# Texts A and B of the Horothesia Dossier at Istros 

James H. Oliver

In excavations near the mouth of the Danube at the Greek site of Istros, which the Romans miscalled Histria, two fragmentary copies of a dossier concerning the exploitation of a pine grove and above all concerning the fishing rights of the Histrians were discovered in 1914. In 1916 Vasile Pârvan published photographs of both inscriptions (A and B), also a drawing of A. The Greek text he gave was a composite text. This procedure makes it impossible to understand the situation in regard to the length of lacunae and misleads both editor and reader in regard to restorations. We need both texts side by side, because one supports the other, while some problems, and errors of restoration, first emerge in such a collocation. Later Pippidi's text of B reflected the inscription as it looked in 1958, but the text of B needs to be given as it was in 1915 before it suffered further damage. After Pippidi's discovery of an old photograph of another fragment of $A$, a complete publication of A too becomes more desirable than ever.

## Text A

The inscription engraved on a sandstone block has now crumbled away.

The side with lines 66-87, not visible to Pârvan, was published by D. M. Pippidi, "Un fragment inedit al hotarniciei lui Laberius Maximus (SEG I 329)," Studii clasice 6 (1964) 331-42 with a summary in German, with photographs of pertinent sections of both $A$ and $B$, and with D. Pecurariu's drawing of the rest of $A$. No transcription of the other lines, those on the front of the block, was ever published, though Vasile Pârvan, "Histria IV," Analele Academiei române, Seria II, 38 (1915-1916), Memoriile sectiunii istorice, pp. 556-58, No. 15 (with photograph on Plate iv and drawing on p. 557), reported their existence. Accordingly, the text we offer below is the first edition of the front and of the inscription as a whole.

## FRONT







$15[\Sigma \alpha \beta \epsilon i v o v \cdot \Phi \lambda] \Sigma \alpha \beta \epsilon i v o\left[s^{\top} \Pi\right] \sigma \tau \rho \iota \alpha \nu \hat{\omega} \nu{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rho \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu \beta o v \lambda \hat{\eta}$

 [ $\left.\tau o v \delta \iota \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \alpha\right] \tau o s \dot{\alpha}[\varphi \in ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa] \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o \hat{v} \pi o-$








 [vacat 'E $\pi \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda \grave{\eta} \Pi_{o \mu \pi} \mu \nu i o v$ Пєiov] vacat


 $[\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ ö $\tau \iota \dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ v \epsilon \iota \alpha \tau] \hat{\eta} s$ пó $\lambda \epsilon \omega s$


$35\left[\delta \iota \alpha \phi \nu \lambda \alpha \chi \theta \hat{\eta}{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha i \alpha v \dot{\xi} \eta \eta \hat{\eta} \tau\right] \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu \delta i-$ $[\kappa \alpha \iota \alpha, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon ́ \kappa \rho \iota \nu \alpha \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha] \tau \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\alpha} \Pi \epsilon \hat{v}[\kappa \eta s] \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ v \omega[\nu]$
 [ $\tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \eta$ ] oi $\pi \rho o ́ \gamma[$ ovoı $\dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa] \alpha i ̀ \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon s$ [ $\tau \hat{\eta}] \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \Sigma \epsilon-$ $[\beta \alpha \sigma \tau \hat{\omega}] \nu \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \alpha \lambda\left[\epsilon i \pi \tau \omega s{ }_{\epsilon} \neq \alpha\right] o \nu \mathrm{v}{ }^{\text {" }} A \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda \grave{\eta} \Pi \lambda \alpha v \tau i[0 v]$
$40[A i \lambda \iota] \alpha \nu o \hat{v} \cdot \Pi \lambda \alpha v^{\prime} \tau[\iota o s A i] \lambda \iota \alpha \nu o ̀ s{ }^{\prime} I \sigma \tau \rho \iota \alpha \nu \hat{\omega} \nu{ }_{\alpha} \rho \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu$
 $[K] \alpha \lambda \lambda i ́ \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau о s ~ \triangle \eta \mu \eta \tau \rho i ́ o v ~ к \alpha i ~ M \epsilon \iota \delta i \alpha s$ ' $A \rho \tau \epsilon \mu \iota \delta \omega ́ \rho о v \cdot$
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau o v \sigma \alpha \nu \nu \hat{\varphi} \tau \epsilon \iota \mu \iota \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}[\mu] \hat{\omega} \nu \Sigma \alpha \beta \epsilon i \nu \omega$




Horothesia Dossier at Istros, Text A, front
(from Pârvan, Analele Academiei române 1915-1916)


Horothesia Dossier at Istros, text A, side
(from Pippidi, Studii clasice 6)



$\kappa о \sigma \mu \epsilon i ̂ \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu \kappa \alpha i{ }^{`} E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \eta \prime \delta \alpha \kappa \alpha i \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu \Sigma[\epsilon-]$
 $\beta \hat{\eta} \mathrm{vvv}{ }^{\text {'E }} \boldsymbol{\pi} \iota \sigma \tau o \lambda \grave{\eta}$ Toud入íov $\Gamma \epsilon \mu i ́ v o v$ vacat
 $T \iota \beta$. K $\lambda \alpha<v>\delta i ́ o v ~ K \alpha i ́ \sigma \alpha \rho o s ~ \Sigma \epsilon \beta(\alpha \sigma \tau o \hat{v}) ~ \Gamma \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \nu \iota \kappa о \hat{v}{ }^{\text {' }}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \rho \iota \alpha \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$


[----M $] \iota \delta i \alpha_{s} \Delta \iota o \nu v \sigma o ́ \delta \omega \rho o s ~ ' H \gamma[\eta \sigma] \alpha \gamma o ́ \rho \alpha s ~ ' A \rho \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \gamma[o ́-]$


 [ $\rho 0 v \sigma i \alpha, \alpha, \sigma \pi o v \delta \alpha \iota o \tau \alpha ́] \tau \eta \nu \pi o \iota \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta}[\nu \pi \epsilon \rho i \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon i \lambda \alpha \sigma-]$
 [ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \iota[\alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu, \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota[\hat{\alpha} \epsilon i ́ \tau \iota \nu o s \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu]$
 $[\mu o \hat{v} \sigma \tau o \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \delta \iota \delta \alpha] \chi \theta \epsilon i s \dot{v} \pi \grave{\partial} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \beta[\epsilon \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \mu-]$


SIDE
[Exemplum decreti Mani La]beri M[a]xi[m]il[eg. Aug. pr(o) pr.]
[Imp. Caesare Traiano Aug. Ge]rmanic[o III Iulio Fron-]
[tino III cos(ulibus), V]III kal. N[o]vem[bres. Descriptum]
70 [et recogn]itum factum ex cọ̣[m(entar)io Mani Laberi]
[Maximi] leg. Aug. pr(o) pr., permi[ttente Fabio Pompeiano q. i.]
[scrip]ta sunt. "Charagon[io Philopalaestro conduct(ore)] [pub]l(ici) portori ripae Thr[aciae postulante ut por-]
[tor]ium sibi Halmyridi[s et Peuci daretur: Secundum]
75 [fo]rm(am) quam accepit i[us exigendi portori habet a fini-]
[bu]s canabar(um) Di[mensium usque ad mare ------]

[l]egionarii V[-------------------------------1]

80

[. . .] et reg[-- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $]$



```
    vetare qu[--------------------- Labe-]
85
rius Max[imus -------------------------
eaque la[---------------------------
[.]accosm[--------------------------
```



```
[- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
```

The restorations of $A$, front, are based on readings and restorations of $B$
 in A 55-56, $\kappa \alpha i$ in A 63, $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi о \tau \alpha \mu o \hat{v}$ in A 64-65, and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho o \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$ in A 6566, all of which are new restorations by Oliver. In A 36 the reading $\kappa \alpha]$ т $\alpha$ (Oliver) and in A 56 ' $\Omega \tau \alpha \kappa$ [ós (Franciszek Piejko) constitute new evidence. In A 46 YME, 47 YMEI, $54 \dot{K} \wedge A \Delta I O Y$ stone.

The restorations of A, side, are by Pippidi except for com[m(entar)io in A 70 and $q(u a e) i(n f r a)$ in A 71 by Oliver, though Pippidi had the reference to the journal in the form ex com[m(entariis). In A 75, where Pippidi restored [forma]m, Oliver and Kevin Clinton think they read [fo]rm(am), and the present habet (Oliver) fits the space better than habebit (Pippidi). The line division of A 67-68, 71-72, 72-73 and 73-74 has been slightly altered, and some letter traces in A 79, 82 and 84 have been differently interpreted. In A 67 we return to the word decreti which Dessau restored in B, whereas Pippidi substituted Pârvan's epistulae.

## Text B

Vasile Pârvan, "Histria IV," Analele Academiei române, Seria II, 38 (1915-1916), Memoriile sectiunii istorice, pp. 558-93, No. 16 with photograph on Plate v, drawing on p. 560, composite Greek and Latin text, and Rumanian commentary. Contributions to the text have been made also by the following: Adolf Wilhelm, Ak. Wien, Anzeiger 59 (1922) 78-82; W. Crönert, SEG I (1924) 329; H. Dessau, "Zur Reihenfolge der Statthalter Moesiens," JOAI 23 (1926) Beiblatt 345-48; H. Nesselhauf, "Publicum portorii Illyrici utriusque et ripae Thraciae," Epigraphica 1 (1939) 331-38 at 334; D. M. Pippidi, "Das Stadtgebiet von Histria in römischer Zeit auf Grund der ${ }^{\text {' }}{ }^{\circ}{ }_{\rho o} \theta \epsilon \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \alpha$ des Laberius Maximus (SEG I 329)," Dacia, n.s., 2 (1958) 227-47, reprinted with photographs in Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte Histrias in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit (= D. Ak. Wiss. Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, 34 [1962]) 133-53, with a text of B alone (though composite in lines 52-53) but more important for its bibliography, photographs, good discussion of territory and of dates. (AÉ

1919, 10, F. F. Abbott and A. C. Johnson, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire [Princeton 1926] 384-86, No. 68, and M. P. Charlesworth, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Claudius and Nero [Cambridge 1939, reprinted 1951] 35-37 with acknowledgement to Dessau, four of whose six changes he then forgot to incorporate, contribute nothing to the text.) On the tax district see, in addition to Pippidi and Nesselhauf, S. J. De Laet, Portorium : Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains surtout d l'époque du Haut-Empire (= Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Wijsbegeerte en Letteren, 105 [1949]) 204-209.

The following text of B is based primarily on Pârvan's photograph, which shows more of the inscription as extant, though Pippidi's slightly retouched photograph is more legible and can be used as a control for most of what Pârvan could read.
'OpoӨєбí $\Lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \rho i o v ~ M \alpha \xi i \mu o v ~ v i[\pi \alpha \tau \iota \kappa o \hat{v}]$
Fines Histrianorum hos esse con[stitui---------] ucem laccum Halmyridem ado [------------ $]$ Argamensium, inde iugo summo [------ ad c-]
5 onfluentes rivorum Picusculi et Ga[brani, inde ab im-] o Gabrano ad capud eiusdem, inde [- - - - - - - - ] Sanpaeum, inde ad rivum Turgicu[lum - - - - - ] a rivo Calabaeo, milia passum circi[ter DXVI ]
'Eாıбтодخे $\Sigma \alpha \beta$ єivov





15 тоv̂ $\alpha$ v̇тôv $\Sigma \alpha \beta \epsilon$ ívov. $\Phi \lambda \alpha ́(\beta ı o s) ~ \Sigma \alpha \beta \epsilon i ̂ v o s ~ \pi[\rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon v \tau \eta ̀ s ~ ' I \sigma \tau \rho \iota-]$






 $\rho \alpha \nu \sigma v \nu \eta^{\prime} \theta_{\iota} \alpha \nu \mu \epsilon \prime \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \alpha \dot{v} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{ } \delta \epsilon \epsilon[\alpha \nu \tau o \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \epsilon \dot{\prime} \epsilon \iota \nu]$



 ${ }^{\prime} E \pi \iota \sigma \tau о \lambda \grave{\eta}$ Поитшviov Пєiov
Поитஸ́vıos Пєios 'I $\sigma \tau \rho \iota \alpha \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \rho \chi o v \sigma \iota \nu\left[\beta о \nu \lambda \hat{\eta} \delta \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \omega \chi \alpha i \rho \epsilon \iota \nu\right]$.

 $\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \stackrel{\circ}{\tau} \iota \stackrel{\dot{\eta}}{ } \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \epsilon \in \nu \iota \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega}[\nu$ '̇ $\pi \iota \kappa о v \phi \iota \epsilon i \tau \alpha \iota]$, $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ф $\rho о \nu \tau і \zeta$ '८


 $\tau \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta$ oi $\pi \rho o ́ \gamma o \nu o \iota ~ \dot{v} \mu \omega \hat{\nu} \kappa \alpha \grave{i} \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon S \tau\left[\hat{\eta} \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \Sigma \epsilon \beta \alpha \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu\right]$


40 Tò $\psi \eta \dot{\eta} \phi \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon ́ \delta o \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \mu \circ \iota$ oi $\pi \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \beta \epsilon[\iota s K \alpha \lambda \lambda i ́ \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau o s]$ $\Delta \eta \mu \eta \tau \rho i ́ o v$ к $\alpha i M \epsilon \iota \delta i \alpha \alpha s{ }^{\prime} A \rho \tau \epsilon \mu \iota \delta \omega ́ \rho o v \cdot \eta$ ' $\xi \iota \circ[\hat{v} \tau \epsilon \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \iota \alpha ̀ \tau o \hat{v} \psi \eta-]$ $\phi i \sigma \mu \alpha \tau o s \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau o[\hat{v} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon \iota \mu \iota \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega \varphi]$




 $\Sigma \epsilon \beta \alpha-]$


 $K \lambda \alpha v \delta i-]$
 $\left.\delta \eta{ }^{\prime} \mu \omega\right]$


 $\left.\Sigma_{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \sigma \tau-\right]$

 $\lambda \alpha \sigma-]$
 $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ vi $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \iota \alpha ́ \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota \frac{\alpha}{} \epsilon i ́ \tau \iota \nu o s \hat{v}[\mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \circ \hat{v}]$

 $\gamma o ́ v \omega \nu \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ vv öpı $\propto$ vacat Exemplum [decreti]
$\mathrm{Ma}\langle$ n〉i Laberi Maximi leg. Aug. pr(o) pr. vv[vacat] Imp. Caesar $\langle e\rangle$ Traiano Aug. German[ico III Iulio Fron-]


Horothesia Dossier at Istros, text B
(from Pàrvan, Analele Academiei române 1915-1916)

```
    tino III cos • VIII ka • Novembres • v [Descriptum]
6 5 \text { et recognitum factum ex comm(entar)io v M[ani Laberi]}
    Maximi - leg. Aug. pr(o) pr. vv permitte[nte scriba]
    Fabio Pompeiano quae im}\langlef\rangle\mathrm{ ra scri[pta sunt vvv]
    "Charagonio Phi<l>0<p\ranglealaestro con[duct • publ • por-]
    tori ripae Thraciae postulante ut [portor(ium) sibi Hal-]
70 myridis et Peuci daretur: Secun[dum formam quam]
    [acce]pit ius exigendi portor[i habet a finibus]
[canab]arum Dimensium usque [ad mare ]
vacat
```

Restorations, apart from those which present themselves automatically in A: 1-2 Pârvan. 2-3 Pe] |ucem Pârvan. 3 a do[minio Pârvan, ad o[ram territorii Nicorescu apud Pippidi. 4 ad c] Pârvan, [collium usque ad c] Nicorescu. 5-8 Pârvan. 11 ö $\pi \omega s \dot{\alpha} \kappa \kappa \in ́ \rho \alpha \iota o \nu$ Wilhelm. 12 Wilhelm. 13 Ai $\{\mu \iota\} \lambda \iota \alpha \nu \hat{\omega}$ Dessau. 15, 22 Pârvan. $30 \kappa \alpha i A_{i \mu ı \lambda \iota]}$ Pârvan, Aìı] Dessau. 31 Wilhelm. 32 є̇ $\pi \iota к о v \phi \iota \epsilon i \tau \alpha \iota$
 Oliver, $K \alpha i \sigma \alpha \rho o s ~ \kappa \alpha i \dot{\omega} s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta}] \rho o s$ (too long) Wilhelm. 34 Wilhelm.
 $\tau] \hat{\omega}$ Pârvan; $\tau \alpha \hat{v}] \tau \alpha$ Wilhelm, $\tau \alpha v j] \tau \alpha$ Pârvan. 37 Pârvan. 41 $\grave{\eta} \xi \iota o[\hat{v} \tau \epsilon$
 47 ELTAI stone. 50 ANTI $\Sigma T P A \Gamma O \Sigma$ stone. 52 ' $\Omega \tau \alpha[\kappa o ́ s ~ P i e j k o . ~ 54 ~ \tau \eta ' \nu ~$ Crönert. 55 Wilhelm. 56 Wilhelm; IOTHEAMENOI stone. $57<\tau>\grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \alpha i$
 $58 \hat{v}\left[\mu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta\right.$ ô $\left.\operatorname{Pârvan.~} 59 \delta_{\iota} \delta \alpha \chi \theta \epsilon\right]$ Wilhelm, $\sigma \tau o \mu[\alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon]$ Pârvan. 60 Pârvan. 61 decreti Dessau, epistulae Pârvan. Ma $\langle n\rangle i$ Dessau, MARI stone. 63 Pârvan. 64 Pârvan, CAESARI stone. 65 comm(entar)io Oliver, comm(entariis) M[ari Laberi] Pârvan, M[ani Dessau. 66 permitte[ $n$ - Pârvan, permitte[nte Dessau; scriba] Oliver. im〈f $\langle r a$ Oliver, IMERA stone, infra Dessau, $i\langle a\rangle m$ era $\langle n t\rangle$ Pârvan. 67 scri[pta Pârvan; sunt Dessau. 68 Phi $\langle\backslash\rangle\langle p\rangle$ alaestro Nesselhauf, PHICORALAESTRO stone; con[ductore publici por] Pârvan, con[duct • publ - Oliver. 70-72 secun[dum veterem legem] and a finibus Pârvan, habet Oliver, the rest by Pippidi (Studii clasice 6 [1964] 331-42).

## Commentary

Whereas Pârvan thought that the inscriptions dated from the time of Trajan because of the date by consuls in B 63-64, S. Lambrino ${ }^{1}$ argued because of the lettering and the many ligatures that the

```
1 REL 16 (1938) }27
```

inscriptions were engraved in the first years of the third century after Christ, although the identifiable documents of the dossier were earlier. Stein ${ }^{2}$ rejected this argument but Pippidi ${ }^{3}$ agreed with Lambrino. The discovery of the side of A has now produced a document later than the decision of Laberius Maximus, with which the date by consuls is connected. This seems to support Lambrino's rejection of a date in the time of Trajan. It does not, however, confirm his inference that the publication was part of measures taken by Septimius Severus to reorganize the Roman frontier near the mouths of the Danube. An explanation from a different point of view will be offered infra, but a date in the time of the Severi still seems acceptable, though probably less so than one under Marcus Aurelius.

There are now eight documents as follows:

1. Latin decision of the legate of Lower Moesia, Laberius Maximus, on the boundaries of the Histrians, a.d. 100.
2. Greek epistle of Flavius Sabinus, legate of the still undivided Moesia, to the Histrians, A.d. 50 or shortly afterwards.
3. Another Greek epistle of Flavius Sabinus to the Histrians, A.D. 56 or shortly afterwards.
4. Greek epistle of Pomponius Pius, legate of undivided Moesia, to the Histrians, A.D. 67 or shortly afterwards.
5. Greek epistle of Plautius Silvanus Aelianus, legate of undivided Moesia, to the Histrians, a.D. 57 or shortly afterwards.
6. Greek epistle of Tullius Geminus, legate of undivided Moesia, to the Histrians, a.d. 47 or shortly afterwards.
7. Authenticated copy of the Latin minute of the legate of Lower Moesia, Laberius Maximus, upon the claim of Charagonius Philopalaestrus, ${ }^{4}$ a contractor of custom duties, A.D. 100 .
8. A Latin document (of unknown authorship) which mentions Laberius Maximus and so may date from the first

[^0]years of the third century, but may well be as early as the second half of the second century. ${ }^{5}$

The main differences between the two inscriptions are the following. In A $15 \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon v \tau \eta \eta_{s}$ has been omitted. In A $17 \mu \epsilon \in \chi \rho$, in $\mathrm{B} 17 \mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s$. In A $29 \Pi_{\circ} \mu \pi \dot{\omega} \nu$ vos seems to have been omitted. In A $30 \Phi \lambda \alpha \beta i o v$ seems not to have been abbreviated. In A $39{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \eta$. In A $49 \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \tau \alpha c$, in B 47 $\epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha L$. In A $50 \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha i \alpha \nu$ and ${ }^{'} E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \alpha$, in $\mathrm{B} 47 \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \nu$ and ${ }^{'} E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu i \delta \alpha$. In A $53 \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \tau \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \gamma(o s)$, in $\mathrm{B} 50 \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \tau \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \gamma o s$. In B 52 three names were omitted. In A $58 \psi \eta^{\prime} \phi \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$, in B $54 \psi \eta^{\prime} \phi \iota \sigma$. A 59 has a shorter version than B 54, where Crönert rightly added a word. There is a longer version in A $63-65$ than in B 59-60, because some words have been omitted in B. In A 69 kal ., in B 64 ka . A 71 has a shorter version than B $65-66$. More of the dossier was engraved on the front of $B$ than on the front of $A$, more on the side of $A$ than on the lost side of $B$.
B 4, iugo summo: Compare the phrase per summa iuga in the Perrhaebian boundary decision of Verginius Publianus, $A E$ 1913, 2, first published in BSA 17 (1910-1911) 195.

A 8: $D[X] V I$ and $D[L] V I$ are equally possible restorations.
A $12=$ B 13: The prefect Arruntius Flamma is mentioned in the text cited in note 5. According to Pârvan and Dessau he is a praefectus orae maritimae, for which see G. Barbieri, RivFilClass n.s., 19 (1941) $268-80$ and 24 (1946) 166-71. Compare the reference to a prefect in A $20=$ B 20 . There were forty Roman warships in the Black Sea (Josephus, Bell. Iud. 2.366).

[^1]6-G.R.B.S.

A $13=$ B 13: Ai $\mu \iota \lambda \alpha \nu \hat{\varphi}$ is, as Dessau has shown and as Stein and Pippidi agree, an error for $A i \lambda \iota \alpha \nu \hat{\varphi}$, an error not by the stonecutter but by the scribe. There was no imperial legate Aemilianus in this period. Aelianus, on the other hand, is well known from Inscrital I $1.125=I L S$ 986. See now Pippidi, "Tib. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus und die römische Politik in Moesien unter Neros Regierung," Epigraphische Beiträge 106-132.

B 32, $\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \in ́ v \iota \alpha$. . . [ $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \kappa o v \phi \iota \epsilon i ̄ \tau \alpha \iota]$ : A medical metaphor occurs. See Soranus, Gynaecia 2.3.1 (for this verb) and 3.38.2 (for a parallel to the abstract noun in association).
 Oration 107, says oo $\gamma \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \alpha$ s in referring to the emperor.

A $43-45=$ B 42-43, $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \ldots \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \ldots \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \epsilon i \alpha \nu$ : The Histrians had asked, not that a message be sent on (so Pârvan, Ausonia 10 [1921] 194), but that the two-man embassy be sent on. The governor did so but not without indicating that it was a favor which he would not ordinarily accord. Hence it was not just a question of letting the ambassadors pass through or of including another piece of papyrus in his next pouch to Rome. The governor was being asked to supply the ambassadors with two (or one) of his few diplomata so that they could make the journey to Rome by means of the cursus publicus ${ }^{6}$ in order to honor Sabinus with a very special testimonial of the city's gratitude. How difficult it was to grant this favor, though Nero hardly expected as much restraint as Trajan did, may be appreciated from Pliny's apologetic letter CXX to the emperor after giving a diploma to his own wife, who had to hurry back to Italy because of a death in the family: Usque in hoc tempus, domine, neque cuiquam diplomata commodavi neque in rem ullam nisi tuam misi. From Pliny's word misi one may infer that in the right context the verb mittere meant "to send a person on by the public post," and into $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon \nu \nu$ we may surely read this nuance, when it appears in the same context, on the evidence afforded by the infinitive $\pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ which the governor of Moesia uses in our inscription.

A $55-56, \Delta[i \mid \kappa \alpha \iota] o s:$ Syllabic division is almost certainly respected,

[^2]and so there must be a lacuna at the end of A 55 , but the lacuna at the end of A 55 is so small that there would not be room for any letter other than iota. The first visible letter of A 56 could by itself be theta, omicron or rho, but in the context it must be omicron. Since only three letters are unknown the name appears to be $\Delta i ́ \kappa \alpha \iota o s$ or $\Delta i \phi \iota \lambda o s$.

A 64-65: The corresponding passage in B , where the phrase reads $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \tau o \mu\left[\alpha \alpha^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu\right.$, is ten letters shorter, but the right length for $A$ is achieved by restoring the phrase as it appears above in A 18-19.

A 69-72 = B 64-67: The character of the heading of the authenticated copy and particularly the meaning of the repeatedly misunderstood phrase permitte[nte . . . . ] Fabio Pompeiano quae IMERA scri[pta sunt of B 67 become clear from comparison with the three following parallels.

From Sardinia ILS 5947: Imp. Othone Caesare Aug. cos., XV k. Aprilis. Descriptum et recognitum ex codice ansato L. Helvii Agrippae procon(sulis), quem protulit Cn. Egnatius Fuscus scriba quaestorius, in quo scriptum fuit it quot infra scriptum est tabula $V$ (ceris) VIII et VIIII et X.

From Perrhaebia in province of Macedonia, AÉ 1913, 2: Imp. Caesare Ne[rva Tra]e. Au. Ger. IIII [Q.] Articuleio Pae[t]o [cos., a. d.] VI k. Apriles. [D]escriptum et re[cognitum e] $x$ commentario [Ve]rgini [P]ub[liani] iudicis dati [ab im]per[at]or[e] Traeiano, quod protu[li]t Caelius Niger, in quo scriptum erat id q.i.s. [e].

From Caere ILS 5918: Descriptum et recognitum factum in pronao aedis Martis ex commentario quem iussit proferri Cuperius Hostilianus per T. Rustium Lysiponam scribam, in quo scriptum erat it quod infra scriptum est: "L. Publilio Celso II C. Clodio Crispino cos. idibus Aprilibus (13 April of a.D. 113), M. Pontio Celso dictatore, C. Suetonio Claudiano aedile iure dicundo praef. aerari. Commentarium cottidianum municipi Caeritum, inde pagina XXVII, kapite VI. . . .

The best discussion is that of Th. Mommsen, "Decret des Proconsuls von Sardinien L. Helvius Agrippa vom J. 68 n. Chr.," Hermes 2 (1867) 102-127 and 173 ( $=$ Gesammelte Schriften V, pp. 325-351), who shows that for an authenticated copy of the decision of the governor of Sardinia they sent to Rome. Similarly the authenticated copy of the decision of Laberius Maximus may have come from Rome. Fabius Pompeianus, accordingly, was not, as Dessau thought, a successor of

Laberius Maximus in the government of Lower Moesia but a scribe or official in Rome. For permitto in the meaning "to send overseas" compare Columella (ed. Lundström) 7.8.6: hoc genus casei potest etiam trans maria permitti.

A $72=$ B 68, Charagonio: Subscriptiones are recorded with the name of the man whose case it was coming first in PCol 123, best consulted in the edition of H. C. Youtie and A. A. Schiller, "Second Thoughts on the Columbia Apokrimata (P. Col. 123)," Chronique d'Égypte 30 (1955) 327-45.

B 70, Peuci: Professor James W. Poultney, with reference to Schwyzer-Debrunner, Griechische Grammatik II (Munich 1950) 42, suggests that the name may have fluctuated between $\Pi \epsilon v ́ к \eta$ and $\Pi \epsilon \hat{\kappa} \kappa o s$, and that Peuci is a genitive based on the latter form.

A 84: This eighth document mentions Laberius Maximus, but it is not certain where the document begins. The Latin language suggests another decision. A later governor seems to have been obliged (by a tax collector?) to rule on the subject once again and seems to have based his decision on an authenticated copy of the ruling by Laberius Maximus, a copy which he procured from Rome. Enough remains of document 8 to show that it was not engraved like document 7 from an authenticated copy, and there is no reason why it should have been if the governor himself gave it to the Histrians. The word vetare occurs nearby. The prefect of Egypt Tiberius Julius Alexander in a famous edict ${ }^{7}$ warned people that he would punish those who brought into court questions already decided. The unknown source of document 8 probably forbade further attempts to infringe the traditional right and advised the Histrians to publish the horothesia of Laberius Maximus and the other documents prominently on permanent material.

## Translation

## Decision of the Consular Laberius Maximus fixing Boundaries

I have appointed the following as boundaries of the Histrian territory:------, Halmyris lagoon; from ---- of the Armagensians, thence along the top of the ridge ----- to the junction of the streams Picusculus and Gabranus, thence from the lower Gabranus to its head, thence - - - - - Sanpaeus, thence to the stream Turgiculus ----- - from the stream Calabaeus, about 516 miles.

[^3]
## Epistle of Sabinus

Flavius Sabinus to the archons, council, demos of the Histrians greetings. Arruntius Flamma the prefect will take care that your right in connection with Peuce be preserved intact, for thus I have written to him. I shall speak also to Aelianus my successor and give you a wholehearted recommendation.

## Another Epistle of the same Sabinus

Legate Flavius Sabinus to the archons, council, demos of the Histrians greetings. Even though the tax district of the shore of the Danube runs all the way to the sea and the town is so great a distance from the mouths of the river, nevertheless, since your ambassadors affirmed, and the prefect Asiaticus said so too, that the revenue there from pickled fish is just about the city's only revenue, I have decided that the same freedom to fish according to your custom at the Peuce mouth and to transport the pine wood without tax for the use of each individual should remain to you. In fact you have undisputed boundaries for the wood; and you have all the enjoyment therefrom without an accounting to the tax office.

## Epistle of Pomponius Pius

Pomponius Pius to the archons, council, demos of the Histrians greetings. Even from what was written to you by Flavius Sabinus and Aelianus, very distinguished men who stand very high in my estimation, it was possible to perceive that your distress [would be relieved because] the most divine present emperor takes thought for all. In order that the rights of the city might be not only preserved but increased, I have decreed that the revenue from fishing below Peuce be yours with the same right as your ancestors and fathers obtained these dues by the grace of the emperors.

## Epistle of Plautius Aelianus

Plautius Aelianus to the archons of the Histrians greetings. Your ambassadors, Callistratus son of Demetrius and Midias son of Artemidorus, delivered to me your resolution. You ask through your resolution that the embassy which is taking your thanks to our most esteemed Sabinus be sent on by public post. On account of Sabinus
himself, yes. On no one else's account would I gladly have done this. You ask me also to preserve your rights at Peuce undiminished. For my part I am so far removed from diminishing any of those rights which have long been guarded for you that I should like to find new ways of honoring an ancient Greek city which is devoted to the emperor and scrupulous in its dealings with us ourselves.

## Epistle of Tullius Geminus

Tullius Geminus, legatus pro praetore of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, to the archons, council, demos of the Histrians greetings. Your ambassadors, D[icae]us, Chabrias, Chaeremon, Demetrius, Aeschrion, Otac[us, ---], Midias, Dionysodorus, Hegesagoras, Aristagoras, Metrodorus, having met with me at Tomis, delivered your resolution, and having shown the loyalty to our emperor, they congratulated us upon our arrival in good health. Most earnest was the conversation they held with us concerning the things you had enjoined upon them. So having appreciated the attitude of your city also toward us personally, I shall always try to become to you the cause of some benefit. Concerning Peuce and the mouths of the river I have been informed by your [aforesaid] ambassadors and have recognized as just that your ancestral boundaries should be preserved for you.

## From Journal of Laberius Maximus

Copy of the decision rendered by the imperial legate $\mathrm{Ma}\langle\mathrm{n}\rangle$ ius Laberius Maximus on the eighth day before the kalends of November when Imperator Caesar Trajan Augustus Germanicus for the third time and Julius Frontinus for the third time were consuls, authenticated copy made from the journal of the imperial legate Manius Laberius Maximus by [the scribe?] Fabius Pompeianus, who sends the following text: "Re the demand of Charagonius Philopalaestrus, contractor for the customs of the Thracian Shore, that the tolls of Halmyris and Peucus be given to him, (the legate said) 'According to the contract which he received, [he has] the right of collecting the customs from the border of the Dimensian Camp all the way to [the sea --
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[^0]:    ${ }^{2}$ A. Stein, Die Legaten von Moesien ( $=$ Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. I, 11 [1940]) 61, n. 6.
    ${ }^{3}$ Dacia, n.s., 2 (1958) 232 ( $=$ D. M. Pippidi, Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte Histrias in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit [D. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Schr. Sekt. Alt. 34, 1962] 138).
    ${ }^{4}$ There is no longer any question of the right nomen and cognomen. As H. Nesselhauf, Epigraphica 1 (1939) 334, pointed out, the man is known from an inscription of Novae ( $=$ Steklen in Bulgaria): [Invicto] deo Melichrysus P. Caragoni Philopalaestri [---.

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ V. Pârvan, "Histria VII," Academia Româna, Memoriile sectiunii istorice, Seria iII, Tomul 2 (1923, published in 1924), No. 40 on pp. 47-51 with French résumé on pp. 116-17 gives a text and drawing of an inscription which had lettering identical in his opinion with that of our texts A and B and which mentions the same (praefectus) Arruntius Flamma. The text reads:

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & \text { - - - - - - ] His[tr-- - - - } \\
    & \text { - - Pontiu]s Laeli[anus - - - } \\
    & 3 \text { - 'Apovv] } \boldsymbol{\tau} i \omega \\
    & \text { - - - -] } \beta \text { ov } \lambda \eta \text { } \delta \eta \dot{\mu}[--- \\
    & \text { - - - - } \dot{\sigma} \pi \text { ] } ̣ \text { ov } \delta \dot{\eta} \nu[---- \\
    & \text { - - - - - - - - - - - - }
    \end{aligned}
    $$

    The name of Pontius Laelianus, a legate of ca. a.d. 170, was restored by D. M. Pippidi, Epigraphische Beiträge 152, n.69. Pippidi agrees that the lettering is very similar and in making the restoration he admits in my opinion that A.D. 170 is not at all too early for our texts A and B. Document 8 could have originated with Pontius Laelianus. Think also of IOSPE I 3 (E. H. Minns, Scythians and Greeks p. 640) which shows that Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus granted to Tyras exemption from customs dues.

[^2]:    ${ }^{6}$ For diplomata see the study published anonymously by H. G. Pflaum, "Essai sur le cursus publicus dans le Haut-Empire Romain," Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie des Inscriptions et de Belles Lettres de l'Institut de France, XIV (1940) 189-391, particularly chapter vr. Also Erik J. Holmberg, Zur Geschichte des cursus publicus (Diss. Uppsala 1933), though he gives more attention to the Late Empire, cites references to diplomata of the Early Empire.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ H. G. Evelyn White and J. H. Oliver, The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis II (Metropolitan Museum, New York 1938) No. 4 = OGIS 699, lines 38-40.

