

BELLUM DACICUM TRAIANI

CORIOLAN OPREANU

Decebalus, the king of the Dacians, was a *rex sociusque et amicus* starting with the peace concluded in AD 89 with the Roman emperor Domitianus¹. The causes that have led to the new conflict between the Dacian client kingship and Trajan are not very well reflected by the written records. There is only the allusion concerning the growing of the power of the Dacians and the “disgraceful” treaty of Domitianus². Modern historians presumed many other possible reasons, as the richness of the Dacian soil (mainly the famous gold)³, the economic crisis in Italy, or Trajan’s desire to reach Alexander’s the Great glory. Recently, more realistic approaches stressed mainly the political and military causes. Conforming this last mentioned view, between AD 89-101 the Dacian kingdom, with Roman support, exceeded the power the Roman Empire permitted for a client kingship. Decebalus was a very dangerous focus for the vast barbarian world, from the Middle Danube to the North of the Black Sea. It is not impossible that the powerful king of the Dacians has been played a part even in the balance of power between the Roman Empire and the Parthian Empire. In the letter no. 74, Pliny storied Trajan about Callidromus a former slave of M’. Laberius Maximus, the governor of Lower Moesia, who was captured by the Sarmatian chief Susagus during the barbarian attack on Lower Moesia, later sent by Decebalus as a gift to Pacorus II, the great king of Parthia. This is the evidence that the Romans had suspicions on diplomatic attempts of Decebalus to involve Parthia in his conflict with the Roman Empire⁴. That is why, very probable, Trajan primarily wanted to bring back the Dacian kingdom to a tolerable client kingdom⁵. The safest solution for the Romans was the diminishing of the territory of Decebalus’ kingdom and the taking possession of the strongly fortified political center of the Dacian kingdom in the mountains of South-West Transylvania and to control the main routes, as well.

Usually, modern historiography talked about Trajan’s two wars against the Dacians. But it worth to add the narrative of Ammianus Marcellinus⁶ concerning Trajan’s two oaths: “*sic in provinciarum speciem redactam videam Daciam*” and “*sic pontibus Histrum superem*”, two main targets of the emperor, whose chronology belongs to the period AD 102-105. At the same time, on Trajan’s Column in Rome scene number LXXVIII shows two trophies and the Victory. Thus, it was not a groundless opinion the conclusion of the great Italian historian Santo Mazzarino, who appreciated that it was a unique *Bellum Dacicum* of Trajan⁷ (as the war of Domitianus, in spite of its three expeditions) divided in *expeditio*

¹ K. Strobel, *Die Donaukriege Domitians*, Bonn, 1989 (Antiquitas, Reihe 1, Band 38), p. 89-98; V. Lica, *Relațiile Imperiului cu dacii în timpul Flavienilor*, EphemNap 6, 1996, 117-120.

² Cassius Dio LXVIII, 7, 2-4.

³ P. G. Michelotto, *Aspetti e problemi dell’età traianea*, Milano, 1994 (reprint from the 3rd vol. of *Storia della società italiana*), 80-84.

⁴ A. N. Sherwin-White, *The letters of Pliny; a historical and social commentary*, Cambridge, 1966, p. 662; J. R. Carbo Garcia, *The LXXIVth Letter of Pliny and the Matter of the Diplomacy between Dacians and Parthians*, in *Fontes Historiae. Studia in honorem Demetrii Protase* (eds. C. Gaiu, C. Gazdac), Bistrița-Cluj-Napoca, 2006, 699-707.

⁵ C. Opreanu, *The Consequences of the First Daco-Roman War (101-102). A New Point of View*, in *Traiano Emperador de Roma* (ed. J. Gonzalez), Roma, 2000, 389-390.

⁶ Ammianus Marcellinus 24, 3, 9.

⁷ Santo Mazzarino, *Introduzione alla Seconda Dacica di Traiano*, in *Colloquio italo-romeno. L’esame storico-artistico della Colonna Traiana. Atti dei Convegni Lincei* 50, Roma, 1982, 30-36.

Dacica prima, epigraphically mentioned in the inscription of L. Minucius Natalis⁸ and *secunda expeditione*, attested by the inscription at Corinth of C. Caecilius Martialis⁹.

The first military campaign of Trajan started, very probable, in May-June AD 101¹⁰. As we know from the records of *Acta fratrum Arvalium*, the emperor made a journey on land and sea on the 25th, or the 26th of March AD 101, that means he left Italy using one of the military harbours of the Adriatic Sea, as Ancona, Brundisium, or, more probable, Ravenna¹¹. Continuing the march, the Roman army lead by the Emperor himself crossed the Danube from Upper Moesia and advanced into today Banat region along the same route as that used by Tettius Iulianus in AD 88. At the same time, Laberius Maximus, the governor of Lower Moesia, marched with his provincial army to the North, following the river Alutus (Olt) valley. His main target was, very probable, the Getic political center at Buridava, as prove the tile stamps with the names of *legio I Italica* and *V Macedonica* found there¹².

In South-West Transylvania, the Emperor, after the battle of Tapae (the gorge called today "The Iron Gates"), entered the Hațeg Depression, whilst advancing to the royal residence of Decebalus. It is unlikely that Trajan planned to start the most difficult part of the first campaign, the siege of the Dacian citadels in the mountains, when the wet and cold season was closely. It is more probable that he has preparing the winter quarters and stockpiling supplies, the final effort being postponed for the next spring. Royal Sarmizegetusa was not endangered that moment. It is the only explanation why Decebalus risked, leaving his residence and created the diversion over the mountains and over the Danube in Lower Moesia. The Dacians, together with their barbarian allies (Sarmatian Roxolans and others) crossed the Danube attacking the Roman forts, as shown on Trajan's Column (scenes XXXI and XXXII).

This attack was the beginning of the second campaign, when Trajan was obliged to leave the mountains of Transylvania hurrying to help the forts and the towns of Lower Moesia (Trajan's Column, scenes XXXIII-XXXV). The first battle and victory of Trajan was at Nicopolis ad Istrum. Ammianus Marcellinus was written: "*Nicopolis quam indicium victoriae contra Dacos Traianus condidit imperator*"¹³. Later, in the 6th century AD, Iordanes is also mentioning this moment: "*Nicopolim accedit quae iuxta Istrum fluvium est constituta notissima, quam devictis Sarmatis Traianus et fabricavit et appellavit Victoriae civitatis*"¹⁴. The final act of this campaign has taken place at Tropaeum Traiani (Adamklissi), in Southern Dobrudja, where Trajan crushed the barbarian coalition lead by Decebalus. The chronology of the campaign "in Moesia" (i.e. Lower Moesia) was better understood after the finding of the inscription from Epidaurus in the temple of Apollo Maleates, the events had taking place in late autumn of AD 101 and in the winter that followed¹⁵.

In the spring of AD 102 the third campaign of the war was opened. While Trajan was returning in South-West Transylvania for the final attack against the center of the Dacian kingdom, the army of Lower Moesia advanced deep into Barbaricum against the Eastern allies of Decebalus. An interesting insight to this campaign is provided by Cassius Dio¹⁶ noted that Laberius Maximus captured Decebalus' sister and at the same time occupied a strong citadel. The despair of Decebalus when he found out, as Cassius Dio describes, can be explained only by the loss of an important friend, probably from Moldavia, whose

⁸ ILS 1029.

⁹ AnnÉp, 1934, 2 (=IDRE II 367).

¹⁰ F. Lepper, S. S. Frere, *Trajan's Column. A New Edition of the Cichorius Plates*, Gloucester-Wolfboro, 1988, 242.

¹¹ S. Mazzarino, *Note sulle guerre daciche di Traiano: reditus del 102 e itus del 105*, in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 122, 1979, 173.

¹² IDR III 559; K. Strobel, *Anmerkungen zur Truppengeschichte des Donauraumes in der Hohen Kaiserzeit II: die trajanischer Ziegelstempel aus Buridava-Stolniceni*, in *ZPE* 68, 1987, 282-284; for the later arrival in Lower Moesia of the *legio XI Claudia* (end of AD 101), see T. Sarnowski, *Zur Truppengeschichte der Dakerkriege Trajans. Die Bonner Legio I Minervia und das Legionslager Novae*, in *Germania* 65, 1, 1987, 107; 111-112; 117-122.

¹³ Ammianus Marcellinus 31, 5, 16.

¹⁴ Iordanes, *Getica*, 101.

¹⁵ C. C. Petolescu, *La victoire de Trajan en Mésie Inférieure*, *Thraco-Dacica* 16, 1995, 1-2, 223-226.

¹⁶ Cassius Dio, *Rom.*, LXVIII, 9, 4.

friendship has been confirmed, possible, by a political marriage with his sister¹⁷. The same army of Lower Moesia occupied the Wallachian Plain and crossed the mountains in Southeast Transylvania. The main aim was to keep control of the main routes to the Danube. At the most important passing points, strong stone forts were built, as at Hoghiz and Brețcu on the Alutus (Olt) valley in Transylvania and Draja de Sus, Rucăr and Târgșor on the Southern part of the mountains, in Wallachia, as prove the tile stamps of the army of Lower Moesia¹⁸. Eastern part of Little Wallachia (Oltenia), Wallachia (Muntenia), Southern Moldavia and the South-Eastern corner of Transylvania became lands *intra provinciam* (i.e. Lower Moesia) in AD 102, as the Hunt *pridianum* attests¹⁹.

Meanwhile, on the main battlefield in Southwest Transylvania, the Roman army led by the Emperor conquered the fortified high-hills, approaching Sarmizegetusa. Cassius Dio tells us that after Decebalus has lost all hope of stopping Trajan, he agreed to accept the Romans' terms to secure his throne and started peace negotiations. At the end Decebalus himself came to Trajan and prostrating throwing off his arms and making the gesture of defeat. This ceremony was identified on Trajan's Column too²⁰. Romanian historiography insisted on the idea that this scene refutes the text of Cassius Dio, proving that, in fact, Decebalus did not prostrate himself in front of the victorious Trajan, keeping his royal pride²¹. It is a groundless interpretation. Besides the distinctness of the ancient written source, the scene of Trajan's Column is one of a great complexity. The artists had to show the symbolism of the ceremony and to emphasize the presence of the great vanquished, king Decebalus. The same scene includes the conditions of peace, illustrating the dismantling of the fortifications, the only one suitable for transposing in plastic art.

The conclusion is that Trajan could depose or put into prison Decebalus if he would like to abolish the Dacian kingdom in AD 102. Another interesting aspect belonging to the end of the war is determining the place where the above-mentioned ceremony took place. We can see on the Column that the submission of Decebalus had been carried out around a Roman fort, probably where, at the moment, the headquarters of the Emperor was located. It is obvious that when Decebalus asked for peace he was desperate and everything seemed lost for the Dacians. We have to accept that the Romans had reached the very neighbourhood of the royal residence at Sarmizegetusa. It is easy to imagine that Decebalus carried on negotiations to keep his throne and only after this was assured did he accept the Romans' conditions. His other choice was to leave Sarmizegetusa, to escape, hoping to organize an opposition movement. In other words he would have tried to continue the war, as he will do later, at the end of the second war, in AD 106. Without these supposed negotiations and without an unconditional surrender, probably promised by Decebalus during the negotiations, Decebalus risked becoming marginalised, his throne given by Trajan to some noble Dacian, sympathetic to the Roman cause.

Returning to the place of the final stage of the first expedition, it is known that among the Roman archaeological traces found around the "Grădiște" hill (where was identified Sarmizegetusa Regia), the most significant ones are those coming from a place named "Sub Cunune". Here, even without any archaeological research, there are known: a Roman silver coins hoard of 500 pieces (the last coin being from Trajan without the title of *Dacicus*), masonry walls, Roman tiles and bricks²². Of very great interest are two votive inscriptions found there. The governor of Upper Moesia, M. Statius Priscus dedicated the first one to Victoria Augusta, during Antoninus Pius time, in AD 156/157²³. Later, the governor of the three provinces of Dacia, L. Aemilius Carus raised the second inscription for Apollo Augustus in AD 175, during Marcus Aurelius reign²⁴. When the two governors were raising their inscriptions, the Dacian

¹⁷ Marriages between Dacian women and neighbour kings from the Eastern Barbaricum are known from inscription CIL VI 1801=ILS 854, where *Pieporus rex Coisstobocensis* was married with *Ziais, Daca*.

¹⁸ Gh. Ștefan, *Le camp romain de Draja de Sus*, Dacia, XI-XII, 1945-1947, p. 124; 141; Gr. Florescu, *Problema castrelor romane de la Mălăiești, Draja de Sus și Pietroasa*, in *Omagiu lui C. Daicoviciu cu prilejul împlinirii a 60 de ani*, București, 1960, 227-229.

¹⁹ F. Lepper, S.S. Frere, *Trajan's Column*..., p. 244-258 (footnote 10).

²⁰ C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Trajanssäule*, Berlin, 1900, LXXV.

²¹ R. Vulpe, *Columna lui Traian, monument al etnogenezei românilor*, București, 1988, 147-148.

²² C. Daicoviciu, Al. Ferenczi, *Așezările dacice din Munții Orăștiei*, București, 1951, 106.

²³ IDR III/3, 276.

²⁴ IDR III/3, 275 (the inscription has been lost).

capital did not exist any more and the last king of the Dacians has been disappeared for over 50 years. The only valid explanation for the presence of the two inscriptions of the two governors and of the other Roman traces there is the existence of a shrine or of an altar built by Trajan after the defeat and the surrender of Decebalus, in AD 102. Beside the inscription for *Victoria Augusta*, in the walls of the Roman fort from the neighbourhood, built by the legions at Sarmizegetusa Regia²⁵, three stone blocks with the image of the paired Capricorns were found²⁶. The paired Capricorns are connected with goddess Victoria, the Peace and show their links with the legions and the emperor²⁷. We think it is very probable that future excavations at "Sub Cunune" will uncover a shrine, or an altar raised by Trajan to commemorate the great victory over Decebalus and the peace of AD 102.

The territories of the Dacian kingdom conquered by the Romans in AD 102 were the Banat, South-West Transylvania including the fortified region around Sarmizegetusa Regia and the Western part of Little Wallachia (Oltenia). While Eastern Little Wallachia, Wallachia, Southern Moldavia and South-East corner of Transylvania were already under the authority of the governor of Lower Moesia, the land conquered by the Emperor himself, situated between the Danube and the Middle Mureş remained under the Roman military occupation. It is not known the precise form of organization between AD 102-106, several hypotheses being expressed²⁸. The army Trajan left in these regions was put under the command of a *vir consularis*, Longinus mentioned by Cassius Dio. That means it had at least two legions, having the size of a provincial army. This Longinus was identified with Cn. Pinarius Aemilius Cicatricula Pompeius Longinus²⁹, known in the prosopography of the Empire. N. Gostar was probably right considering it is a province in process of forming. This region, including the greatest part of the Southern range of the Carpathians was marked to the North by a natural frontier, a natural axis of communication, composed of the Mures River and of the Transylvanian sector of the Alutus (Olt) River³⁰. These natural boundaries were the Southern limits of the new client kingdom of Decebalus. In this way, Trajan has reached the main purpose of the war. From now on, he had at his discretion the Dacian client kingship, which ruled over an area severely diminished.

The new Dacian kingdom covered central and Northwest Transylvania. It was no more a great military power. The new strategic situation from North of the Danube and the positions of the Roman army did not allow Decebalus to focus other barbarian forces and to threaten the Roman rule from the South bank of the Danube, as happened before. Keeping the Dacian kingdom under Roman control was a preventive act. The main foreign policy idea of the Roman Empire towards the barbarians was always to maintain the political and the military stability of the barbarian world and to create some power structures, which were possible to use as a force against other barbarians in case they became dangerous for the Empire³¹. That is the explanation of keeping Decebalus as a king. He was an experienced military commander and he had a huge prestige inside the barbarian world. Having all these qualities he seemed to be very useful to the foreign Roman policy.

²⁵ C. Opreanu, *The Roman Fort at Grădiştea Muncelului (Sarmizegetusa Regia). Its Chronology and its Historical Meaning*, in *Daci şi romani în nordul Dunării la începutul secolului II p. Ch.* (Bibl. Hist. et Arch. Univ. Timis. 2/2000), Timişoara, 79-96.

²⁶ Idem, *Military Symbol or Allegoric Image ? The Motif of Paired Capricorns on Stone Monuments*, in *The XV-th International Congress of Classical Archaeology Amsterdam 1998. Abstracts*, Amsterdam, 1998, 110.

²⁷ J. Barton, *Augustus and Capricorn: Astrological Polyvalency and Imperial Rhetoric*, JRS 85, 1995, 33-51.

²⁸ M. Macrea, *Viaţa în Dacia romană*, Bucureşti, 1969, p. 37-38 (annexed to Upper Moesia); H. Daicoviciu, *Cassius Dio şi Sarmizegetusa*, in *In memoriam Constantini Daicoviciu*, Cluj, 1974, p. 111 (military district); N. Gostar, *Longinus. Dio Cassius LXVIII, 12, 1-5, AIIA Iaşi 13*, 1976, 63 (new province in process of forming); C. C. Petolescu, *L'organisation de la Dacie sous Trajan et Hadrien*, in *Dacia*, N.S. 29, 1-2, 1985, 48 (self organization); N. Gudea, *Der obermoesische Limes zwischen 86 und 106 n. Chr.*, in *Roman Limes on the Middle and Lower Danube* (Hrsg. P. Petrović), Belgrade, 1996, 121-122, Abb. 2 (extending of the territory of Upper Moesia over the Danube till to the Mures river="Bigger Upper Moesia"); C. Opreanu, *Dacia romană şi Barbaricum*, Timişoara, 1998, 40 (Roman military occupation between the Danube and the Mureş River valley, including former Sarmizegetusa Regia and its surroundings)

²⁹ N. Gostar, *op. cit.*, 53-69.

³⁰ C. Opreanu, *Die Folgen des ersten Dakerkrieges Trajans für die politische Lage der Gebiete nördlich der Donau*, ActaMN 35/1, 1998, 190, Abb. 1.

³¹ Idem, *Dacia romană şi Barbaricum*, Timişoara, 1998, 20-26.

Cassius Dio tells that among the peace conditions of AD 102 Trajan obliged Decebalus and his staff to leave the conquered territories³². That means Decebalus could no longer stay in the occupied land. We cannot believe that he would remain because it was illogical and impossible for him. The kingdom he had to rule from now on was far away from the old royal residence at Sarmizegetusa. Cassius Dio stories that in AD 102 Trajan left at Sarmizegetusa a “*stratopedon*”. In our opinion, it is out of question that Cassius Dio, as a historian, wrote his work using information transmit it. It is very probable that he used for the chapter concerning the Dacian war Trajan’s Commentaries, as a main source. That means it is sure he is referring to Sarmizegetusa Regia of the Dacian kings, the only one that existed during the Dacian war. It is not possible to believe that Cassius Dio is referring to the future Colonia Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa³³, the veteran colony founded by Trajan in the flat land of the Hațeg Depression after the establishment of the Roman province of Dacia. The Roman colony did not exist yet in AD 102, when Cassius Dio was mentioned the “*stratopedon*” at Sarmizegetusa. The information of Cassius Dio got recently a brilliant epigraphically confirmation: in the precinct walls of the so-called “great citadel” from “Grădiște” hill (= Sarmizegetusa Regia) were found stone construction blocks mentioning the names of the legions who built it (*IV Flavia Felix*, *II Adiutrix*, *VI Ferrata*). Obviously it is not a Dacian “citadel”, but a Roman fort³⁴, which can be easily identified with that “*stratopedon*” mentioned by Cassius Dio at Sarmizegetusa in AD 102³⁵. Sarmizegetusa from the very neighbourhood of this fort was no longer a Dacian political and religious center. It was situated in the territory under Roman military occupation. Thus, Decebalus had to choose another residence in the free territories from central Transylvania. To the North of the Mureș River, the only known Dacian citadel having stonewalls and placed in an exceptional strategic position was uncovered at Piatra Craivii³⁶. We think, as a hypothesis, that Decebalus’ new royal residence after AD 102 could have been at Piatra Craivii³⁷. The technical aspects of the stonewalls at Piatra Craivii and the topography of the place³⁸ are very close to the so-called “siege of Sarmizegetusa” scene of the second Dacian war on Trajan’s Column³⁹. Therefore, the first Dacian expedition and the peace of AD 102 had decisive consequences upon the history of the North Danubian land. The *Fasti Ostienses* mentioned that Trajan “*de Dacis triumphavit*” and got the *cognomen ex virtute* of Dacicus⁴⁰, sometime between 25 and 28th of December AD 102⁴¹.

A king with the personal qualities of Decebalus could no easily accept his new position. That was why the peace ends so quickly. Trajan left Italy for Moesia in 4th June AD 105, as *Fasti Ostienses* recorded⁴². The second Dacian expedition started in the summer of AD 105. Its topography was less complicated than the first one. The second expedition has been shown different to the first one even in the scenes of Trajan’s Column; there are many scenes regarding the travel of the Emperor from Italy to Dacia, a sort of “introduction to the war” (or, “guerreggiata”), which does not exist at the beginning of the first expedition⁴³. In AD 105-106 all the military operations of the Roman army were concentrated in

³² Cassius Dio, *Rom.*, LXVIII, 8, 5.

³³ This hypothesis was defended hardly by H. Daicoviciu, *Cassius Dio și Sarmizegetusa* (footnote 28).

³⁴ C. Opreanu, *The Roman Fort at Grădiștea Muncelului (Sarmizegetusa Regia). Its Chronology and its Historical Meaning*, in *Daci și romani în nordul Dunării la începutul secolului II p. Ch.* (Bibl. Hist. Et Arch. Univ. Timiș. 2/2000), Timișoara, 79-96.

³⁵ Al. Diaconescu, *Dacia under Trajan. Some Observations on Roman Tactics and Strategy*, in *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der römischer Heeres in den dakischen Provinzen*, Zalău, 1997, 5-44; C. Opreanu, *op. cit.*

³⁶ V. Moga, *Așezarea și cetatea dacică de la Piatra Craivii*, in H. Daicoviciu (ed.), *Studii dacice*, Cluj-Napoca, 1980, 103 sq.

³⁷ The idea of a second royal residence after AD 102, was first time expressed by C. Cichorius, *Die Reliefs...*, III. Textband, p. 399 sq. (footnote 20); F. Lepper and S. S. Frere, *Trajan’s Column...*, p. 40 (footnote 10) accepted Cichorius idea and the topographical proposal of the German scholar in Eastern Transylvania, in Harghita Mountains.

³⁸ V. Moga, *Remarques sur le mur de la citadelle dace de Piatra Craivii*, *ActaMN* 32/1, 1995, 145-147.

³⁹ F. Coarelli, *La Colonna Traiana*, Roma, 1999, tav. 137 (LXXXIII-LXXXIV/CXIII)-150 (XCII/CXXII).

⁴⁰ Santo Mazzarino, *I “Fasti Ostienses” e il primo trionfo dacico di Traiano*, *Epigraphica* 40, 1978, 241-246.

⁴¹ Idem, *Note sulle guerre daciche di Traiano...*, 173 (footnote 11)

⁴² IDRE I 95; see also A. Fraschetti, *Traiano nei Fasti Ostienses*, in *Traiano Emperador de Roma* (ed. J. Gonzalez), Roma, 2000, 141-154.

⁴³ Santo Mazzarino, *Introduzione alla Seconda dacica di Traiano...*, p. 21-22 (footnote 6).

Transylvania, to the North of the Mures River. The main aim of the Roman headquarters was the capture of Decebalus, of his royal residence and the abolishing of the Dacian kingdom, replacing it with a Roman province. This happened, probably in July⁴⁴ of AD 106. That is, probably, the proof that the capital of Decebalus was not any more at Sarmizegetusa because in 11 August AD 106, the province of Dacia is already attested⁴⁵. We think there was not enough time from July since 11 August to conquer the land between Sarmizegetusa and Northern Transylvania. If we accept the new royal residence was at Piatra Craivii during the Second Dacian expedition, the conquering of this territory during one month seems more plausible. An inscription tells that *secunda expeditione qua universa Dacia devicta est*⁴⁶. Decebalus tried to escape, followed by Roman auxiliary cavalry. The famous inscription at Grammeni⁴⁷ mentions T. Claudius Maximus who led the Roman detachment and who was witness to the suicide of Decebalus. He also brought to Trajan the head of the king. The inscription attests a place-name: *Ranisstoro*. It was translated with "to Ranisstorum", a place where the headquarters of the Emperor was placed during the final stage of the war⁴⁸. We think it is possible to be the place where Decebalus made suicide and the meaning of "*Ranisstoro*" is "from Ranisstorum" and not "to Ranisstorum", because this translation looks more suitable to the Latin grammar. It is hard to say when happened this important moment, before or after the establishment of the province of Dacia⁴⁹. From territories conquered during the two expeditions, representing, very probable, the area of the former Dacian kingdom, Trajan created the Roman province of Dacia (Banat, Western Little Wallachia and Transylvania). When the Romans transformed a former barbarian kingdom into a Roman province, they followed approximately its borders. An example was the kingdom of Amyntas in Asia Minor, turned into the province Galatia by *kleronomia*, but inside the same borders⁵⁰. The first annexed North Danubian land (former territories of barbarian tribes outside the Dacian kingdom allied with Decebalus) remained part of Lower Moesia (Eastern Little Wallachia, Wallachia, Southern Moldavia, Southeastern corner of Transylvania). A new era began for the Carpathian lands 1900 years back.

⁴⁴ News concerning a success of the Emperor (=the conquer of the royal residence?) reached Cyrene after 30 July AD 106 (F. Lepper, S. S. Frere, *Trajan's Column*..., 242).

⁴⁵ IDR I 1. – DiplD I (69-72)

⁴⁶ AnnÉp, 1934, no. 2.

⁴⁷ M. P. Speidel, *The Captor of Decebalus*, JRS, 60, 1970, 142-153.

⁴⁸ Idem, identified Ranisstorum with future Apulum, north of the Mureş River; recently, J. Bennett, *Trajan. Optimus Princeps*, London, 1997, p. 101 considered that Ranisstorum has to be looked for at Piatra Craivii.

⁴⁹ F. Lepper, S. S. Frere, *Trajan's Column*..., 242 (footnote 10) supposed that the suicide of Decebalus has taken place between 2 September and 20 December AD 106.

⁵⁰ Strabo 12, 5, 5, 567; 12, 6, 5, 559.