between the Istos river and the sea." The Getae found themselves to be subordinate to the Odrys king Sitalkes.

According to the same author, „the biggest part of the cavalry (talking about Sitalkes' army of 150.000 men, a third of which was the cavalry) was made of Odryse and Getae"¹¹. Eventually, under the rule of king Seuthes, 2000 lightly armed Getae fight as mercenaries alongside the Odrys, this time against Athens, in Chersones. The Odrys state stretched itself right up to the Danube, therefore including all the Getae from Dobrogea and south of the Hister. A series of archaeological discoveries, like the treasures buried in the royal tombs of Agighiol (Tulcea) and Vraca, from the north-west of Bulgaria, or the treasures of Borovo (near Ruse), Rozogen and Letnica (between the northern Balkan mountains and the Danube) suggest this assertion. On multiple pots, discovered in these treasures and tombs lies the name Kotys, engraved, the name of the Odrys king (387-359 BC). During his reign the realm faces growth and prosperity. It is interesting to note that in the similar treasure found north of the Danube, the name of any dynastic Ódrys has not been engraved, so it is added to the lack of evidence from written sources, as the extension of the Odrys rule left of the Danube.

The pyramidal organization of the Ódrys state certainly disrupted the evolution of the structure of the Gethese tribal union, and it is not surprising that the Getis always assumed a unitary, reducible force. The rally of the Scythians led by king Ateas (Atais), probably in the 4th century BC, had to have led to quarrel with the local population, and it was to a large extent, Getis. On the other hand, it is safe to assume that they found a way to live with the local system. A necropolis, like the one in Enisala, functioned throughout the 4th century, and the royal tomb from Agighiol, if it is dated before 340 BC, must have belonged to a Getis chief, in the time of Ateas.

The relations between the Getis and the Macedonian state during the time of Philip II and Alexander the Great. The Macedonian invasion of the Danube took place during the reign of King Phillip II¹² (382-336 BC), who

tried and succeeded in replacing the Kingdom of Odris in the region of Haemus. As a result of this policy, in 341 BC, the Kingdom of Odris was transformed into a Macedonian kingdom, the authority of the Macedonian king extending to the Hister. This Macedonian province was maintained in its administrative form during the reign of Alexander. The first governor of the new ruin created by Philip II is Alexandros Lynkéstis, the son-in-law of Antipatros, who claimed the title of "strategist of Thrace". The actions of Phillip II are recorded by Pholibeus¹³, who later stated that "Macedonians extended their settlement in Europe, from the Adriatic Sea to the Hister".

In the period following the dissolution of the Odrys kingdom, on the right of the Hister, probably profiting on the power vacuum that remained, the Scythians entered Dobrogea, under the leadership of king Atheas¹⁴. The event is recorded by Trogus Romreius¹⁵, who relates that the Scythians came into conflict with a certain "Orexis", although V. Pârvan assumed that he was a Getis king, and they sought the help of Phillip II through the city of Apollonia Pontica. The unexpected death of "Orexis" persuaded the Scythians, those who moved en masse due to the Sarmath¹⁶ pressure, to refuse the Macedonian help. As a response, in 339 BC, after the failure suffered following the siege of the Greek cities of Byzantium and Perinthos, between the years 341-339 BC, but also after the collapse of the Odrys kingdom¹⁷, the Macedonian king started a campaign in Dobrogea, removing the Scythian military force from the region, with the defeat of Atheas.

D.M. Pippidi's point of view is also interesting, he considered that the Scythians, once they entered the territories south of the Danube, grounded a fully fledged kingdom, with a dynasty started by Atheas¹⁸. The fact that coins (tetradrahmes) with the legend of ATAIA were discovered in the south of the Danube, is true. The coins, being issued by the Pontic Heraclea and later by the Callatis, cities who were thought to have been under the protection of the Scythian king, but the existence of a real dynasty in Dobrogea is debatable¹⁹.

The administrative organization of King Phillip II was also maintained during the reign

of his son, Alexander²⁰, king of Macedonia in the period 336-323 BC. There are first-hand testimonies about Alexander the Great's campaign on the Danube from 335 BC. There testimonies are provided by an eyewitness, Ptolemy of Lagos (the future king of Egypt), who accompanied Alexander and whose history was used by Arian²¹. The purpose of Alexander's reign was of course to unify his country toward his ultimate goal: a great campaign towards Asia. The tribals had already betrayed his father, they also showed their independence towards the Ódrysi kings (also italk s was defeated and died, in 424 BC, in a fight with the tribals). These antecedents convinced Alexander to annihilate this opposing force. Left in pursuit of the tribesmen, he arrived at the banks of the Hister and "forced himself to cross the Hister in front of the Getis that were coming from the Hister, although he saw them gathered in great numbers on the banks of the river. They wanted to stop him, if he even tried to reach them (there were around four thousand riders and over ten thousand soldiers)"²². This was an exaggeration meant to highlight Alexander's courage, but, as Al. Vulpe observed, it should be noted, that evidence of the ratio between the cavalry and infantry (1:3) can also be found in the necropolis of Ferigile in Vâlcea county²³.

After he crossed the river, "On the edge of dawn, Alexander went through the lands. He ordered the infantry to move forward, flattening the wheat with the lances, until they reached the uncultivated land. As long as the riders advanced, the phalanx followed them. But as soon as they came out of the fields, Alexander himself led the cavalry to the left flank, and asked isan r to lead the phalanx in square formation. But the Getis could not even hold back the first cavalry attack. They were amazed by Alexanders audacity to easily cross one of the biggest rivers, the Hister, in one night, without building any bridge. They were also terrified by the impenetrable structure of the phalanx and the speed of the cavalry attack. First, they fled the city, which was at the far end of the river [ssa. 6 km]. When they saw that, leaving the riders in the lead, Alexander hurriedly led the phalanx along the river, so that the infantry would not be attacked by the Getae

lying in wait, the Getae also abandoned the city, because it was not well fortified. They took their sons and wives with them, as they went. They retreated further away from the river in lonely places. Alexander sacked the city and took all the spoils left behind by the Getis²⁴.

V. ârvan considered the "city of the Getis" to be the same as Zimnicea, as well as any settlement on the left bank of the Danube²⁵. On the other hand, V. Pârvan noted that the information provided by Arian is quite unclear from a graphical²⁶ point of view.

The existence of rich spoils in the "city was not well fortified" conquered by Alexander suggests that it was the residence of a local nobleman and the political and economic center of a tribe or tribal union.

In connection with the region through which the macedonians crossed the Hister a point of view was shown by Fl. Medele . Analyzing the literary information from Alexander's expedition, it states that the antique news refers to the tribals before 335 BC and in the 2nd century BC (for instance starting from H r d t, IV, 49 and Thu ydid s II, 96) places them west of rava, on the right bank of the Danube and upstream of The Iron Gates, and not in the southern region of the Danube²⁷. The thesis issued by Fl. Medele is that Alexander's conquest took place in the Banat area of the Danube, where a series of "weakly fortified cities²⁸" appeared.

The history of the Dobrogean lands has information from ancient sources, and it refers to the actions of Z yri n, Alexander's general, while he was campaigning in Asia²⁹. According to V. ârvan, the literary information about this campaign is transmitted in a rather unclear and confusing way³⁰.

Curtius Rufus³¹, a roman epoch author of the history of Alexander, relates: "During one expedition against the Getis, Zopyrion, the governor of Thrace, was killed alongside his whole army because of a storm that arose unexpectedly. When he found out about this, uth provoked the dry , his conationals towards an uprising. Thrace was almost lost". These events occurred, according to Curtius Rufus, when Alexander had already conquered India, sometime in 326 or 325 BC. From the account of urtius Rufus, it does not appear

where the confrontation with the Getis would have taken place, but given the fact that after the death of Ziryx the Odrys rebelled, vouches to pinpoint these events in the lower region of the Danube, in the Getis land. Triguempeius in his "History of Phillip" states that Ziryx fought with the Scythians³², and Ziryx's presence in Olbia is also mentioned by Strabon³³. It stated that "During the siege of Ziryx, the Borystenes freed the Slavs, gave citizenship to foreigners, forgave debts and tried to keep fighting the enemy".

Al. Suceveanu claims that taking an absolute position regarding these informations is risky, because of the exaggerated credit given to one source or another, which leads to mistrust³⁴. The controversies are backed by the lack of information clarity, for example, the title that Zopyrion had.

Following the division between the dyadochs of the huge kingdom founded by Alexander, after his death, which occurred on June 13, 323 BC, Thrace (the "Macedonian" strategy of Thrace) "and the folk neighboring the Black Sea"³⁵ went back to Lysmiach³⁶. The first decision he made was to suppress the uprising of Odris. According to Diodorus, the fights with the Odrys lasted many years, with losses in both sides. This happened due to the intrigues of Antigonos Monophthalmos ("the blind"), the heir of the territories of middle Asia, who sent a fleet and an army to the aid of the citizens of the left Pont, who rose up in 313 BC. against Lysimach. The latter still manages to face the respective threats, but some time is yet to pass until he will get the Odrysians to stand down. Although, at first, this thraco-scythian³⁷ allied force was defeated by Lysmiach, the entire political configuration of the region south of the Danube shows hostility towards the Macedonians, which cannot properly exert their authority in the area.

The situation presented above explains the conflict between Lysmiach and the Getis king Dromichaites, which took place during the first decade of the 3rd century BC. Dióдор is the main author who presents this conflict. After the battle of Ipsos, in 301 BC, and the redistribution of Alexander's inheritance between the dyadochs, which were divided into 305 kings,

and the new definition of the spheres of influence, Lysmiach, which, aside from Thrace, extended his kingdom over a large part of middle Asia, is headed to the lower Danube where the Getis took his son, Agathokle, hostage. According to Diodorus³⁸, the Thracians (Getae) would have returned him to his father, hoping to get "the land that Lysmiach conquered". In 292 BC, Lysmiach initiates a new military campaign against the Getae, and Diodorus of Sicily reports that "Lysmiach's army was starving. He was advised by his friends to flee while he can, because his army would not be able to save him. Lysmiach responded that what they suggested was unfair and cowardly. He would not abandon his soldiers and friends in favor of a quick escape"³⁹. Taken hostage by Dromichaites, "he took him along with his kids to the fortress called Elis"⁴⁰. Strabon⁴¹ brought to attention the fact that, in exchange for his release, Lysimach "makes peace with Dromichaites and gave him the lands beyond the Hister". Althemore, he gave him his daughter towards marriage", and Diodorus⁴² states that Dromichaites "gets back all the fortresses occupied by Lysmiach's men".

Even the "imprisonment" by the Getae would be questionable given the independent source, Memnon⁴³ - an author from the time of Hadrian - would not have wrote that one chief of the Heraclea fortress was captured alongside Lysmiach during the war against the Getis. The fact that the leader of Heraclea, named Klearchos, was released, according to Memnon's texts, only later at the insistence of Lysmiach, shows that the whole story presented by Diodorus was "sweetened". In reality, the conditions for the release of Lysmiach and his companions may reflect a long series of negotiations, probably harshly contested by both sides.

In spite of such a well-remembered conflict, many things remain obscure. First of all, who was Dromichaites and where was his kingdom located. Dióдор sometimes calls him a thrace, other times a getae, Triguempeiu, Rex Thracum, as well as Lyain; Strabon (VII, 3, 8 and 14), Memnon and Pausanias called him getae, while he was called odrys by Strabon and Polibius. Considering this inconsistency,

Daicóviciu tried to explain it as a misspel and a mixup of word meanings⁴⁴. The argument that Daicóviciu follows is the presence in Herodotus (IV, 48) of the hydronym Ordesos, Argesis according to V. ârvan, identified with Arges river, in the proximity of which Helis can also be placed. Al. Vulpe⁴⁵ points out the fact that Dromichaites, the king of the Getis, who always considered himself Odrys, which was also confirmed by Polibius⁴⁶, by virtue of the bondage (vassality) of the Getis to the Kingdom of Ódryes. That would be the best way to explain the oscillations from the literary sources regarding Dromichaites ethnic background. When it comes to Dromichaites kingdom and its capital, Helis (either a corrupted name or a Greek name), several hypotheses have been formulated. If, according to Diodorus, the army of Lysimas was starving and thirsty, he had in mind a land of waste, a deserted land and a shortage of settlements and water sources. That's why some writers thought either of Bran or the Romanian Plains in general, or of the south of Basarabia (Bugea ul). V. ârvan did not exclude the possibility of Helis being in Crișani, in Ialomița⁴⁷.

R. Florescu observes that Strabon leaves the legacy of LySMiach in "the Getis wasteland", and the most probable localization of the kingdom of Dromichaites is in the middle area of Moldavia, where there are a series of fortified settlements⁴⁸. In conclusion, the settlement of Dromichaites represents the first serious affirmation of a Getisian force on the Danube, formed of course on the basis of a more ancient tradition. No matter how tempting it may be to celebrate this unional-tribal form of the Getae in the time of Darius, or even when Alexander faced them in 335 BC, we can't really speak of the same tradition, respectively a political continuation. What happened with the "kingdom" of Dromichaites during the peace with the Macedonians, and what will be the status of this "kingdom" in the what is to come, in the power sphere of the Macedonian route to the Danube, is not known. When, soon after 279 BC, the Celts establish the kingdom of Tyllis for a short time, its extent will be, at least virtually, the same as the former Odrys kingdom, they do not appear to have extended past the Danube⁴⁹, on its left side.

Dromichaites era marks the first period of economic-cultural flourishing and political affirmation in the history of the Getae. The second period of development, the true climax of this evolution, will officially start in two centuries. This is the story of the rules of the great kings Burebista and Decebal, where the Getae and the Dacians had established a true ethno-cultural unit and, briefly, a political one. A force which managed to leave the geological frame of the Carpatho-Danubian region. In direct contact with the Getae have remained the colonies on the western shore of the Black Sea, proof being several significant inscriptions. As an example, the ones recording in significant detail the relations between Istria and the Getis dynasts Zalmódégikós and Rhama⁵⁰.

In the territory of southern Dobrogea, archeological findings and, in particular, numismatics (coins of the kings Ailiariak, Tanu a, Akra, Zara and Kanite) prove the presence of some ancient enclaves, explaining the definition of Dobrogea, from that time (in the Histrian decret for Agathocles) as Scythia⁵¹. The late Scythic presence in Dobrogea is however poorly documented, as it seems that the allogeneic factor disturbed the normal development of the Getis tribes and their relations with the Greek cities. It is significant, of course, that in Dobrogea, until now, the only fortified Getis settlement (dava) has been identified and researched, of course, that of Satu-Mare, County of Constanta. There are very few Getis typical settlements and burials datable in the III-I centuries BC.

After Dromichaites, as it has already shown, events and names linked to the history of the Getae from the III-II centuries BC. although we only rarely find them, fleetingly mentioned in the literary sources, and only a few reports are based on epigraphic and numismatic documents, they are, more likely, of local importance. Thus, the inscription in the Greek language, found in Istria, in 1959, and dated to the epigraphic inscriptions in the 3rd century B.C., mentions Zalmódégikós, who is, by his name a Getis chief, who exercises a pressuring protectorate on the Milesian colony⁵². The inscription is a decret in honor of the three

"sent to Zalmodegikos to retrieve the hostages"; they "roamed in the enemy's territory and - facing all kinds of threats and showing the most zealous bone - they brought the hostages (sixty in number) back, at the same time convincing Zalmodegikos to give back the settlements income"⁵³. As a result, having the ability to control the sources of income of Istria by force (mainly the crops from the rural territory, but also the fishing on the Danube) and retaining an unusually large number of hostages, Zalmodegikos would periodically receive a tribute from the Istrian folk. Moreover, it is safe to assume that Zalmodegikos was the chief of a tribe or a tribal union of Getae from the northern half of the Dobrogea and, possibly, from the other side of the Danube. He obviously had the power, the force to compel Istria to pay some sums of money or gifts in nature, on the contrary, shutting the rural territory of the city or forbidding the navigation on the river.

In the same northern area of Dobrogea, several monetary remains dating from the 3rd century BC, testify to the existence of another local dynasty, called Moskon. Although he does not have other mentions (sources), the very fact that a local chief managed to strike a silver coin with his effigy (seen with a diadem) and his name, accompanied by the title of "Basileus", illustrates this distinction, an advanced stage of social organization and political self-awareness.

In 200 BC, the historical epigraph of special documentary value — the inscription in the name of Agathocles, the son of Antiphilios — provides more details. Details that relate to the complicated and turbulent relations between the Greek cities and the various "barbarians" that surrounded them. From this decree it follows that, through active diplomacy (messengers) and regular gifts (mainly a tribute, phoros), Istria and other Greek cities of Dobrogea (also mentioned as Scythia for the first time) obtained administrative support and military protection of the "king" Rhemaxos against the Thracians led by Zoltes⁵⁴. These people called for a more imposing character, Rhemachos (called in the inscription basileus, in contrast with Zoltes, who was only designated as a chief), and, according to several researchers, he would be the head of one of the most important tribal formations on the left side of the Danube, in the Muntenia

plains, south of Moldova, possibly from Buceag. Although the name of Rhemaxos, as well as that of his son Phradmon, were considered by some authors to be of Iranian origin, it is more likely that this tribal formation (union) was a native one, Getis, maybe even descendants of Dromichaites folk⁵⁵. Thus, according to the tribute, Agathokles obtained from Rhemachos a hundred soldiers "for the sake of thirst", and on the other hand, from Zoltes another six hundred, a "salt, having roused these enemies, they defeated the Zoltes army". From the historical record, it is clear that Rome was an amazing historical repercussion. Thus, by paying the tribute, Agathokles obtained from Rhemaxos one hundred riders "for the city defense", and later, from Phradmon, another six hundred, "which, having outnumbered the enemy forces, defeated Zoltes". From the historical record, it is clear that Rhemaxos was an important historical figure.

Then, as well as in other eras, the antique authors were mainly interested in the faces of some foreign nations, of warlike habits, and that recently entered the historical scene. Thus, probably trained in the ancient bastarn expeditions in the Balkans, the "Getae from the north of the Istra" are mentioned by Appian⁵⁶ as mercenaries employed by the Macedonian king Perseus in 168 BC. Even if there would have been a confusion regarding the Getis chief Cloilios and the fact that he is actually the bastarn Clondicus mentioned in similar instances by Titus Livius (XLIV, 26,27), the participation of the Getae in this expedition south of the Danube remains highly probable.

The first evidence of human life in Dobrogea dates back to the paleolithic. The archaeological findings have highlighted traces of the presence of man in the paleolithic, especially in the remains of Izvora (Izoria) and La Adam (Târgu Jiu) from the basin of the Arad valley; in several parts of central and southern Dobrogea it has also been identified as a trace of sporadic inhabitation.

The neolithic, through the three cultures of Gumelnita and Cernavoda, is present in many places along the Danube, the seaside and the principal valleys; depending on the local conditions, the settlements were

located either on heights with steep slopes, or in low areas (settlements with total or partial fortifications by ditches and earthworks).

In the Bronze Age (3rd millennium B.C.), there was a mixture of Indo-European tribes with the native population and the formation of the Thrace or an area of development in the carpato-balkan region (there were farmers, shepherds, butchers).

In the Iron Age (1200-450 BC) the tribes were divided into two separate groups, with some disputes related to religion, customs and language (the Balkan tribes in the southern Danube and Carpatian tribes and the northern Danube or Bohemia). From the latter came the Getae (7th century BC), focused Dobrogea, romanian plain, and Moldova.

The foundation of the cities of Istria (7th century BC), Tomis (6th century AD), Callatis (6th century BC) is related to the presence of the greeks along the Black Sea. Among these there are also several stationary points (near Tuzla; *artç n li*, south of *tinesti*).

At the end of the iron age, the Geto-Dacian civilization was created, highlighted by a large number of settlements with waves of defense or located on natural mountains. On the coast, the colonists took a part from their lands, used them in agriculture and established strong ties with the local community. Tariverde has become an important center for the production of agricultural products for the city of Istria.

In the first century BC was the start the evolution of tribal unions that ultimately led to the creation of the centralized state led by Burebista (82-44 BC). In the context of the Roman threat, he takes control over all towns from Olbia (north) to Arrollonia (south) and the territory on the right side of the Danube until the Balkans, by virtue of the unity of kin and language.

The disintegration of the state of Burebista favored the roman conquests and the transformation of Dobrogea into a Romanian province (in 46 B.C. – it entered the province of Moesia); the romans ground ports along the shores, on the littoral the cities were established in a federation with the headquarters in Tomis; the agriculture develops (viticulture, cereal cultivation, animal breeding, rice farming), trade, crafts. The Romans have have improved

the organization of the customs and financial status.

It is a network consisting of three main roads and other, secondary ones. The oldest road connects the towns and villages along the river – from Transmarisca (Turtusaia) to Iistria; from there, the second, the Greek one, restored by the Romans and the one that runs along to the Byzantine coast, starts. The third road goes through the center of Dobroga (Troraem Traiani – Ulmetum-Ibida). There were also many bridges, over the Danube, at Altinum (Itina), *arium (âr va)*, *Barb i* and *vi dunum (I assea)*, between connections with the roads from Moldova and Muntenia.

In the IV-VII centuries AD, Dobrogea was a standalone province (*ytçia Minor*). The fortification systems of the Danube harbors, as well as of the Danube settlements (Capidava, Dinoge ia) and the seaside cities (Troraem Traiani – Ulmetum) and the marine ones (*allatis*, Tomis) were strengthened to defend against the Ostrogoths, Huns, Slavs, Bulgarians. In the VII century, the Romano-Byzantine domination breaks facing the Slavs and Avarils. Byzantium occupied the littoral zone with its fleet headquarters at Lysostomion (*çilia*), the Bulgarians were in the south of the coast, and in the center and on the Danube was the Romanized p ulation.

In the 10th century AD, Dobrogea reentered the Byzantine Empire, being known under the name of *aradunav n* or *ari tri n*. The frequent invasions determined the consolidation of the defense system materialized in three waves (the small and big waves of land; the stone wave) located between Constan a-Cernavod - iculi el. In the next period (XII-XIV centuries), the Byzantine authority weakens again, but the role of the Genoese merchants in the Danube Delta increases.

The feudal state is organized under the leadership of Dobrotici through the union of local political organizations; in the time of Mircea cel B trân, the unification between the Romanian country and Dobrogea is realized.

In 1417, Dobrogea was conquered by Mahomed I, and the Danube Delta in 1484. This led to four centuries of slow economic and social evolution. Moreover, the area will be

frequently affected by the Russo-Turkish wars, accompanied by large material losses. In addition to the colonization of Tatars and Turks, the return of the Romanian element from Moldova, Muntenia, Transylvania was also established and merged with the old Romanian population; the Romanians founded new settlements.

NOTES

1. D. M. Pippidi, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, vol. I, Ed. Academiei, Bucure ti, 1965, p. 157-182.
2. D. Bug , *Geografia uman , geografia istoric i etnografic în opera lui Constantin Br tescu*, Rev. Etnogr. Folcloric , 42, 1-2.
3. *Podi ul Dobrogei*, în *Geografia României*, vol. V, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 2005.
4. H. C. Matei, *Enciclopedia antichit ii*, Editura Meronia, Bucure ti, 2004, p. 105.
5. P. Alexandrescu, Izvoare grece ti despre retragerea lui Darius din expedi ia scitic , în SCIV, tom VII, nr. 3-4, Bucure ti, 1956, p. 320; Al. Vulpe, *Istoria i civiliza ia spa iului carpato-dun rean între mijlocul secolului al VII-lea i începutul secolului al III-lea a.Chr.*, în *Istoria Românilor*, vol. I, Editura Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 2001, p. 451-454.
6. Al. Vulpe, op. cit., p. 541-550.
7. P. Alexandrescu, op. cit., p. 319-342
8. *Istoriei*, IV, 93.
9. M. Cosac, *Introducere în Istoria veche a României*, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Târgovi te, 2006, p. 96.
10. *Istoria r zoiului peloponesiac*, II, 91, 1.
11. *Ibidem*, II, 98, 4.
12. H. C. Matei, *Enciclopedia antichit ii*, Editura Meronia, Bucure ti, 2004, p. 133-134.
13. *Istoriei*, I, 2, 4.
14. V. Pârvan, *Getica. O protoistorie a Daciei, Edi ie îngrijit , note, comentarii i postfa de R. Florescu*, Editura Meridiane, Bucure ti, 1982, p. 53.
15. *Istoria lui Filip*, IX, 1, 9- IX, 3, 1.
16. V. Pârvan, op. cit., p. 51-53.
17. R. Vulpe, *Studia Thracologica*, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 1976, p. 35.
18. D. M. Pippidi, *Dic ionar de Istorie Veche a României*, Editura tiin ific i Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 1976, p. 66-67.
19. P. Alexandrescu, *Ataias*, în *Studii Clasice*, IX, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 1967, p. 88-89.
20. H. C. Matei, *Enciclopedia antichit ii*, Editura Meronia, Bucure ti, 2004, p. 20-22.
21. *Expedi ia lui Alexandru*, I, 1, 4 – I, 4, 1; Strabon, *Geografia*, VII, 3, 8 (C. 301).

22. Arian, Expedi ia lui Alexandru, I, 3, 1.
23. Al. Vulpe, Istoria i civiliza ia spa iului carpato-dun rean între mijlocul secolului al VII-lea i începutul secolului al III-lea a.Chr., în Istoria Românilor, vol. I, Editura Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 2001, p. 458.
24. Arian, op. cit., I, 4,1.
25. V. Pârvan, Getica. O protoistorie a Daciei, Edi ie îngrijit , Editura Meridiane, Bucure ti, 1982, p. 45; R. Vulpe, A ez ri getice din Muntenia, Editura Meridiane, Bucure ti, 1966, p. 19
26. V. Pârvan, op. cit., p. 43.
27. Fl. Medele , *În leg tur cu expedi ia întreprins de Alexandru Macedon la Dun re în 335 î.e.n.*, în Acta Musei Napocensis, XIX, Cluj-Napoca, 1982, p. 16.
28. Ibidem, p. 16-22.
29. Al. Suceveanu, O ipotez despre Zopyrion, în SCIV, tom 17, nr. 4, Bucure ti, 1966, p. 635-644; Vl. Iliescu, Campania strategului Zopyrion la Dun rea de Jos, în Pontica, IV, Muzeul de Arheologie Constan a, 1971, p. 57-74.
30. V. Pârvan, Getica. O protoistorie a Daciei, Edi ie îngrijit de R. Florescu, Editura Meridiane, Bucure ti, 1982, p. 48.
31. Istoria lui Alexandru cel Mare Macedoneanul, X, 1, 43- X, 1, 45.
32. Trogus Pompeius, Istoria lui Filip, XII, 1, 4 i XXXVII, 3, 2.
33. Saturnale, I, 11, 33.
34. Al. Suceveanu, op. cit., p. 637-638.
35. Diodor din Sicilia, Biblioteca istoric , XVIII, 3, 2.
36. M. Cosac, Introducere în Istoria veche a României, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Târgovi te, 2006, p. 99-100; H. C. Matei, Enciclopedia antichit ii, Editura Meronia, Bucure ti, 2004, p. 195-196.
37. D. M. Pippidi, Din istoria Dobrogei, vol. I, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 1965, p. 132-136.
38. Diodor din Sicilia, Biblioteca istoric , XXI, 11.
39. Ibidem, XXI, 12, 1.
40. Ibidem, XXI, 12, 2.
41. Descrierea Greciei, I, 9, 7.
42. Biblioteca istoric , XXI, 12, 6.
43. Despre Heracleia, 5.
44. C. Daicovicu, Il paese di Dromichete, în Dacica. Studii i articole privind istoria veche a p mântului românesc, Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis, I, Cluj-Napoca, 1970, p. 97-100.
45. Al. Vulpe, Istoria i civiliza ia spa iului carpato-dun rean între mijlocul secolului al VII-lea i începutul secolului al III-lea a.Chr., în Istoria Românilor, vol. I, Editura Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 2001, p. 463.

46. Fragmente din C r i nesigure, Fr. 102.
47. V. Pârvan, *Getica. O protoistorie a Daciei*, Edi ie îngrijit , note, comentarii i postfa de R. Florescu, Editura Meridiane, Bucure ti, 1982, p. 63.
48. R. Florescu, *ara lui Dromichaites, în Pontica*, XIV, Constan a, 1981, p. 153-157.
49. D. M. Pippidi, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, vol. I, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 1965, p. 134-135.
50. Idem, *Contribu ii la Istoria veche a României*, Editura tiin ific , Bucure ti, 1967, p. 167-221; idem, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 1965, p. 225-231.
51. Idem, *Histria i ge ii în secolul al II-lea î.e.n. Observa ii asupra Decretului în cinstea lui Agathocles, fiul lui Antiphilos*, în *Contribu ii la Istoria veche a României*, Editura tiin ific , Bucure ti, 1967, p. 189-191.
52. Idem, *tiri noi despre leg turile Histriei cu ge ii în secolul al III-lea*, în *Contribu ii la Istoria veche a României*, Editura tiin ific , Bucure ti, 1967, p. 167-185.
53. Ibidem, p. 171.
54. H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea roman* , Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1972, p. 22-25; D. M. Pippidi, *Contribu ii la Istoria veche a României*, Editura tiin ific , Bucure ti, 1967, p. 189-212; idem, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, vol. I, p. 228-231.
55. D. M. Pippidi, *Contribu ii la Istoria veche a României*, Editura tiin ific , Bucure ti, 1967, p. 186-221; I. I. Russu, *Zoltes i Rhemaxos. Tracii, sci ii i Istria în secolele III-II î.e.n.*, în *Apulum*, VI, 1967, p. 123-143.
56. *Istoria Roman* , Macedonia, 18, 1-3.

References

- Alexandrescu, P., *Izvoare grece ti despre retragerea lui Darius, din expedi ia scitic* , Bucure ti, 1965.
- Barnea, I., *tef nescu. t*, *Din istoria Dobrogei*, Editura Academiei, 1971.
- Cosac, M., *Introducere în istoria veche a României*, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Târgovi te, 2006.
- Daicoviciu, C., *Studii i articole privind istoria veche a p mântului românesc*, Cluj-Napoca, 1970.
- Daicoviciu, H., *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea roman* , Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1972.
- Giurescu, C., *Istoria Românilor*, Editura Albatros, Bucure ti, 1975.
- Iorga, N., *Cele trei Dobrogi pe care le-am g sit*, *Analele Dobrogei*, 1922.
- Matei, H., C., *Enciclopedia Antichit ii*, Editura Meronia, Bucure ti, 2004.
- Pârveu, Stelu a, *Multiculturalit i în Dobrogea*, Editura Ex Ponto, 2007.
- Pipidi, D. M., *Contribu ii la istoria veche a României*, Editura tiin ific , Bucure ti, 1967.
- Pipidi, D. M., *Din istoria Dobrogei, vol I*, Editura Academiei, Bucure ti, 1965.
- Pipidi, D. M., *Dic ionar de Istorie veche a României*, Editura tiin ific i Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 1978.
- R dulescu, A., Bitoleanu I., *Istoria Dobrogei*, Editura Ex Ponto, Consta a, 1998.
- R dulescu, A., Bitoleanu I., *Istoria românilor dintre Dun re i Marea Neagr* , Editura tiin ific i Enciclopedic , Bucure ti, 1979.