

## Dio Chrysostom (707)

Dowden, Kenneth

*License:*

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Dowden, K 2015, Dio Chrysostom (707). in I Worthington (ed.), *Brills New Jacoby*. Brill's New Jacoby, Brill. <<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/dio-chrysostom-707-a707>>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

Published in Brill's New Jacoby. Final version of record available online: <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>

**General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

**Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

# 707 Dio Chrysostom

## Ken Dowden (Birmingham)

BNJ	Dio Chrysostomus (Prusensis)	Dio Chrysostom
Historian Number:	707	

<b>707 T 1</b> - SUDA δ 1239	<b>meta</b> [[ id="707" type="T" n="1" sourcework(level1="Suda" level2="" level3="Lexicon" level4="" level5="" level6="- Δίων ὁ Κάσσιος χρηματίσας") ]]
<b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD 10th cent. <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100	<b>Translation</b>
Δίων ὁ Κάσσιος χρηματίσας... ἔγραψε Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἱστορίαν ἐν βιβλίοις π̄ (διαιροῦνται δὲ κατὰ δεκάδας)· Περσικά· Γετικά· Ἐνόδια· Τὰ κατὰ Τραιανόν· Βίον Ἀρριανοῦ τοῦ φιλοσόφου.	<b>Dio:</b> the one known as Cassius... wrote a <i>Roman History</i> in 80 books – they are divided into decades; <i>Persika</i> ; <i>Getika</i> ; <i>Wayside (Omens)</i> ; <i>Events of Trajan's Time</i> ; <i>Life of the Philosopher Arrian</i> .

## 707 T 1 Commentary

This passage is also D(e)inon *FGrH* 690 T1.

**divided into decades:** into sets of 10 books, as in the case of Livy.

### Disambiguation

Confusion reigns in this entry of the *Suda*, which deals with **Cassius Dio** (born AD c. 164, cos. II in 229), of whom there are no fragments collected in *FGrH* or *FHG* (some, however, evidently lurk in the fragments of Jordanes' contemporary Petrus Patricius, *FHG* 4.181-91: compare F 5 with Dio 68.9, as E. Cary does in the Loeb text of Cassius Dio). He indeed wrote the *Roman History*, of which a good deal remains, and he must also be the author of the *Life of the Philosopher Arrian* (c. 85-150, whom we think of as a historian, though it is thanks to him that we possess works of Epictetus).

The *Getika*, the subject of *BNJ* 707, is the work of **Dio Chrysostom** (AD 40s-110s, see Biographical Essay; *RE* Dion (18), Dio of Prusa; see T 2, T 4). The confusion of Cassius Dio with Dio Chrysostom is not unique to the *Suda*: see on T 3a for Jordanes.

Mommsen took *Getika Enodia* together to be the title of Dio's work, interpreting it as 'Getic (information) gathered on (my) journey' (Th. Mommsen, *Iordanis Romana et Getica, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 5.1 (Berlin 1882), xxxi). The combination of the two words is unpersuasive on grounds of idiom and on the grounds of the actual content of the *Getika* (which is historical and diachronic, not just ethnographic) – the *Getika* is one work, and the *Enodia* another. This latter is a *Wayside (Omens)* to be attributed to Cassius Dio, probably the work he refers

to at 72.23 (73.23 in the Loeb edition), on signs portending the rise of Septimius Severus, who wrote gratefully to Dio about it.

The *Persika*, however, was a work not of either Dio, but of D(e)inon (*FGrH* 690).

We do not discover how many books the *Getika* comprised. Perhaps it was a *monobiblos* (i.e., in 1 book) like Tacitus' *Germania*, though *-ika* titles tend to be in a number of books (perhaps with *biblia* understood). Certainly Jordanes cites no book number.

## Who were the Getai?

1. Modern authorities distinguish the *Getai* from the *Goths* - these are, then, two different peoples. The former are related to the *Thracians* (see below) and are 'the most northerly branch of the Thracian population group' (J. Weiss, 'Getae', *RE* 7 (1910), 1330-4, at 1330; P. Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen 1896), 214); the latter are a tribe speaking an East Germanic language that leaves us Wulfila's (d. 382/3) translation of the Bible. The key to this division is *language*. A further term in this mix is 'Dacians', who seem to be much the same as Getai.

2.1 Pliny (*NH* 4.80) opines that *Getai* is Greek and *Daci* Latin for the same people and a Greek inscription certainly represents Trajan's Dacian War as 'the war against the Getai' (Weiss, 'Getae', 1330). The Dacians speak the same language as the Getai according to Strabo (7.3.12). Strabo is however unclear, and maybe inconsistent, on whether the Getai should be counted as Thracian, which is what 'the Greeks used to suppose' at 7.3.2: at 7.3.4 they seem to be the same and at 7.3.10 the Getai speak the same language as the Thracians!

2.2 Some light is cast on this confusion by an important article of D. Dana, 'Les Daces dans les ostraca du désert oriental de l'Égypte: Morphologie des noms daces', *ZPE* 143 (2003), 166-86, esp. 168 and n. 21. Dana shows that the Dacian language and the Thracian can be seen from personal names to be quite distinct, even if not unrelated. The Dacians are not Thracians. They are, however, in an area that may be regarded generically by Greeks as 'Thrace' (*IGBulg* I<sup>2</sup> 13.23 of c. 48 BC). On the relationship between Getai and Thracian Kretschmer's formulation scarcely needs alteration: 'eine gewisse Geschiedenheit' (*Einleitung*, 213). See also the more adventurous theses of V. Georgiev, 'The Genesis of the Balkan Peoples', *Slavonic and East European Review* 44 (1966), 285-97, at 288, 292-3: he sees Albanian and 'Daco-Mysian' as exhibiting a common substrate.

2.3 Cassius Dio speaks of 'certain of those Thracians called "Getai"' (*Or.* 72.3). But he also insists on the term 'Dacians' at 67.6.2, stating that this is what the people called themselves and not committing himself to confirming or denying that 'certain of the Greeks' are right to call them 'Getai'; he knows, however, that those 'beyond the Haimos living along the Danube' are Getai.

2.4 Strabo (7.3.1) regards the Getai as extending from land adjoining S Germany and (supposedly) E of the Elbe along both sides of the Danube; they are therefore the adjoining swathe to the Suevi, who stretch from the Rhine to the Elbe. Naturally geography in this region is somewhat schematic, but we get the impression of a nation beyond Bohemia ('home of the Boii') perhaps in what we might call Hungary, S Romania and N Bulgaria. The Dacians are the western part, the Getai proper the eastern (7.3.12).

3. I have reviewed all instances in Greek of the use of the term *Getai* and its derivatives from the 1st century AD to the 6th. I can find no instance where it is not applied, or meant to be applied, to the 'Thracian' tribe (with some very deliberate exceptions from the 4th century on, below). This is largely because Greek writers do not even know about the Goths. Discourse about Getai, however, can get into ruts, and introduce no new information, notably when rehearsing material about Zamolxis/Zalmoxis and the supposed philosophy of this *Naturvolk*. The campaigns of Alexander, Marcus Crassus (in 29 BC for Augustus), Domitian, and Trajan (notably at Julian, *Caesars* 28) against the 'Dacians' drive most of the other mentions.

4. In most of Latin the term *Getae* is largely applied, if often atmospherically, to a 'Thracian' or the Thracian people (Vergil, *Georgics* 3.462, 4.463; *Aen.* 3.35, 7.604; Horace, *Odes* 3.24.11, 4.15.22; Columella 7.2.2; Curtius Rufus 10.1.44; Lucan 2.54, 296, 3.95, all notably together with *Daci*, cf above; Ovid, *Tristia* 3.10.5 and frequently, due to his Black Sea exile; Seneca, *Phaedra* 167, *Oedipus*

468 &c; Pliny, *HN* 4.41.6, 4.80.3; Statius, *Theb.* 1.275, 2.595 &c.; Valerius Flaccus, e.g. 5.603; Juv. 5.50; Martial, e.g. 7.80.7; Silius 1.324, with *Dacus*, and elsewhere; Tac., *Ann.* e.g. 11.31.3; Suet., *div. Aug.* 63.2; Porphyrio on Horace, *Odes* 3.24.11: ‘The Getae are Thracians’; *SHA Probus* 16.3.2 ‘through the Thraces and all the Getic peoples’). Even Ausonius (AD c.310–394) 3.5.37 seems through the terms ‘Getae’ and ‘Alani’ to be talking about Thracians and Scythians (cf. 12.10.22, 19.26.7). Servius too (writing early 5th cent. AD) remains aware of the Getai proper (on *Aeneid* 3.35 ‘Getic: Thracian’, and then as Moesians, cf on F 2.58 below).

5. In Latin, starting late in the 1st century AD, we come across references to the *Gutones* (Pliny, *NH*, e.g. 4.14.28), or *Gotones* (Tacitus, e.g. *Germania* 43.6), referring pretty clearly to the Goths. Later, e.g. when Paulinus of Pella (Ausonius’ grandson) refers to Goths, in connexion with their taking and sacking of Bordeaux in AD 414, he refers to *Gothi* (*Euch.* 285, 289 &c). Cassiodorus too (c.490-c.590, whom Jordanes was supposedly summarising) of course knows what a Goth is, dealing as he did day to day with the Visigothic King Theoderic (ruled AD 418-451).

6. From the 4th century AD the Greeks know the Goths. Themistios (317-c.390), *On the peace to Valens* (p.140 c, Harduin) already knows the *Gotthoi* and the adjective *gotthikos*. The form seems derived from the Gothic *Gutþiuda* (‘Goth-people’; for the second component cf ‘Teutones’). John Chrysostom (Bishop of Constantinople 397-404) refers to the land *Gotthia* (*Ep.* 206) and the *Gotthoi* (*Ep.* 9), as does Epiphanius (d. 403) in the *Panarion* 70.15 (*GCS* 37, p. 248). Sokrates (c.380-after 439) in his *Church History* (4.33) deals with *Gotthia* and ‘those barbarians beyond the Istros (Danube) called *Gotthoi*’. And indeed Jordanes’ contemporaries Prokopios (c.507-after 555) and Agathias (c. 532-580) write about the *Gotthoi*.

7. It is therefore a learned speculation, and not a confusion, that leads to the assimilation of Getai to Goths. If it is not Photios’ own comment in his report of this text – and it appears not from the continuing use of the term later in the fragment - Philostorgios (c. 368-after 425) is the first to my knowledge to say that Getai is the old name for Goths (*Historia ecclesiastica* Bk 2 F 5), in his account of Wulfila (c. 311-382/3). Probably after this, Orosius (writing 416-418) says the same (1.16.2 *modo autem Getae illi qui et nunc Gothi*: ‘just then the Getae who were now the Gothi...’). This is a point that gets repeated – by Prokopios (*Wars* 5.24.29: Γετικὸν γάρ φασι εἶνος τοῦς Γότθους εἶναι: ‘for they say that the Goths are a Getic people’) and John Lydus (c.490-560: *de mensibus* 4.132: οἱ Γότθοι Γέται: ‘the Goths are Getai’); and Servius Danielis on Vergil, *Georgics* 4.462 bluntly glosses Getai as ‘Gothi’ – which might be an indication of the date of the redaction of this longer version of the Servius scholia. Jordanes, like Prokopios, knows that Getai is one term, Goth another. He has derived the view that identifies them from Orosius and regards it as correct but worth proving (cf. on F 2.58).

8. This view rests on three factors: (1) the names are similar in consonantal structure (G-t-); (2) both nations trouble the Danube border; (3) people used to speak about the Getae but now speak about the Goths. These three propositions are true but do not necessarily lead to the desired conclusion. For Jordanes, however, it has the advantage that he is able to use the text of Dio’s *Getika* for his history of the Goths. It seems unlikely, though not impossible, that Cassiodorus would have shared this view and this choice is testimony to Jordanes’ independence of Cassiodorus (see on T 3a).

9. The Getai vanish from history during the 2nd century AD. The Goths seem to emerge in the 1st, but become more important in the 3rd. Roughly simultaneously, the Skythians disappear and the Alans are there instead. It is not wholly impossible that the name ‘Goths’ is indeed the new version of the name ‘Getai’, applying to shifting population mixtures (the Indo-European root would have to be something like \**Gh<sup>w</sup>et-*). I von Bredow regards the Getai as dissolving into a varied ethnic mixture of Germans, Avars, Bulgarians and Slavs (‘Getae’, *BNP*). If the Goths represent something new, as is generally thought, then they must have migrated south from for instance Swedish Gotland, as their mythology would indicate (origin on the island of Scandza: Jordanes, *Getica* 9, 16, 25) – their language certainly belonged to the now extinct ‘East’ Germanic branch, together with e.g. Prussian.

vol. 2 p. 7.14-16 Kayser, p. 487 Olearius	level3="Vitae sophistarum (Kayser C., 1)" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 7; p. 7, 14") ]]
<b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD 230s <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100	<b>Translation</b>
ὥς δὲ καὶ ἱστορίαν ἰκανὸς ἦν ξυγγράφειν, δηλοῖ τὰ Γετικά· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἐς Γέτας ἦλθεν, ὁπότε ἠλᾶτο.	It can be seen from the <i>Getika</i> that ( <i>Dio Chrysostom</i> ) was capable of writing history too – and he actually reached the Getai when he was roaming.

## 707 T 2a Commentary

This passage is *FGrH* 707 T 2.

**capable of writing history too:** The *Getika* is Philostratos' evidence for Dio's historical skills – he obviously is not confusing him with Philostratos' contemporary Cassius Dio, unlike the *Suda* and Jordanes (see on T 1, T 3a). Though it can only be speculation, one may wonder whether this comment was not in fact triggered by a comment of Dio's own in the introduction to the *Getika* to the effect that now, unusually and contrary to what his audience might expect, he turned his hand to history; it is an engaging characteristic of Dio to start by drawing the reader into reflection on the nature of his writing. As von Arnim said long ago, Dio loved talking about himself (H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin 1898), 115).

**reached the Getai:** The source for the supposedly noteworthy extent of Dio's journey must be the introduction (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 303). There is apparent intertextuality with Aristeas of Prokonnesos (*BNJ* 35), who also got beyond the Skyths and actually reached, in his case, the Issedones. And the interest of both seems to have been caused by incursions into the Greek world – for Aristeas, of Kimmerians and then Skyths in his father's generation (*BNJ* 35 Biographical Essay); for Dio, of the Getai, particularly under Byrebistas when the latter had captured Olbia and neighbouring towns in 55 BC (F 4, Dio 36.4-6), though they remained a persistent problem for emperors into Dio's own time – especially for Domitian and Trajan.

**was roaming:** Philostratos, writing around AD 230 (as we can tell from the references to Gordian in his preface), links the *Getika* with Dio Chrysostom's exile; ἠλᾶτο, rather an old-fashioned word (translated 'was roaming' here), denotes 'wandering' but often connotes 'banishment' (cf. *LSJ* s.v.). Philostratos uses it to avoid stating that Dio was in exile because he wrongly believes that the period of wandering was not a formal exile (cf on T 2b).

In practical terms, to reach the land of the Getai, it would be sufficient for Dio to get on a boat to Odessa or (like Ovid) Tomoi in Moesia (cf on T 4). However, a more arduous journey is evidently signalled to the reader and there is some possibility that the entirety of this testimonium is in fact extracted from Dio's preface – the novelty of his writing history, his journey all the way to the Getai, and his 'roaming'. The overland journey was also Dio's ambition at T 4 and is implicit in T 2b.

<b>707 T 2b</b> - PHILOSTRAT. Vit. Soph. 1.7, vol. 2 p. 7.20-29 Kayser, p. 487-8 Olearius	<b>meta</b> [[ id="707" type="T" n="2b" sourcework(level1="Philostratus (Flavius)" level2="" level3="Vitae sophistarum (Kayser C., 1)" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 7; p. 7, 20") ]]
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD 230s <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100	<b>Translation</b>
<p>Γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους, οὗς Ἀπολλώνιος τε ὁ Τυανεύς καὶ Εὐφράτης ὁ Τύριος ἐφιλοσόφουν, ἀμφοτέρους ἐπιτηδείως εἶχε καίτοι διαφορομένοις πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἕξω τοῦ φιλοσοφίας ἥθους. τὴν δὲ ἐς τὰ Γετικά ἔθνη πάροδον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς φυγὴν μὲν οὐκ ἀξιῶ ὀνομάζειν, ἐπεὶ μὴ προσετάχθη αὐτῷ φυγεῖν, οὐδὲ ἀποδημίαν, ἐπειδὴ τοῦ φανεροῦ ἐξέστη κλέπτων ἑαυτὸν ὀφθαλμῶν τε καὶ ὠτων καὶ ἄλλα ἐν ἄλλῃ γῆ πράττων δέει τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν τυραννίδων, ὅφ' ὧν ἠλαύνετο φιλοσοφία πᾶσα.</p>	<p>(Dio) lived in the times when Apollonios of Tyana and Euphrates of Tyre were active philosophers and was on familiar terms with both of them for all that they had differences with each other that went beyond the philosophical norm. As for his making his way to the Getic peoples, I would not call that 'exile', since he was not instructed to go into exile, nor a 'visit abroad', since he went incognito, hiding himself from eyes and ears and occupying himself in different ways in different lands, through fear of the tyrannies in the City (of Rome) by which all philosophy was harassed.</p>

## 707 T 2b Commentary

I have added this passage to *FGrH*.

Fronto lists Euphrates and Dio amongst the pupils of Musonius (Fronto, *ad Verum imp.* 1.1.4, vol. 2 p. 50 Haines). And Philostratos presents Dio, Euphrates and Apollonios as discussing kingship with the newly acceded Vespasian in the *Life of Apollonios* (5.27-38). The scene is evidently fictional, but there are some traces of historical reality in it – the interest of such philosophers in rulership (e.g., Dio, *Or.* 1-4), their familiarity with Roman rulers, and some nice remarks on the character of Dio and how a ruler might react to it (in 5.37); cf. J.L. Moles, 'The career and conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *JHS* 98 (1978), 79-100, at 83-4.

However, this passage is muddled. Philostratos seems to have picked up a more general hostility to philosophers at Rome, as evidenced – obviously unknown to him – by Vespasian's expulsion of philosophers in the early 70s (see Biographical Essay), as well as by Domitian's in 95. He supposes, wrongly, that Dio made himself scarce in this climate and does not actually have accurate information about the circumstances of Dio's exile.

Von Arnim suggested Philostratos was drawing a contrast with the resolve of Apollonios of Tyana and that his reference to philosophers running away to, *inter alia*, Skythia (*Vita Apollonii* 7.4) was aimed at Dio (von Arnim, *Dio*, 225-6). See further Biographical Essay.

<b>707 T 3a - JORDANES</b> <i>Getica</i> 9, 58	<b>meta</b> [[ id="707" type="T" n="3" n-mod="a" sourcework( level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 58") ]]
<b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD 551 <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100	<b>Translation</b>
<p>58... Dio storicus et antiquitatum diligentissimus inquisitor, qui operi suo <i>Getica</i> titulum dedit...</p>	<p>58... Dio, a historian and most careful researcher into olden times, who gave his work the title <i>Getika</i>...</p>

# 707 T 3a Commentary

Extract from F 2. Jordanes is writing about the Goths, considering them identical with the Getai, which he takes to be their earlier name (see on T 1).

Jordanes' stress on the historical skill of Dio evidently results not from the historical character of the *Getika* (as it does for Philostratos in T 2), but (like the *Suda* in T 1) from confusion of Dio (Chrysostom) with Cassius Dio; cf, e.g., *Getica* 14, and Th. Mommsen, *Iordanis Romana et Getica* (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 5.1; Berlin 1882), xxx-xxxii. The *antiquitates* ('olden times') are those of the Getai, whose history Dio traced.

Jordanes has been thought to be dependent on Cassiodorus' 12-book *Historia Getarum* (so, Mommsen), which he professes to have intended to abridge at the request of 'brother Castalius' (§1). Scholarly opinion on how much Jordanes owes to Cassiodorus has diverged significantly: for this issue, see N. Wagner, *Getica: Untersuchungen zum Leben des Jordanes und zur frühen Geschichte der Goten* (Berlin 1967), 57-9; and note the particularly hardline position, speaking mainly of 'Cassiodorus' rather than Jordanes, in H. Wolfram, *History of the Goths*, Eng. tr & rev. (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1988), 36, *passim*. However, as Goffart underlines in a trenchant article, Jordanes only had a period of *three days* to look at this work (*Getica* §2; W. Goffart, 'Jordanes's "Getica" and the Disputed Authenticity of Gothic Origins from Scandinavia', *Speculum* 80 (2005), 379-98, at 385). In his introduction he cites the difficulties posed by the work - namely that he (humbly) did not have the skills to rise to the material (a rhetorical *topos*), and that Cassiodorus' 12-book history was a weighty work and an inaccessible one (*Getica* §2-3):

**2** ... nec facultas eorundem librorum nobis datur, quatenus eius sensui inserviamus, sed, ut non mentiar, ad triduanam lectionem dispensatoris eius beneficio libros ipsos antehac relegi. quorum quamvis verba non recolo, sensus tamen et res actas credo me integre retinere. **3** ad quos et ex nonnullis historiis grecis et latinis addidi convenientia, initium finemque et plura in medio mea dictione permiscens.

**2** ... nor was I given the opportunity with these same books to pay full attention to their content; rather – and I am not lying – by the kindness of his *dispensator* I was given three days' read beforehand to scan over the actual books. Although I cannot recall their words, all the same I believe I have accurately retained the content and the events. **3** To these I have also added appropriate material from certain Greek and Latin histories, blending in a beginning and an end and quite a lot in between in my own right.

Given the limited access to Cassiodorus' text, the reading of 'Greek and Latin histories' can only be real and his use of Dio is correspondingly likely to be direct, *pace* Mommsen, whose view of Jordanes denied him not only intelligence but (Greek) culture (*MGH*, xliii, and see Wagner's analysis, *Getica*, 58-9). It follows that the text of Dio's *Getika* survived in Constantinople in the mid-6th century AD, something which need occasion no surprise, especially given the relative proximity of the former Dacia or the now supposedly identical Goths.

<b>707 T 3b</b> - JORDANES <i>Getica</i> 5, 40	<b>meta</b> [[ id="707" type="T" n="3" n-mod="b" sourcework( level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="5, 40") ]]
<b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD 551 <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100	<b>Translation</b>
<b>40...</b> Dio, qui historias eorum annalesque	<b>40...</b> Dio, who composed their ( <i>the Goths'</i> )

Greco stilo composuit.	histories and annals in Greek.
------------------------	--------------------------------

## 707 T 3b Commentary

Extract from F 1. For Getai and Goths, see on T 1.

<b>707 T 4 – DIO CHRYSOSTOM, 36.1</b>	<b>meta</b> [[ id="707" type="T" n="4" sourcework(level1="Dio Chrysostomus (Prusensis)" level2="" level3="Orationes (36, Borysthenitica) (von Arnim J., 2)" level4="" level5="" level6="36, 1; p. 1") ]]
<b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD c. 100 <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100 <b>Historical period:</b>	<b>Translation</b>
ἐτύγχανον μὲν ἐπιδημῶν ἐν Βορυσθένει τὸ θέρος, ὅποτε εἰσέπλευσα μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν, βουλόμενος ἐλθεῖν, εἰ δύνωμαι, διὰ Σκυθῶν εἰς Γέτας, ὅπως θεάσωμαι τὰ κεῖ πράγματα ὅποια ἐστὶ κτλ.	I happened to be at Borysthenes during the summer when I arrived by ship after my exile. I had wanted, if I could, to travel through the Skyths to the Getai so I could see what things were like there (&c).

## 707 T 4 Commentary

**Borysthenes:** This is strictly the name of the river (Dnieper); the town is Olbia, situated on the Hypanis (Bug) just before it flows into the Borysthenes or rather the lagoon that it has given way to. But Olbia is called Borysthenes as early as Herodotos (e.g., 4.24).

**after my exile:** This is often taken, e.g. by H. von Arnim (*Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin 1898), 302), to mean ‘after my period of exile was over’; this phrase is therefore thought by him to have crept in from the title, which would on this view have specified that the work was composed after his exile. More recently, scholars who translate the Greek in this way have entertained an indeed post-exilic trip to the Getai; see Cécile Bost-Pouderon, *Dion de Pruse dit Dion Chrysostome: Oeuvres: Discours xxxiii-xxxvi* (Paris 2011), 107-13; A.R.R. Sheppard, ‘Dio Chrysostom: the Bithynian years’, *AC* 53 (1984), 157-73. However, others (for instance, Emperius, below) have seen that the phrase in fact means ‘after I had been exiled’. This corresponds to the difference between the imperfect and the aorist of the related verb (ἔφευγον, ἔφυγον) referring to the state of *being* in exile and of *becoming* an exile (the act of banishment) respectively (cf. the use of βασιλεία to mean ‘accession’, *LSJ* s.v. III). We may compare passages of Plutarch:

*Them.* 21.5: πολὺ δ’ ἀσελγεστέρα καὶ ἀναπεπταμένη μᾶλλον εἰς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα βλασφημία κέχρηται μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν καταδίκην ὁ Τιμοκρέων (‘Timokreon employed more licentious and unrestrained abuse against Themistokles *after his banishment* and condemnation’);

*Cic.* 33.7: Κατῆει δὲ Κικέρων ἐκκαιδεκάτῳ μηνὶ μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν (‘Cicero returned (from exile) in the sixteenth month *after his banishment*’);

*de tranq. animi* 467c: ἤρξατο γὰρ φιλοσοφεῖν μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν ('(Diogenes) began to act as a philosopher *after his banishment*', incidentally the obvious intertext for Dio's claim that he began to philosophise *during* his exile).

The article seems to be crucial in this phrase. Without the article, as at Dio, *Or.* 40.12, the word can be used to denote a period of exile. With the article, the phrase is of perfective aspect and denotes the aorist action, the banishment.

**wanted, if I could:** This seems to indicate that Dio did not in fact reach the Getai at that time (viz. soon after his banishment) by A. Emperius, 'De exilio Dionis Chrysostomi', in F.G. Schneidewin (ed.), *Adolphi Emperii Brunopolitani Opuscula philologica et historica* (Göttingen 1847), 102-9, at 107 & n.4. It does indeed appear that he spent that summer at Borysthenes after it proved impossible to reach the Getai (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 304). He must have reached the Getai on a later occasion, likely during his exile.

It is a romantic picture of Dio making his way overland from Olbia through all those Herodotean Skythians, river by river (see my comments on Aristeas of Prokonnessos *BNJ* 35 F 1b, F 2), all the way to the remote Getai. One should not, however, forget the historical context. Domitian was campaigning against the Getai in what would become Dacia from 85 to 88 (see F 5). Later, Trajan invaded in 101/2 and 105/6 (Cassius Dio 68.6-14), culminating in the creation of the province of Dacia in 106. Dio would have found more Greek-speaking authorities on the Getai on the coast and in the camps of Roman soldiers (on which latter see Biographical Essay).

<p><b>707 F 1 - JORDANES</b> Get. 5, 38</p>	<p><b>meta</b>[[ id="707" type="F" n="1" sourcework(level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="5, 38-42")]]</p>
<p><b>Subject:</b> national history, constitution, priesthood, migration, foundation myth, ethnography  <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i>  <b>Source date:</b> AD 551  <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100  <b>Historical period:</b> 1490 – 50 BC</p>	<p><b>Translation</b></p>
<p><b>38.1</b> quorum mansione prima in Scythiae solo iuxta paludem Meotidem, secundo in Mysiam Thraciamque et Daciam, tertio supra mare Ponticum rursus in Scythia legimus habitasse.  <b>38.2</b> nec eorum fabulas alicubi repperimus scriptas, qui eos dicunt in Britannia vel in unaqualibet insularum in servitute redactos et in unius caballi praetio a quodam ereptos. aut certe si quis eos aliter dixerit in nostro urbe quam quod nos diximus fuisse exortos, nobis aliquid obstrepebit: nos enim potius lectioni credimus quam fabulis anilibus consentimus.  <b>39</b> ut ergo ad nostrum propositum redeamus, in prima sede Scythiae iuxta Meotidem commanentes, praefati unde loquimur, Filimer regem habuisse noscuntur; in secunda, id est Daciae Thraciaeque et Mysiae solo Zalmoxen, quem mirae philosophiae eruditionis fuisse testantur plerique scriptores annalium. <i>nec</i></p>	<p><b>38.1</b> We read that they lived, in their first stopping-place (<i>on their migrations</i>), on Skythian soil next to Lake Maeotis (<i>Sea of Azov</i>); for their second they moved on to Mysia, Thrace and Dacia; and for their third, beyond the Pontic Sea (<i>Black Sea</i>) back in Scythia.  <b>38.2</b> -- And we do not find written down anywhere stories about them claiming they were reduced to slavery in Britain, or some island or other, and rescued by someone at the price of a single horse; indeed if anyone in our city says that their origin was different to what we have stated, he can make some objection to us; but we prefer to believe what we read rather than go along with old wives' tales. --  <b>39</b> So, to return to the subject, in their <i>first</i> settlement, staying in Scythia next to Lake Maeotis, (<i>arriving</i>) from where we previously said (§26, see <i>FGrH</i> 708 F 1), they are known to have had a king, Filimer. In their <i>second</i>, i.e. the soil of Dacia, Thrace and Mysia,</p>

*defuerunt, qui eos sapientiam erudirent: nam et Zeutam prius habuerunt eruditum, post etiam Dicineum, tertium Zalmoxen, de quo superius diximus.*

**40.1** unde et pene omnibus barbaris Gothi sapientiores semper extiterunt Grecisque pene consimiles, ut refert Dio, qui historias eorum annalesque Greco stilo composuit. qui dicit primum Tarabosteseos, deinde vocatos Pilleatos hos qui inter eos generosi extabant, ex quibus eis et reges et sacerdotes ordinabantur.

**40.2** adeo ergo fuere laudati Getae, ut dudum Martem, quem poetarum fallacia deum belli pronuntiat, apud eos fuisse dicant exortum, unde et Vergilius « Gradivumque patrem, Geticis qui praesidet arvis ».

**41** quem Martem Gothi semper asperrima placavere cultura (nam victimae eius mortes fuere captorum), opinantes bellorum praesulem apte humani sanguinis effusione placandum. huic praede primordia vovebantur, huic truncis suspendebantur exubiae, eratque illis religionis preter ceteros insinuatus affectus, cum parenti devotio numinis videretur impendi.

**42** tertia vero sede super mare Ponticum iam humaniores et, ut superius diximus, prudentiores effecti, divisi per familias populi, Vesegothae familiae Balthorum, Ostrogothae praeclaris Amalis serviebant.

they had Zalmoxis, a person of astonishing philosophy and learning, as a great many authors of annals testify. Nor was there any shortage of people to teach them wisdom. For earlier they had had the learned man Zeuta, and later also Dicineus (F 4) and thirdly Zalmoxis about whom we spoke above.

**40.1** As a result the Goths have always been wiser than just about all barbarians and practically like Greeks, according to Dio, who composed their histories and annals in Greek. He says that those who were noble amongst them – from whom their kings and priests were appointed – were at first called *Tarabostesei*, then later *Pilleati*.

**40.2** Indeed so praised were the Getae that they say that long ago Mars, whom the illusion of poets declares god of war, had originated amongst them – which is how Vergil came to write ‘and father Gradivus, who guards over Getic fields’ (*Aeneid*, 3.35).

**41** This Mars the Goths have always appeased with a brutal cult – its victims were executed captives – thinking that the god in charge of war was suitably appeased with the gushing of human blood. To him they vowed the firstfruits from the booty, to him they hung spoils on trees, and they had, more than other people, an intimate feel for religious practice, as the devotion due to a divinity appeared to be being lavished on a parent.

**42** However, in their *third* settlement, above the Pontic Sea, they were by now turned more humane and, as we said above, wiser. And their peoples were divided by families: the Vesegoths served the family of the Balthi, the Ostrogoths the renowned Amali.

## 707 F 1 Commentary

### Textual note

**39** *nec defuerunt... nam et...* Dowden; *nam et... nec defuerunt...* mss, eds; [[*tertium... diximus*]] Jacoby.

### Content

This passage gives us the most substantial available insight into Dio’s work, though the reader needs to be wary. Dio was writing about the Getai, not the Goths (see on T 1; since AD 45 the Getai, some of them at any rate, had been part of the new province of Moesia). In this passage some material derives from Dio, some is added by Jordanes, and some material relates to Getai and other to Goths. I have accordingly tried to indicate, in parentheses against each passage below, to which of these categories each belongs. If Dio, then the material relates to the Getai

Dio is explicitly cited for §40.1, where he comments on the wisdom of the Getai and their sovereign-priestly caste. §40.2 is learning (of a fashion) intruded by Jordanes. §41 (see below) may be an

intrusion resting on Tacitus or similar (see below). §42, at least on Gothic families, cannot be Dio for chronological reasons; the earlier part of §42 may, however, indeed be Dio.

The story of the three stages of migration is articulated by the succession of three gurus in §39 (Zeuta, Zalmoxis, Dicineus) who are assigned to these stages and to the evolution of their supposedly unusually civilised culture. (Thus Dio must also be responsible for the first stage at §38.1.) Paramonarchic leaders are, in the Greek *imaginaire*, often considered important for setting the ethos of a nation – for instance, Lykourgos at Sparta and Solon in Athens; for such a religious leader, cf the portrait of Moses at Poseidonios *BNJ* 87 F 70. Amongst the Getai, Zamolxis and Dekaineos had already been recognised by Strabo at 16.2.39 (*BNJ* 87 F 70, again, but Dekaineos cannot go back to Poseidonios, for chronological reasons). In any case, the tale of ethical evolution is manifestly a Greek philosophical invention and constitutes in all probability Dio's interpretation and structuring of the historical data he was able to obtain. But however much it may appear to correspond to plausibly Gothic archaeology (cf. P. Heather, *The Goths* (Oxford 1996), 18-30), it is not about (Germanic) Goths but about (para-Thracian) Getai and this part of the archaeological effort is misplaced.

The origin of the Goths in Scandza (a characteristic late Latin pronunciation of *Scandia*) earlier in Jordanes' *Getica* (§§9, 16, 25) is highly unlikely to derive from Dio, as it seems to concern the Goths not the Getai. And together with Scandza goes Filimer (§26), but see on §39 below.

**38.1 stopping-place (Dio):** The word is *mansio*, which is used for the points on a route at which travellers stopped for the night (W. Smith, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*<sup>2</sup> (London 1882), s.v.). In §§39-42, this is replaced with *sedes* ('seat, settlement'). It may be that Jordanes is actually wrestling with Greek words here and that what Dio wrote was something like κατοίκησις (settlement).

**38.1 Mysia (Dio):** i.e. Moesia (see on F 2.58), the home of the Getai.

**38.1 single horse (Gothic):** This otherwise unknown story, rejected as an old wives' tale by Jordanes, does appear to give the horse a very special role. That would not be surprising in Germanic mythology, which has its named and special horses (e.g., in Norse tradition, Odin's 8-legged steed Sleipnir). It is quite possible that Jordanes is, amazingly, rejecting genuine Gothic, evidently oral, tradition in favour of what Dio wrote about the Getai.

**38.2 our city (Jordanes):** Constantinople.

**39 Filimer (Gothic):** is the last of the first five kings, whose years of rule, according to Mommsen's calculations, run from 1490 to 1324 BC (Th. Mommsen, *Iordanis Romana et Getica, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 5.1 (Berlin 1882), xxi). Jordanes is here joining the Getic tradition (Dio) with the Gothic; Filimer comes from the second, but if they are validly joined then he must be attached at this point (by Jordanes) to the Getic tradition.

Though Gothic is a Germanic language, it is a curious fact that, evidently due to population mixture, Gothic names often appear to belong to other language groups (cf. G. Sotiroff, 'Onomastic and Lexical Curiosities in Early Gothic', *Études slaves et est-européennes* 13 (1968), 53-62). Filimer may be a form of the name Valamir (King of the Ostrogoths, 447-465), plausibly cited by Sotiroff ('Curiosities', 56-7) as a form of Vladimir, which is transparently Slavonic ('lord of the world'). Thus these 'Goths' may represent a number of peoples or indeed a population mixture. After all, in Prokopios, the Gothic forces include the 'Sklaivenoi and Antai' who are worshipping what is evidently the Balto-Slavonic god Perkunas/Perun (*Gothic War* 3 (7).14.23). See too Jordanes, *Getica* 116-121, where the account of the extension of Gadaric's dominion over the Sclaveni and Antae is followed by the account of his son Filimer. The passage of *Vala-* to *Fili-* (*Phili-*) seems to indicate a Greek ear, but not Dio's (who is writing on Getai not Goths).

**39 Nor was there any shortage (Dio):** The two sentences which I have indicated in italics are in reverse order in the manuscripts, which makes no sense.

**39-40 (Dio)** The role of priests/gurus is to provide a control on kings who are not philosophers. This is explained by Dio at *Or.* 49.7-8, as observed by Sabrina Terrei, 'I *Getica* di Dione Crisostomo', *Aevum* 74 (2000), 177-86, at 181.

**39 Zeuta (Dio):** The name occurs only here and must be an attempt to render some other name. Mommsen suggested (*Iordanis Romana et Getica*, 156), Seuthes, a Thracian royal name also given as the father of Abaris by the *Suda* (BNJ 34 T 1). But that name is indeed Thracian, and not Dacian, cf. D. Dana, 'Les Daces dans les ostraca du désert oriental de l'Égypte: Morphologie des noms daces', *ZPE* 143 (2003), 166-86, at 168 n.19. A root *Zout-* (probably *\*Diout-*) is in fact found (Dana, 'Daces', 181), which one might guess represented IE *\*teutā-* ('people').

**39 Dicineus:** See on F 4.

**40 practically like Greeks (Dio):** For the thought, cf Plutarch's comment on the Romans in 225 BC: 'they do not have any barbaric or outlandish practices - in fact their ways of thought are, as much as any could be, of a Greek character and mild towards matters divine' (*Marcellus* 3).

**40 Tarabostesei... some (Dio):** These are not Gothic but Getic priests, because they come from Dio. *Pilleati* is a Latin word, meaning 'wearing a *pilleus*' or felt head-covering. At Rome, the *pilleus* was given to a slave when manumitted and worn by freedmen on ceremonial occasions. But it was a characteristic, and distinguished, headdress amongst some eastern peoples, for instance the Parthians (Martial 10.72.5) and evidently significant Dacians (Getai), given that a statue of one from Trajan's forum, now in the Hermitage (inv. A.427), is so depicted ([http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fișier:Roman\\_bust\\_of\\_a\\_Dacian\\_tarabostes,\\_Hermitage,\\_St\\_Petersburg,\\_Russia\\_-\\_20070614.jpg](http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fișier:Roman_bust_of_a_Dacian_tarabostes,_Hermitage,_St_Petersburg,_Russia_-_20070614.jpg), accessed August 2014). Dio speaks of those amongst the Getai who wear the *pilleus* at *Oratio* 72.3, a work which is clearly post-exilic: 72.11 reflects his account of his own experience in exile at 13.11-12; and the mention of Delphi is surely inspired by his own consultation at the beginning of his exile according to 13.6-9. Thus *Or.* 72, in this detail as in others, may well reflect an already composed *Getika*.

The Latin term *pilleati* reflects the Romanisation of the province of Moesia. But what of the term *tarabostesei*?

It seems irresistible to see in *tarabosteseus* the word 'tarboosh' ('A cap of cloth or felt (almost always red) with a tassel (usually of blue silk) attached at the top, worn by Muslims either by itself or as part of the turban,' according to *OED*; it later led to the fez). Though *tarboosh* goes back to Egyptian Arabic, it goes back further again to Persian *sar* ('head', corresponding to Greek *kara*) and *pūš* ('cover') (*Oxford Dictionary of English*<sup>3</sup> (Oxford 2010), s.v. tarboosh). The same word is also found in Sanskrit, *śirobhūṣaṇa* ('head-ornament', Monier-Williams), indicating an Indo-Iranian origin at the latest.

A variant form appears, mainly in Herodotos: the *kurbasia*, in reference to the headgear of the Persian king (Aristophanes, *Birds* 487), Persian warriors (Herodotos 5.49.3), and Skythians known as Sakai (Herodotos 5.64.2). The *k-* points to a *centum* language and etymologists are surely right to adduce a Hittite *kurpiši-* 'helmet' (P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris 1968-80), s.v.; attributed by H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1960-72), s.v., to M. Grošelj, *Živa Antika* 4 (1954), 172). In view of the variant form *Kurbantes* for *Korybantes*, it would not seem unreasonable to speculate that the word for helmet could at some stage have been something like *\*karybaš-* and that the *Korybantes* are the Anatolian etymological and functional equivalent of these *Tarabostesei* – they are both 'Headdress-Wearers', as an honorific religious title. The initial *T-* is puzzling. One would have expected *S-* if borrowed from Skythians, *C-* if *centum* Indo-European. Maybe the 'attack' was indistinctly captured by Dio or his source, or there has been corruption in the transmission.

For the 'change of name' from Getic to Latin, see on F 4.71.

**41 Mars... brutal cult (Jordanes):** The Getai enter literature with Herodotos. At 4.93, they are the 'bravest and justest' of 'the Thracians' (cf §40 *init.*); then follows (4.94) the account follows of how they believe that the dead go to join the *daimon* Salmoxis (or Gebeleizis, perhaps closer to the native phonology) and the living can be sent there by being tossed up and speared. They have only one god, whom they blame for thunder and lightning (4.94). Jordanes' 'Mars', though, seems closer to the Ares worshipped by the Skythians and to whom alone they set up a sort of sanctuary (4.59-62). Other 'Thracians' are responsible for human sacrifice of captives – like that escaped by Orestes and Pylades

in Euripides' *Iphigeneia amongst the Tauri*, and not escaped by Oiobazos whom the Apsinthian Thracians sacrificed to their god Pleistoros (Herodotos 9.119). And human sacrifice particularly of captives in war, with hanging in trees, is reported in the case of Germanic tribes (K. Dowden, *European Paganism* (London 2000), 181-5 – NB Tacitus, *Annals* 13.57 with sacrifice to 'Mars'), and more generally of other European tribes as a mark of their barbarism (Dowden, *Paganism*, 280-92).

The reference to Virgil is due to Jordanes himself; the barbarity of human sacrifice may also be a Latin intrusion (perhaps deriving from reading of Tacitus) – it does not sit well with Dio's portrait of the evolution of Getic civilisation, quite apart from the fact that such practice is not otherwise attested for the Getai.

**42 families (Gothic):** The *Visigoths* are of course interpreted as the 'West-Goths' and the *Ostrogoths* the 'East-Goths' (though in fact 'Visigoth' probably means 'noble Goth, cf. Sanskrit *vasu-*, Greek *εὐ-*). This sentence is not about Dio's Getai but reflects much later conditions and does not therefore form part of the fragment of Dio. The division into western and eastern occurred with the resettlement of the Goths at the end of the 3rd cent. AD, with the Dniestr forming the dividing line (M. Todd, *The Early Germans* (Oxford 1992), 152). The family tree of the Amali is given at Jordanes, *Getica* 79-81. Balthi is correctly interpreted by Jordanes (§146) as meaning *audax*, i.e. our related word 'bold' (Common Germanic *\*balþaz*, C.T. Onions, *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* (Oxford 1960), s.v. 'bold').

<p><b>707 F 2 - JORDANES</b> Get. 9, 58</p>	<p><b>meta</b>[[ id="707" type="F" n="2" sourcework(level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 58-59")]]</p>
<p><b>Subject:</b> national history, ethnography  <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i>  <b>Source date:</b> AD 551  <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100  <b>Historical period:</b> 12th cent. BC, Trojan War</p>	<p><b>Translation</b></p>
<p><b>58</b> sed ne dicas « de viris Gothorum sermo adsumptus cur in feminis tamdiu perseverat », audi et virum insignem et laudabilem fortitudinem. <b>#paraphrase# Dio storicus et antiquitatum diligentissimus inquisitor, qui operi suo Getica titulum dedit #</b> – quos Getas iam superiori loco Gothos esse probavimus, Orosio Paulo dicente – hic Dio regem illis post tempora multa commemorat nomine Telefum. ne vero quis dicat hoc nomen a lingua Gothica omnino peregrinum esse, nemo qui nesciat animadvertat usu pleraque nomina gentes amplecti, ut Romani Macedonum, Greci Romanorum, Sarmatae Germanorum; Gothi plerumque mutuuntur Hunnorum.</p> <p><b>59</b>... huius itaque regnum Moesiam appellavere maiores...</p>	<p><b>58</b> But in case you say 'Why does a discussion which began with the men of the Goths spend so long on women?', hear about the notable and praiseworthy bravery of the men. Dio, a historian and most careful researcher into olden times, who gave his work the title <i>Getica</i> – and these Getae we have proved in an earlier passage are Goths on the authority of Orosius Paulus – this Dio mentions a king of theirs, after much time had passed, called Telefus. Now in case anyone says this name is wholly foreign to the Gothic language, no-one with any knowledge fails to realise that peoples adopt most names out of familiarity, as for instance the Romans borrow those of the Macedonians, the Greeks those of the Romans, the Sarmatai of the Germans, the Goths commonly those of the Huns.</p> <p><b>59</b>... So our ancestors called his (<i>Telephos</i>) kingdom Moesia...</p>

## 707 F 2 Commentary

**Context:** 47 Vesosis (i.e. Sesostris), king of Egypt, attacks the Goths under Tanausis and fails miserably. 48 The Goths found Parthia, according to Trogus, and Tanausis is worshipped as a god after death. 49-50, 56-7 The Gothic women, left behind, repel an attack and become the Amazons.

**58 Getae... earlier passage... Goths... Orosius:** Jordanes in fact has *assumed* the Getae are Goths (at §40, in F 1 above), not ‘proved’ it (though it is interesting, cf on T 1, that he thinks he views this as a thing to be proved); Orosius does, however, make the requisite point at 1.16.2. See on T 1 for this issue.

**58 Telephus:** The mention of Telephos, the mythological king of Teuthrania, is most interesting. Mommsen saw that this had come from the Greek original text of Diktys (*BNJ* 49; Th. Mommsen, *Jordanis Romana et Getica, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 5.1 (Berlin 1882), xxxi). Jordanes reports (§61) a distance of about 630 years between the events concerning Telephos and Cyrus’ war with Tomyris (Justin 8.1) on the authority of Pompeius Trogus, which might seem to indicate that Trogus was responsible for Telephos too, but Trogus was Augustan and Diktys post-Neronian (*BNJ* 49 T 1-4 with my commentary) and the material clearly comes from Diktys, including a detail missed in the Latin abridgement (Mommsen, *MGH*, 71 n.1 *fin.*).

Jordanes’ language is unambiguous: Dio must have included the Diktys material about Telephos and made him Getic. In the epic (the *Kypria* and the *Little Iliad*) Telephos had ruled ‘Teuthrania’, a land later unknown (*pace* Strabo 13.1.69). In Dio (Jordanes) and the Latin Dictys (2.1) he is ruler of Mysia, as he is since at least Sophokles (F 210.74 Radt; Akousilaos *BNJ* 2 F 40 is very dubious) – which is later identified with Moesia: ‘the Mysoi, who themselves are also Thracians, whom now they call Moisoï. From these set out also the Mysoi who now live between the Lydians, Phrygians and Trojans.’ (Strabo 7.3.2 = Poseidonios *BNJ* 87 F 104). Georgiev accepted the identification, which is not wholly impossible, and sees it in terms of a Dacian sound-shift *ū > oi*: V. Georgiev, ‘The Genesis of the Balkan Peoples’, *Slavonic and East European Review* 44 (1966), 285-97, at 293. In this way, Telephos, ruler of Mysians on the Asia Minor coast immediately S of the Troad, may be viewed as a legendary king of Moesia, straddling the lower Danube (for this Danubian ‘Mysia’, see Strabo 12.8.1), homeland of conveniently homophonic Getai and Goths. Servius remarks (on Vergil, *Aeneid* 3.35, cf on 7.604) *Getae autem populi sunt Mysiae* (‘and the Getae are peoples of Mysia), testifying to how deep rooted the identification of Mysia with Moesia had become. Dio had evidently played his part in this intertextuality.

**58 the Goths commonly those of the Huns:** This statement of Jordanes’ is confirmed by names such as Totila and Ulfila that, whatever their roots, display Hunnic endings; see G. Sotiroff, ‘Onomastic and Lexical Curiosities in Early Gothic’, *Études slaves et est-européennes*, 13 (1968), 53-62, at 54-5.

<p><b>707 F 3 - JORDANES</b> Get. 10, 65</p>	<p><b>meta</b>[[ id="707" type="F" n="3" sourcework(level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="10, 65-66")]]</p>
<p><b>Subject:</b> national history, priesthood, ethnography  <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i>  <b>Source date:</b> AD 551  <b>Historian’s date:</b> AD c. 100  <b>Historical period:</b> 5th-4th cent. BC</p>	<p><b>Translation</b></p>
<p><b>65.1</b> Philippus quoque, pater Alexandri Magni, cum Gothis amicitiae copulam Medopam Gudilae regis filiam accepit uxorem, ut tali affinitate roboratus Macedonum regna firmaret.</p>	<p><b>65.1</b> Philip too, the father of Alexander the Great, to create a tie of friendship with the Goths, took the hand of Medopa, daughter of King Gudila, in marriage so that with the solid basis of such a relationship he might strengthen the kingdom of</p>

2 qua tempestate Dio storico dicente Philippus inopia pecuniae passus Odysitanam Moesiae civitatem instructis copiis vastare deliberat, quae tunc propter vicinam Thomes Gothis erat subiecta. unde et sacerdotes Gothorum illi qui *pi<lleat>i* vocabantur subito patefactis portis cum citharis et vestibus candidis obvium egressi, patriis diis ut sibi propitii Macedonas repellerent voce supplicii modulantes. quos Macedones sic fiducialiter sibi occurrere contuentes stupiscent et (si dici fas est) ab inermibus terrentur armati; nec mora soluta acie quam ad bellandum construxerant, non tantum ab urbis excidio <abstinuerunt>, verum etiam et quos foris fuerant iure belli adepti reddiderunt foedusque inuito ad sua reversi sunt.

66 quod dolum post longum tempus reminiscens egregius Gothorum ductor Sithalcus CL virorum milibus congregatis Atheniensibus intulit bellum adversus Perdiccam, Macedoniae regem quem Alexander apud Babylloniam ministri insidiis potans interitum Atheniensium principatui hereditario iure reliquerat successorem. magno proelio cum hoc inuito Gothi superiores inventi sunt, et sic pro iniuria, qua illi in Moesia dudum fecissent, isti in Grecia discurrentes cunctam Macedoniam vastaverunt.

Macedonia.

2 At this time, following the account of the historian Dio, Philip, suffering from a shortage of money, gave thought to committing his forces and sacking the Odysitanan city in Moesia at that time, which then was subject to the Goths because of the vicinity of Tomi. From there suddenly, the gates thrown open, those priests of the Goths that were called *pi<lleat>i* emerged opposite them with citharas and white costumes, singing with suppliant voice to their ancestral gods that they should favour them and repulse the Macedonians. The Macedonians were stunned to see them proceed toward them with such confidence and, if one may say so, armed men were terrified by the defenceless. Straightaway they dissolved the battle line they had drawn up to fight and not only refrained from destroying the city but even gave back those they had seized outside the city under the rules of war.

66 Remembering this deceit after a long interval, the outstanding leader of the Goths, Sithalcus (*Sitalkes*) collected 150,000 Athenian troops and made war on Perdikkas, whom Alexander had left as his successor as king of Macedonia with hereditary rights to rule over the Athenians, when he was in Babylonia drinking his death due to the conspiracy of an attendant. Engaging in a great battle with him, the Goths came out on top and thus, in return for the wrong done to them long ago in Moesia, they invaded Greece and ransacked Macedonia.

## 707 F 3 Commentary

### Textual note

65.2 *pi<lleat>i* Dowden, cf. §§ 40, 71; *pīi* ('pious') mss, eds; obelized, Jacoby; *dīi* ('gods') Grimm (in Mommsen's apparatus), cf. Poseidonios *BNJ* 87 F 70.39, F 104.5 and commentary. And see commentary on F 3.65.2.

### Content

**Context:** 61-4 Wars of Persians, from Cyrus to Xerxes, with the Goths. Source: Trogus (*Pompeio Trogo testante*, §61).

**65.1 Medopa, daughter of King Gudila:** This king and daughter appear otherwise only as the 'Thracian king' Kothēlas and his daughter Mēda in Satyros, *Life of Philip*, *FHG* 3.161 (in Ath. 13 557d), presumably the Satyros (A. Gudeman, Satyros (16), *RE* 2A (1921), 228-35) that appears fleetingly at *BNJ* 776 F 1 and elsewhere. Müller took a more holistic view of Satyros' work than Jacoby later did, at *FHG* 3.159, and saw him as being active around 175 BC. Gudila, a splendidly Gothic-sounding name, is wholly impossible for Philip's time; Satyros has the Thracian version which Dio must have had reason to take as Getic. In Satyros, this forms part of a list of wives of Philip.

The independent attestation of this king and daughter, however, is a good sign that this colourful story has a real historical backdrop in Philip's early campaigns, maybe in 356/5. It is not exactly plausible, however, that Philip or his forces would be so awe-stricken. This looks, rather, like a local story explaining the *absence* of an attack on Odessa, when Philip was perceived to have had the opportunity (perhaps they bribed him, or perhaps it was just a city too far). If so, then the story reports not a marvel beheld by a Greek audience, but the pride of a Getic population in their ancestral priesthood.

**65.2 shortage of money:** Lack of resources is also stated to be a reason for Philip's activities among Thracians and Skythians (and even piracy) by Justin 9.1, i.e. Trogus. Dio may be cited, but Trogus continues to underlie the account; it is possible that Jordanes is reading Trogus (end 1st cent. BC) through Dio (end 1st cent. AD). Certainly, Dio is the one who has built up the story of the *pilleati* (cf. F 1).

**65.2 the Odysitanan city:** Namely, Odessos (mod. Odessa), later known as Odysso; *civitas* is meant in its late sense, 'city' – otherwise its gates could not be thrown open.

**65.2 those priests of the Goths that were called *pi<lleat>i*:** See textual note. The manuscripts have *pīi* ('pious'), which is not a known name of the priests. Grimm suggested *dīi* ('gods'), resting presumably on the priest that is known as the 'God' amongst the Getai (Poseidonios *BNJ* 87 F 104 and my commentary), but that is singular, not plural. It seems obvious that this is in fact the known priestly class of the Getai, the *pilleati*, and the only reason to resist that is Jordanes' assertion that the class was created by Dekinai 300 years later (F 4.71). But it is sufficiently clear from F 1.40.1 that this priesthood is a foundational fact about the Getai and not newly invented in the mid-1st century BC. Thus the chronological difficulty rests not here but with F 4 (q.v.).

**66 Remembering this deceit after a long interval:** This whole paragraph is very muddled. The show of the priests was doubtless impressive, but not really a deceit or trick and it is not clear how it is being 'remembered'. Perdikkas appears in Trogus/Justin 13 but not quite in this role. Sitalkes belongs not a long time after Philip and the Getai but, on the contrary, a century before. Jordanes has confused two Perdikkai: Perdikkas, the competitor for power after Alexander, died in 321; Perdikkas II (c. 450-413) of Macedon was in conflict with Sitalkes, king of the (Thracian) Odrysai, whom the Athenians had incited at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, namely in 431-429. One is also left with the uncomfortable feeling that by 'Athenians', Jordanes means 'Greeks'.

<p><b>707 F 4 - JORDANES</b> Get. 11, 67</p>	<pre>meta[[ id="707" type="F" n="4" sourcework( level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="11, 67-75") ]]</pre>
<p><b>Subject:</b> national history, priesthood, philosophy, constitution, ethnography  <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i>  <b>Source date:</b> AD 551  <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100  <b>Historical period:</b> c. 60 BC – AD 40</p>	<p><b>Translation</b></p>
<p>[11] 67 dehinc regnante Gothis Buruista Dicineus venit in Gothiam, quo tempore Romanorum Sylla potitus est principatum. quem Dicineum suscipiens Buruista dedit ei pene regiam potestatem. cuius consilio Gothi Germanorum terras [[quas nunc Franci optinent]] populati sunt. 68 Caesar</p>	<p>[11] 67 Then, when Buruista was ruling over the Goths, Dicineus came into Gothia, at the time at which Sulla had seized power over the Romans. Buruista received Dicineus and gave him practically royal powers. It was through his policy that the Goths raided the lands of the Germans [[which the Franks now hold]]. 68 Caesar, however, who...</p>

vero, qui... pene omnem mundum suae dicioni subegit... Gothos tamen crebro pertemptans nequivit subicere.]]

Gaius Tiberius iam tertius regnat Romanis: Gothi tamen suo regno incolume perseverant. **69** quibus hoc erat salubre, hoc adcommodum, hoc votivum, ut, quidquid Dicineus eorum consiliarius precepisset, hoc modis omnibus expetendum, hoc utile iudicantes, effectui mancipient. qui cernens eorum animos sibi in omnibus oboedire et naturalem eos habere ingenium, omnem pene phylosophiam eos instruxit - erat namque huius rei magister peritus: nam ethicam eos erudiens barbaricos mores compescuit; fysicam tradens naturaliter propriis legibus vivere fecit [[quas usque nunc conscriptas belagines nuncupant]]; logicam instruens rationis eos supra ceteras gentes fecit expertos; practicen ostendens in bonis actibus conversare suasit; theoreticen demonstrans signorum duodecem et per ea planetarum cursus omnemque astronomiam contemplari edocuit, et quomodo lunaris orbis augmentum sustinet aut patitur detrimentum edixit, solisque globum igneum quantum terreno orbe in mensura excedat ostendit; aut quibus nominibus vel quibus signis in polo caeli vergente et revergente trecentae quadraginta et sex stellae ab ortu in occasu precipites ruant exposuit. [[**70**...]]

**71** haec et alia nonnulla Dicineus Gothis sua peritia tradens mirabilis apud eos enituit, ut non solum mediocribus, immo et regibus imperaret. elegit namque ex eis tunc nobilissimos prudentioresque viros, quos theologiam instruens numina quaedam et sacella venerare suasit fecitque sacerdotes, nomen illis pilleatorum contradens, ut reor, quia opertis capitibus tyaris, quos pilleos alio nomine nuncupamus, litabant. **72** reliquam vero gentem capillatos dicere iussit, quod nomen Gothi pro magno suscipientes adhuc odie suis cantionibus reminiscunt.

**73** decedente vero Dicineo pene pari veneratione habuerunt Comosicum, quia nec impar erat sollertiae. hic etenim et rex illis et pontifex ob suam peritiam habebatur et in summa iustitia populos iudicabat. [**12**] et hoc rebus excedente humanis Coryllus

brought almost the whole world under his sway... all the same, frequently though he tried, was unable to subjugate the Goths.

Gaius Tiberius was by now the third ruler of the Romans; but the Goths stayed unharmed in their own kingdom. **69** They thought their security, their advantage and their hopes rested in ensuring that whatever instructions Dicineus had given as their counsellor should be the objective of everyone, judging it useful to put effort into achieving it. He could see that their minds obeyed him in all matters and that they had natural intelligence; so he taught them just about the whole of philosophy – for he was a past master of this discipline. In teaching them ethics, he repressed their barbaric ways; in passing on physical philosophy, he brought it about that they lived by appropriate laws in accordance with nature [[which they have even today in written form and call *belagines*]]; by instructing them in logic, he gave them expertise in reasoning beyond other nations. Demonstrating practical philosophy, he persuaded them habitually to carry out good deeds; by showing theoretical philosophy, he taught them how to contemplate the paths of the twelve signs of the zodiac and of the planets through them, and the whole of astronomy; and he enunciated who the orb of the moon supports growth and undergoes decline; he proved how much the fiery globe of the sun exceeds the terrestrial sphere in its dimensions; and he laid out how as the axis of heaven turns and turns again, under various names and through various constellations three hundred and forty six stars hurtle on their way from rising to setting. [[**70**...]]

**71** These and other such things Dicineus passed on to the Goths thanks to his expertise and he shone forth a marvel amongst them, one who might give orders not merely to humble people but even to kings. For he selected the most distinguished and wise men of that time, whom he instructed in theology, persuading them to revere certain divinities and shrines. And he made them priests, giving them the name of *Pilleati*, because, as I think, they performed their prayers covering their heads with tiaras that we call by a different name, *pillei*. **72** The rest of the people he told them to call *Capillati*, a name which the Goths accepted as important and which still today they recall in their songs.

**73** When Dicineus died, they held Comosicus in almost equal veneration, as he did not fall short of Dicineus in intelligence. They had him as their king and priest due to his expertise and he passed judgment on peoples with total justice. [**12**] And when he departed the human realm, Coryllus

<p>rex Gothorum in regno conscendit et per quadraginta annos in Dacia suis gentibus imperavit. [[74 Daciam dico antiquam, quam nunc Gepidarum populi possidere noscuntur. quae patria in conspectu Moesiae sita trans Danubium... 75... haec de Danubio dixisse sufficiat; ad propositum vero, unde nos digressimus, iubante domino redeamus]].</p>	<p>ascended to the throne of the Goths and ruled over his peoples in Dacia for 40 years. [[74 By Dacia I mean the ancient one that is now known to be held by the peoples of the Gepidae. This homeland is situated across the Danube within sight of Moesia... 75... This should be enough said about the Danube; we can now return to the subject from which we had digressed, with the help of the Lord.]]</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 707 F 4 Commentary

### Textual note

**67-68:** [[quas nunc Franci optinent]] Dowden; [[cuius consilio Gothi... nequivit subicere.]] Jacoby.

### Content

This passage follows straight on from F 3. Its whole vision suits Dio, with its analysis of philosophy in §69, its emphasis on practical philosophy (reflecting Dio's own experience in exile, maybe), and with its concern about the relationship between sovereignty and philosophy. It also matches what seems to represent Dio in earlier fragments. Dio must have taken the history down to his own day (Domitian in F 5); the political fragmentation following the deposing of Burebista may have led to some thinness of material covering the period between him and the times of Domitian, but the major factor seems to be (see on F 5.76) that Jordanes has found little to interest him and has skipped over a whole area of Dio's *Getika*.

**67 Buruista:** This is Strabo's Byrebistas: see 7.3.5 (*BNJ* 87 F 104) and 16.2.39 (*BNJ* 87 F 70), 'Boirebistas' at Strabo 7.3.11. The variant names are reconciled as Burbista (reading Jordanes' version as Burvista) by C.G. Brandis, 'Burbista', *RE* 3 (1899), 2903-4 (repeated, s.v. Burebista, at *RE* Suppl. 1 (1903), 261-4 !), but inscriptions too show him as Byrebista (*IGBulg* I<sup>2</sup> 13 of c. 48 BC, 323 of c. 55 BC). His name may well underlie the 'Barsabas' of Diodoros 32.15.7 for a king of the Thracians of a century earlier (A.J. Reinach, 'Les Mercenaires et les colonies militaires de Pergame (suite)', *RA* 14 (1909), 55-70, at 67 n.4). He was deposed (killed?) before 'the Romans' could send an expedition against him (Strabo 7.3.11) – apparently that planned by Julius Caesar before his death (Strabo 7.3.5) – and therefore in 44 BC.

**67 Dicineus:** For the sequence of three gurus – Zeuta, Zalmoxis, Dicineus - cf F 1.39 and commentary on F 1. The original Dacian name, usually Dekinai, appears surprisingly to be close to Jordanes' form of the name, which perhaps he had got from Dio: D. Dana, 'Les Daces dans les ostraca du désert oriental de l'Égypte: Morphologie des noms daces', *ZPE* 143 (2003), 166-86, at 175 & n.49.

In Strabo he is Dekaineos at 7.3.5 (*BNJ* 87 F 104) and (in the mss, see Dana, 'Daces', 175) Dekineos at 16.2.39 (*BNJ* 87 F 70); the passages of Strabo are closely similar in content, discussing the institution of a Getic priesthood called the 'God' (see my commentary on Poseidonios *BNJ* 87 F 104, 7.3.5), once supposedly held by Zamolxis (or Zalmoxis), but in Strabo's time by Dekinai. In Strabo Byrebistas, and therefore Dekinai, was active in the years following 62 BC (see my comments on *BNJ* 87 F 70.39) rather than in the times of Sulla (dictator, 82-81 BC), as Jordanes here. But on Jordanes' chronology, he still seems to be active under Caligula ('Gaius Tiberius', §68 fin.) in AD 37-41 !

**67 [[which the Franks now hold]].** Double-brackets indicate an authorial intrusion (by Jordanes) into surrounding Dionian material. Reference to the Franks takes it well outside Dio's time-frame. The Franks emerge out of nowhere in the mid-3rd century AD (M. Todd, *The Early Germans* (Oxford 1992), 192-3). Jordanes' geography is dubious: in his time the Franks were in France and the Rhineland – perhaps, charitably, he means the Rhineland; cf. Todd, *Early Germans*, 192-207. But the

attack by Byrebistas must have been much further East. He is recorded as having wiped out the Boioi under Kritasiris and also the Tauriskoi by Strabo 7.3.11 and having generally attacked other Celtic tribes. If he had as much trouble distinguishing Celts from Germans as everyone else does, then it may well be on this occasion that the conflict alleged by Jordanes happened.

It would then follow that the account of Byrebistas and Dekainis (and Zalmoxis) and the sudden increase in ambition of the Getai is a consistent story between Jordanes and Strabo. Dio, then, is part of this tradition. Poseidonios' views on priests and kings, including Zalmoxis (see above), have been expanded to include the very striking instance of Byrebistas and Dekainis (and his foreign policy) by Strabo himself, a historian after all, or by Strabo's source.

Jacoby bracketed a larger area ('It was through his policy... unable to subjugate the Goths.'), but there is no reason to exclude the further material from Dio, after making allowance for Jordanes' misunderstandings (see below).

**68 Caesar... unable to subjugate the Goths:** Jordanes seems to be referring to Augustus (to judge also by the text Jacoby omits). But it is plain that his source was talking about Julius Caesar, as can be seen from the similar line of thought at Orosius 1.16.2 (maybe *he* is Jordanes' source for this sentiment) which presents a litany of those who had balked at the thought of attacking the Goths/Getae: Alexander, Pyrrhus and Caesar. This goes back to the topic of what Caesar was planning when he was assassinated in 44 BC, on which see particularly Gavin Townend, 'A clue to Caesar's unfulfilled intentions', *Latomus* 42 (1983), 601-6. From Townend's analysis it seems credible that Caesar did have in mind a pacification ('Clue', 604-5) of the Getai to secure the Danube frontier. The sources are, in ascending order of exaggeration: Appian, *Civil Wars* 2.110 (Getai); Suetonius, *Caesar* 44 (pacifying the Dacians as part of a list of projects); Plutarch, *Caesar* 58.3 ('Skythia' and northern Europe, eg, Germans); Antony's speech over the body at Cassius Dio 44.43.1 (Empire to extend to the northern sea, therefore including Getai/Dacians). It is interesting that Appian and Suetonius specifically state that the campaign against the Getai/Dacians was to come first, before the campaign against Parthia. There is a coherent source at the root of their two accounts.

There was in fact no intention to extend the Empire to include the Getai (not until Trajan took Dacia) because there was no adequate urban basis for Romanisation (Townend, 'Clue', 606, though see below on Dacian towns); the idea that the Romans were frightened of the Goths is trivial and inaccurate and in any case belied by the campaign of M. Licinius Crassus in 29 BC: he conducted the campaign energetically (to the extent, even, of single combat) and decisively pacified the Getai and others (Cassius Dio 51.23-27). The need for that campaign demonstrates the credibility of Caesar's having so planned.

It may be asked what author before Orosius might have been trying to praise the Goths through a sequence of non-conquests by Alexander, Pyrrhus, and Caesar. The most readily available answer would seem to be Dio Chrysostom on the Getai. I have accordingly moved Jacoby's closing double-brackets

**68 frequently though he tried:** This is true neither of Julius Caesar nor of Augustus.

**69 *belagines*:** This word for written laws is derived by W.P. Lehmann (*A Gothic Etymological Dictionary* (Leiden 1986), 69) from *\*bilagjan* 'lay down, impose', which would make it similar to the concept of *thesmoi* ('layings down, ordinances') in Greek to describe, e.g., the 7th-century BC legislation of Drakon in Athens (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 4.1). The word is on this view Germanic and therefore must be an intrusion of Jordanes's relating to the real Goths.

**69 physical philosophy... practical... theoretical... :** This programme of philosophy is a particularly gross reading of Greek culture onto less civilised parts of the world. This is comparable with views about Druids probably deriving from Poseidonios (e.g., Caesar, *de bello gallico* 6.14). And remarkably, Hippolytos (*Refutation of All Heresies* 1.2.17) claims that Zalmoxis taught the Druids Pythagorean philosophy. It looks as though Dio, in this case, has, on the basis of the Poseidonian tradition, worked up an even more impressive philosophy to attribute to Dekainis as part of his mission to praise the Getai (this is in effect, though a history, also an *epainos* (praise-piece) of a characterful barbarian people). The division of philosophy into theoretical and practical, with physical

as a subdivision of theoretical, goes back to Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 5.1 1025b25-27 and becomes common currency (e.g., Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.57.5; Diogenes Laertius 7.92 (incl. Poseidonios F 424 Theiler); Ptolemy, *Harmonika* 3.6); a simple threefold division like this is rarer and maybe just less exhaustive (otherwise found in  $\Sigma$  *Od.* 1.3).

**71 And he made them priests:** We have seen the role played by the *Pilleati* (if my emendation is right) against Philip II of Macedon in F 3.65.2 and their apparent prior existence at F 1.40.1. It seems unthinkable that this defining institution was created by Dekinai in the 50s BC. There had in any case been a name change from ‘Gothic’ (i.e. Getic) to Latin as F 1.40.1 tells us, or Greek as Cassius Dio 68.9.1 (see below) shows. Previously known by the native term, *Tarabostesei*, now they become known as the ‘Cap-wearers’, whether in Greek or Latin, *pilophoroi* or *pilleati*. The Getai are becoming an institutionalised people, with a single king, Byrebistas, and a spiritual leader, Dekinai; the latter can, if Greeks wish, be mapped onto a pre-existing Zalmoxis, and they have priests of great antiquity and (72 below) a warrior class.

Together with this goes a certain urbanisation. They have a string of towns, around 50 with names ending in *-dava*: O. Weiss, ‘Getae’, *RE* 7 (1910), 1330-4, at 1331; V. Georgiev, ‘The Genesis of the Balkan Peoples’, *Slavonic and East European Review* 44 (1966), 285-97, eg 286 and map at 287. These include such places as Argidava, Dausdava, Sacidaba (= ‘Skytho-polis’?), Pulpudeva (Jordanes, *Romana* 221, 283; formerly Philippopolis, mod. Plovdiv, though this is a special case in an aberrant position: Georgiev, ‘Genesis’, 286). This ending comes from Indo-European *\*dhē-wā* according to Edgar Polomé (‘Balkan Languages (Illyrian, Thracian and Daco-Moesian)’, in *CAH*<sup>2</sup> 3.1 (1982), 866-88, at 886) and Georgiev, ‘Genesis’, 293. In addition, there is Byrebistas’s remarkable capital Sarmizegetusa and its ample provision of temples (T. Taylor, ‘Aspects of settlement diversity and its classification in southeast Europe before the Roman period’, *World Archaeology* 19 (1987), 1-22, at 16). The Getai/Dacians are a nation of some account. It seems intelligible that some sort of ideological revolution is taking place under Byrebistas and Dekinai and this must be what Dio had picked up and Jordanes has, in his own way, transmitted.

**72 Capillati:** ‘Long-haired’, for which the Greek term is κομηῆται, as opposed to the πλοφόροι (Cassius Dio 68.9.1; the latter mentioned also by Kriton of Pieria *BNJ* 200 F 3). Cassius Dio makes clear the higher, aristocratic, status of the *pilleati*, but the *capillati* were evidently of significant status themselves. *Pilleati* are sovereign-priestly; *capillati* are warriors. What is surprising, however, is that Jordanes goes on to say that the Goths still ‘today’ celebrate this latter status in their songs, if, as is thought now, the identification of Goths with Getai is an illusion. The easiest explanation would be to assume celebration of long-haired warriors in Gothic heroic song (like the ‘long-haired Achaians’ of Homer); if Germanic peoples could have long beards (‘Lombards/Langobardi’), they could doubtless have long hair. Otherwise, one would have to construct a model based on population mixture, shifting primary languages, and some stable customs – which would allow some continuity between Getai and Goths. A final, if remote, possibility, is that Jordanes’ own name, though probably just a baptismal name at conversion (he is a Goth, *Getica* 266), but not otherwise attested as the name of an author, would correspond well to the attested *Dacian* name Diourdanos/Zourdanos (cf. Dana, ‘Daces’, 176, 181). On the other hand contemporary mosaics in baptisteries at Ravenna depict, Tiber-like, a human River Jordan.

**73 Comosicus:** otherwise unknown. One would expect a double *m* in Greek, which some mss of Jordanes have. It is notable that this person combined ruler and priestly functions. Dekinai must have died either when Burebista was deposed or before.

**73 Coryllus:** This name is given by Frontinus (*Strat.* 1.1.4) as Scorylo, a Dacian leader who refrained from attacking the Romans while they were embroiled in civil war for fear it might unite them. The civil war in question might be the war between Antony and Octavian, as thought by A. Stein, ‘Scorylo’, *RE* 2A1 (1921), 836 – the only alternative is AD 68-69, which seems too late. There is also a ‘Cotiso’ (Florus 2.28; Horace, *Odes* 3.8.18; Suet., *Aug.* 63.2; A. Stein, ‘Cotiso’, *RE* 4.2 (1901), 1676), who was negotiating with both Octavian and Antony. Given the apparent breakdown in Getic power after the forced end of Burebista’s reign, the variation in names, and the alleged 40-year reign of Coryllos, historical certainty does not seem recoverable. For one view, see Ioana A. Oltean, *Dacia:*

*Landscape, Colonisation, Romanisation* (London, New York 2007), 49, 72. However, if Scorylo/Coryllus was active in the 30s BC, which seems plausible, then his 40-year reign will have ended before, say, the death of Augustus in AD 14.

<p><b>707 F 5 - JORDANES</b> Get. 13, 76</p>	<p><b>meta</b>[[ id="707" type="F" n="5" sourcework(level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="13, 76-78") ]]</p>
<p><b>Subject:</b> national history, military history  <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Getika</i>  <b>Source date:</b> AD 551  <b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 100  <b>Historical period:</b> AD 85-88</p>	<p><b>Translation</b></p>
<p>[13] <b>76</b> Longum namque post intervallum Domitiano imperatore regnante eiusque avaritiam metuentes, foedus quod dudum cum aliis principibus pepigerant Gothi solventes ripam Danubii iam longe possessam ab imperio Romano deletis militibus cum eorum ducibus vastaverunt. cui provinciae tunc post Agrippam Oppius praerat Savinus, Gothis autem Dorpaneus principatum agebat, quando bello commisso Gothi, Romanos devictos, Oppii Savini caput abscisum, multa castella et civitates invadentes de parte imperatoris publice depraedarunt.</p> <p><b>77</b> qua necessitate suorum Domitianus cum omni virtute sua Illyricum properavit et totius pene rei publicae militibus ductore Fusco praelato cum lectissimis viris amnem Danubii consertis navibus ad instar pontis transmeare coegit super exercitum Dorpanei. <b>78</b> tum Gothi haut segnes reperti arma capessunt primoque conflictu mox Romanos devincunt, Fuscoque duce extincto divitias de castris militum spoliant magnaue potiti per loca victoria iam procures suos, quorum quasi fortuna vincebant, non puros homines, sed semideos [[id est Ansis]] vocaverunt. [[quorum genealogiam ut paucis percurram... ]].</p>	<p>[13] <b>76</b> After a long period, in the reign of the emperor Domitian, in fear of his greed, the Goths broke the treaty which they had long ago struck with other emperors and laid waste to the bank of the Danube which had long been held by the Roman Empire, killing the soldiers and their leaders. Oppius Savinus after Agrippa was at that stage governor of the province and Dorpaneus held sway over the Goths at the time when the Goths made war, defeated the Romans, beheaded Oppius Savinus, attacked and blatantly plundered numerous strongholds and cities belonging to the Emperor.</p> <p><b>77</b> As his people were in such need, Domitian hastened to Illyricum with his entire forces and with the soldiers of practically the entire state. The general Fuscus was sent forward with crack troops and made his troops cross the stream of the Danube to reach the army of Dorpaneus on a sort of bridge made of ships joined together. <b>78</b> At this point the Goths displayed no idleness but took up arms and presently overcame the Romans in the initial engagement, killing the general Fuscus. And gaining a great victory in the region, they now called their elders, through whose good fortune they had supposedly been victorious, not mere men but demigods [[that is, 'Ansis']]. [[If I may run briefly through their genealogy... ]].</p>

## 707 F 5 Commentary

This passage follows straight on from F 4. It plausibly represents Dio, cf on F 4. Domitian's campaign against the Dacians brings us to the time of Dio's travels and must stand in some relation to his decision to write the *Getika*.

**76 After a long period:** See note on F 4.73. Jordanes has skipped the period from the death of Augustus (AD 14) to the accession of Domitian (AD 81).

**76 Domitian:** This passage adds flesh to the surprisingly terse account of Tacitus, *Agr.* 41.2 (see also, very brief, Suetonius, *Dom.* 6). Cassius Dio 67 had given a full account of which there are some remains (67.6-7).

**76 treaty which they had long ago struck with other emperors:** The Getai had been a threat to Moesia in the time of Tiberius (Suetonius, *Tib.* 41); it is not known when this settlement with Rome took place – perhaps with the creation of a distinct province of Moesia in AD 45. The most obvious interpretation of this passage is that Jordanes is now referring back to a part of Dio’s narrative which he has omitted. Tacitus stresses the untrustworthy nature of the Dacians when they irrupt into the Roman Empire in 68 (*gens numquam fida*, *Hist.* 3.46), which would imply the existence of a treaty.

**76 Oppius Savinus:** C. Oppius Sabinus (correctly in some mss of Jordanes), the *consul ordinarius* of 84 (O 122 *PIR*<sup>2</sup>; E. Groag, ‘Oppius (31)’, *RE* 18 (1939), 744-5). That would imply a date of 85 or 86 for his governorship and death. See also Suet., *Dom.* 6.

**76 after Agrippa:** C. Fonteius Agrippa (F 466 *PIR*<sup>2</sup>; A. Kappelmacher, ‘Fonteius (16)’, *RE* 6.2 (1909), 2846), *consul suffectus* in AD 58, was moved in 69, when already an ‘old man’ (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 7.91, presumably in his 50s), from the province of Asia to Moesia to confront the Dacian threat (Tacitus, *Histories* 3.46). He was soon (AD 70) killed in a battle with, according to Josephus, the Sarmatians, who had crossed the Danube. It is not clear whether Josephus or his sources could distinguish between Dacians and Sarmatians. Jordanes gives then impression that Sabinus succeeded Agrippa, which is evidently not true, given the 15-year gap between 70 and 85. Jordanes has garbled Dio’s account, as can be seen from his referring to Agrippa’s (unfortunate) tenure without having narrated it.

**77 Fuscus:** The restless energy of Cornelius Fuscus (C 1365 *PIR*<sup>2</sup>; A. Stein, ‘Cornelius (158)’, *RE* 4 (1900), 1340-2) earns him a thumbnail portrait at Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.86. A *vir militaris*, if ever there was one, he proved his worth to Vespasian against Vitellius and, promptly in 69, got praetorian insignia for his pains (Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.4). He is *praefectus praetorio* under Domitian (Suet., *Dom.* 6.1) and here in 86 or 87 is sent ahead by Domitian to engage the Dacians – which he does and dies, ‘reserving his innards for Dacian vultures’ (Juvenal 4.111). His death was told in the lost part of Tacitus’ *Histories* (see Orosius, *Hist.* 7.10.4) and in Cassius Dio (cf. 77.6.5-6). Martial wrote an epitaph (6.76).

**77 Dorpaneus:** *Diourpa* is a common name amongst the Dacian soldiers in Egypt studied by D. Dana, ‘Les Daces dans les ostraca du désert oriental de l’Égypte: Morphologie des noms daces’, *ZPE* 143 (2003), 166-86, at 177 & n.56. Dana there reasonably hypothesises a form \**Diourpa-nais* (cf. *Dekanais* = Decaneus). The name is indeed spelt Diurpaneus by Orosius, *Hist.* 7.10.4 and attested as DIUPANEUS on an inscription (where the first P is a mistake for R), *CIL* 6.16903. Oddly, Cassius Dio uses the form Dekebalos (Cassius Dio 77.5 = Peter Patricus, *FHG* 4.185.4; 77.7 &c), which led Stein to wonder whether ‘Dekebalos’ was a regnal name (‘Cornelius’, 1341). See further *BNJ* 200 F 1-2 and Banchich’s commentary.

<b>707 F 6 - JORDANES</b> Get. 29, 150	<b>meta</b> [[ id="707" type="F" n="6" sourcework(level1="Jordanes" level2="" level3="De rebus Geticis" level4="" level5="" level6="29, 150") ]]
<b>Subject:</b> national history <b>Historical Work:</b> <i>Roman History</i> <b>Source date:</b> AD 551	<b>Translation</b>

<b>Historian's date:</b> AD c. 230 <b>Historical period:</b> c. 31-12 BC	
<p><b>150</b> a meridie item ipse Padus, quem Italiae soli fluviorum regem dicunt cognomento Eridanus, ab Augusto imperatore latissima fossa demissus, qui septima sui alvei parte per mediam influit civitatem ad ostia sua, amoenissimum portum praebens, classem ducentarum quinquaginta navium Dione referente tutissima dudum credebatur recipere statione.</p>	<p><b>150</b> On the southern side (<i>Ravenna is bounded by</i>) the actual Po, which under the name Eridanus they call the King of Rivers in the land of Italy, sent into a very wide canal by the Emperor Augustus, of which a seventh of the stream flows through the centre of the city to its mouth, offering a most pleasant harbour. It was believed to have taken a fleet of 250 ships in olden days, safely at anchor there, according to Dio.</p>

## 707 F 6 Commentary

This is part of Ablabius *BNJ* 708 F 4 (q.v. – I have adapted the translation of R.M. Frakes) and is a red herring for both Ablabius and Dio. The geography arises in Jordanes à propos of Alaric's invasion of Italy AD c. 400, which for obvious chronological reasons cannot serve to get this geography into Dio's *Getika*. The passage is generally taken to refer to Cassius Dio (Jordanes does not seem to know the difference between the Dios, see on T 3a) and is printed as Cassius Dio 55.33.3, where there is a 4-page gap in the manuscript but little other reason to house it there. Ravenna is mentioned by Dio (in the Xiphilinos epitome) at 73.17 (Loeb 74.17), as taken without a struggle by Septimius Severus in AD 193. Perhaps it had figured there, or at 71.11 (Loeb 72.11 – uprising by peoples settled there by M. Aurelius).

## 707 Biographical Essay

Dio must have been born in the 40s AD, given his likely age at exile in the early 80s, and given the age of his son on his return from exile in 96 (therefore born about 70, as W. Schmid, 'Dion (18)', *RE* 5.2 (1905), 848-77, at 850). Arguments based on *Orationes* 28-29 and the athlete Melankomas, beloved of the Emperor Titus (Schmid, 'Dion', 849-50), are now abandoned (C.P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge MA 1978), 133). He came from Prusa, modern Bursa (Turkey), in the Roman province of Bithynia. He was from the beginning a top member of the Greek provincial establishment, and his family was one of the most prominent in Prusa. His maternal grandfather had himself been on friendly terms with the emperors of his time, something which Dio claims he used conspicuously to the benefit of Prusa (46.3-4; cf. 41.6, 44.5). Dio, by now probably in his seventies, is known to Pliny the Younger, who as governor of Bithynia and Pontus (from around 109) had to deal with a case concerning the transfer of a building to public ownership in which Dio was held by enemies to have acted corruptly and improperly (to the extent of *maiestas*), as 'Cocceianus Dio' (*Letters* 10.81, and Trajan's reply at 10.82). We do not know when Dio died, but presumably it was in the 110s.

The name *Cocceianus* has been taken to show that he had acquired, rather than inherited, Roman citizenship and that he stood in some relationship to the emperor (M. Cocceius) Nerva, as argued by H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin 1898), 125, though this has been doubted (D.A. Russell, *Dio Chrysostom: Orations vii, xii, xxxvi* (Cambridge 1992), 3). H. Sidebottom has argued for a nephew of Nerva, L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus, as his sponsor ('Dio of Prusa and the Flavian Dynasty', *CQ* 46 (1996), 447-56, at 453). The name 'Chrysostom' ('Golden-mouthed') may

have been introduced to distinguish him from the historian Cassius Dio and therefore would not be contemporary (Schmid, 'Dion', 848).

Much is known about Dio's life, though there is practically nothing about his education or early career and the rest is a patchwork, not a narrative. He is himself the principal source (for an attempted biographical organisation of the relevant passages, see H. von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae extant omnia*, 2 (Berlin 1896), 366-71). The critic needs to strike a balance between distrust in his accomplished rhetorical self-presentation and a recognition of Dio's evident earnestness and moral authority in his own terms.

Central to his life and later identity is his **exile**, which lasted from the 80s to 96. It resulted (*Or.* 13.1) from his *amicitia* with an important Roman that fell foul of Domitian and lost his life. We do not know who this Roman was: it is generally reckoned to be T. Flavius Sabinus, one of Domitian's cousins and his partner in his initial consulship (82) cf. Suetonius, *Domitian* 10 (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 228-31; see also A. Stein, 'Flavius (169)', *RE* 6.2 (1909), 2614-5), but Sidebottom has made an interesting case that it was in fact Nerva's nephew L. Salvius Otho Cocceianus ('Dio of Prusa', *passim*, and cf. above), another casualty in Suetonius, *Domitian* 10. Whatever the case, the significance of his connections can be judged by the fact that he was exiled. Though Philostratos asserts otherwise (T 2b), it seems clear that Dio was in fact formally exiled, both from Rome and presumably Italy (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 232-3, citing *Orat.* 1.50) and from Bithynia (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 233, citing *Orat.* 19.1-2) and indeed for many years (*Orat.* 40.2), ending only following the death of Domitian (*Orat.* 45.2; von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 230-2). It thus ended after September 96, perhaps early in 97, having begun at the date in the 80s at which the associated Roman notable incurred Domitian's wrath. If it was T. Flavius Sabinus, it cannot have been as early as 82, as for instance Emperius and von Arnim thought (A. Emperius, 'De exilio Dionis Chrysostomi', in F.G. Schneidewin (ed.), *Adolphi Emperii Brunopolitani Opuscula philologica et historica* (Göttingen 1847), 102-9, at 105; Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 231), because Sabinus must actually have entered his consulship to appear on the Fasti, contrary to the story of his death (Stein, 'Flavius (169)', 2614-5).

**Before the exile**, interest has been taken in Vespasian's expulsion of the philosophers except Musonius (see Cassius Dio 65.13, 65.13.2), usually said to have occurred in AD 71 (see J.L. Moles, 'The career and conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *JHS* 98 (1978), 79-100, at 85 n.56), but maybe rather during the censorship in 73 (also consistent with Cassius Dio 65.13, and cf. Suet., *Dom.* 8). This expulsion may well have been the occasion for Dio's lost diatribe *Against the Philosophers* and maybe for another lost work hostile to (at least some) philosophy, entitled *To Musonius* (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 150-1; Moles, 'Career', 85-6). These works were used by Synesius, *Dio* 1, at the beginning of the 5th century, to deduce that Dio, thanks to his exile, had undergone a conversion from sophist to philosopher, a view that was accepted at the formative point in Dio studies represented by, for instance, the work of von Arnim in the 1890s. Following on from this somewhat Pauline view of Dio, the dating of his works became partly a matter of how philosophical or merely rhetorical they seemed (for a worthwhile attempt at a chronology of the speeches, see Jones, *Roman World*, 133-40). The later 20th century and the 21st have reacted instinctively against the clear contours of this position, preferring a Dio that always mixed the philosophical with the rhetorical-sophistic and recognising that Synesius was rather projecting his own psychology onto Dio (see especially H. Seng, 'Die Kontroverse um Dion von Prusa und Synesios von Kyrene', *Hermes* 134 (2006), 102-16). There is however some grounding for Synesios' view in Dio himself (cf. Moles, 'Career', 96) and in Dio's model, Diogenes, as represented by Plutarch (*de tranq. animi* 467c, quoted in the Commentary on T 4), however 'disingenuous' we may choose to find it.

The truth probably lies between these two positions. Philosophical conviction cannot have run very deep if he found it expedient to support the régime's expulsion of philosophers in the early 70s, though it may be a question of which philosophers, given that Musonius was on this occasion excepted but eventually, like Dio (because of the same social circle and at the same time?), exiled according to Lucian (*Peregrinus* 18). On the other hand, he represents his exile as leading him to soul-searching including even a visit to the Delphic oracle with implicit homage to Socrates (*Or.* 13.9; living the intertext) and in retrospect he describes how he developed a habit of philosophising in response to people's expectations of him (*Or.* 13.11-12). However sceptical we are about constructed self-images,

there is nothing implausible about the disorienting experience of exile driving Dio into his philosophy and into questions about what matters in life. It is likely too that most of the work which we have of Dio's dates from after his exile; it is this work that propagates that image, one which was powerful with all audiences – leading even to the story that on a particular occasion (Philostratos, *Lives of the Sophists* 1.7) Dio was privileged to accompany Trajan in his triumphal chariot and that Trajan kept turning to him saying 'I do not know what you are saying but I love you as I love myself', rather implausibly as though Trajan knew no Greek (the story is generalised in Photios, *Bibl. cod.* 209 *init.* and from there in the *Suda*, δ 1240).

The *Getika* belongs somehow with his exile. Its inspiration appears ethnographic, a revival of the spirit of Herodotos and Aristeeas of Prokonnesos (see on T 2a), but the real comparand, other than the travels of Apollonios of Tyana as imagined by Philostratos, is the moral ethnographic curiosity of Poseidonios (*BNJ* 87); the latter is visible at several points in the *Getika*, see Commentary e.g. on F 4, and more generally in Dio's works, esp. *Or.* 72, cf. P. Desideri, *Dione di Prusa: un intellettuale greco nell'impero romano* (Florence 1978), Index, 621; see also, e.g., F. Wilhelm, 'Zu Dion Chrys. Or. 30 (Charidemus)', *Philologus* 75 (1918), 364-83, with the comments of J.L. Moles, 'The Dionian Charidemus', in S. Swain (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom: politics, letters, and philosophy* (Oxford 2000), 187-210, at 201 & n. 40. Though Dio appears not to have made his journey to the Getai immediately following his banishment as he had planned, going overland from Borysthenes (T 4), at some point he evidently did reach them sufficiently closely to obtain information about them and their history. Indeed, at the very end of his exile, at the death of Domitian, he is found, according to Philostratos (*Lives of the Sophists* 1.7), in the Roman camp, obviously in Moesia (von Arnim, *Leben und Werke*, 305-6) amongst the Getai. So Philostratos' story goes, he cast aside his rags, Odysseus-like, and leapt onto an altar to harangue the troops so that they would not mutiny. Philostratos goes so far as to say that he frequently visited the camps incognito in his rags. If so, his interest in human life and behaviour might be one driver, just as maintaining confidential contacts with those who might have the influence to bring about the rescinding of his banishment might be another. Whatever the circumstances, it is perhaps likelier that at a time of high international tension, his successful visits to the Getai were amidst the Roman military than amongst barbarians who spoke little or no Greek.

As a description of a barbarous people redeemed by their spirit and by their surprising tints of civilisation, Dio's *Getika* would have borne comparison with the *Germania* of his contemporary, Tacitus rather than with the lost 20 bks on the *Wars with Germany* of Pliny the Elder (Pliny, *Ep.* 3.5.4). However, it was also firmly in the Greek philosophical tradition: the distinct class of the *pilleati/tarabostesei* had for Dio something of the allure of the Druids for Poseidonios (and Diodoros and Caesar); and instructive writing resulted from the mirage of praiseworthy philosophy and wisdom amongst *Naturvölker* which is enshrined in the Zamolxises and Dekainises of this corner of the world (see on F 1; and on F 4.67, 69). Dio may not wholly have believed in his own mythology, given that he later refers casually to the 'accursed Getai' (τοὺς καταράτους Γέταις, *Or.* 48.5 of around AD 105, Jones, *Roman World* 139). However, the work may have served to encapsulate Dio's world-view as it settled out during his exile, in which the pursuit of wealth, fame and bodily pleasures was not everything (*Or.* 13.13). As *philosophical* history and ethnography, it may represent the last flowering of the spirit of Poseidonios (*BNJ* 87).

*Getika* were also written by Dio's only slightly younger contemporary, another 'friend' of Trajan, Kriton of Pieria (*BNJ* 200 with Banchich's commentary; J. Benedum, Kriton (7) *RE* Suppl. 14 (1974), 219-220). That was plainly a work more concerned with Trajan's campaigns than with ethnography (see Banchich on *BNJ* 200 T 1) and was used by Cassius Dio. Dio Chrysostom's work, however, may be largely Domitianic: it probably derives substantially from his exile. If so, it was quickly overtaken by events.

## 707 Bibliography

H. von Arnim, *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa* (Berlin 1898).

D. Dana, 'Les Daces dans les ostraca du désert oriental de l'Égypte: Morphologie des noms daces', *ZPE* 143 (2003), 166-86.

J.L. Moles, 'The career and conversion of Dio Chrysostom', *JHS* 98 (1978), 79-100.

Th. Mommsen, *Jordanis Romana et Getica, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 5.1 (Berlin 1882).

W. Schmid, 'Dion (18)', *RE* 5.2 (1905), 848-77.

S. Swain, 'Reception and Interpretation', in S. Swain (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom: politics, letters, and philosophy* (Oxford 2000), 13-50.