

BARBARIANS OF THE BLACK SEA REGION IN THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN CONSTANTINE I AND LICINIUS*

Sergey Vladimirovich YARTSEV**
Olga Igorevna KRAYUSHKINA***

Introduction

This article is dedicated to the complicated question of the role and the significance of barbarians in the struggle between emperors Constantine I and Licinius I. Most of the facts we know are from various written sources about the two Augustus' confrontation, and can be used to draw certain conclusions about the sequence of events. The most important of these events are the attack of the Sauromatus barbarians from Palus Maeotis, led by their king Rausimodus, against Constantine's estate (at an unspecified date shortly before 323 AD) and the Gothic invasion in 323 AD. It is not unlikely that both these invasions were connected with plots hatched by Licinius. At the beginning, the march of Rausimodus, king of the Sauromatus to the Empire's borders could be related to the fighting within the Roman state.¹ It is very likely that this was one of the last attempts by barbarians to arrange a predatory aggression using a Bosporan fleet.

Chapter 53 of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' treatise *De Administrando Imperio* named *Ἱστορία περὶ τοῦ κάστρου Χερσονόου* [Story of the city of Cherson] is a very specific source. It includes five different plotlines that tell us about events of ancient Crimean history. However, the information in this source is quite difficult to understand and to interpret. The main complications for the author were that the events in the text are unique and were written in a time distant from Constantine's epoch. Also, the fictional style of the source causes scholars to doubt its trustworthiness and reliability. Most scholars consider Porphyrogenitus' treatise to be one of the most significant sources on the history of the Black Sea region from the 1st century BC to the 3rd-4th centuries AD.² However, a few doubt its trustworthiness.³

One of the most important subjects of the manuscript is the text's second plot, where it is written of Constantine that:

* The paper was executed within the assignment from Russian Federation Ministry of Education and Science, no. 2014/389 (research work' lot no. 1799).

** Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University, Tula Region, Russian Federation; e-mail: s-yartsev@yandex.ru.

*** Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University, Tula Region, Russian Federation; e-mail: jkzkray@mail.ru.

¹ Stephenson 2009, p. 179.

² Bolgov 1996, p. 9; Zubar' 1998, p. 23-24; Yurochkin 1999, p. 272; Vasiliev 2002, p. 8-14.

³ Frolova 1989, p. 199; Aibabin 1999, p. 47-48.

when he came to Byzantium, and certain of those in Scythia revolted against him, he called to mind what had been said by his father Constant concerning the affection of the Chersonites and their alliance, and he sent envoys to the country of the Chersonites, with the instructions they should go to the country of the Scythians and fight those who had revolted against him. The chief magistrate and the primate of the Chersonites was at that time Diogenes, son of Diogenes, and the Chersonites gladly obeyed the imperial mandate and with all zeal constructed the military wagons and the arbalests and arrived at the Ister River and, having crossed it arrayed themselves against the rebels and routed them.⁴

The war of the Chersonites and rebels described in this source is usually dated between 323 and 337 AD.⁵ In many cases it correlates with the 5th century Byzantium historian Zosimus' book *Ἰστορία νέα*,⁶ which tells of the events preceding the renewal of the conflict between Constantine and Licinius:

Constantine hearing that the Sauromatus, who dwelt near the Palus Maeotis, had passed the Ister in boats, and pillaged his territories, led his army against them, and was met by the barbarians, under their king Rausimodus. The Sauromatus attacked a town which was sufficiently garrisoned, but its wall was built in the lower part of stone, and in the upper part of wood. They therefore thought that they might easily take the town by burning all the wooden part of the wall; and with that view set it on fire, and in the meantime shot at those who stood on the walls. The defenders threw down darts and stones upon the barbarians, and killed many of them; and Constantine then coming up and falling on them from a higher ground, slew a great number, took more alive, and put the rest to flight. Rausimodus, having lost the greater part of his army, took shipping and crossed the Ister, with an intention of once more plundering the Roman dominions. Constantine, hearing of his design, followed them over the Ister, and attacked them in a thick wood upon a hill, to which they had fled, where he killed many of them, amongst who was Rausimodus. He also took many of them prisoners, giving quarter to those that would submit; and returned to his head-quarters with an immense number of captives.⁷

By analysing these sources in connection with the political and diplomatic realities of this period, we can draw some conclusion regarding the real role of the barbarians in this war.

Methodology

The methodological basis of this study is the principle of a multi-faceted approach to the sources, combining the analysis of literary sources with archaeological information, including the use of epigraphy and numismatics. Furthermore, the research was undertaken based on the principle of historicism, i.e. that we can observe in their successive and logical bringing to light the events and their mutual conditionality, whilst trying to be as objective as possible in reconstructing processes which took place in the past.

⁴ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, 53. 125-160.

⁵ Zubar' 1998, p. 156.

⁶ Ibid.; Sharov 2002, vol. I, p. 211-213.

⁷ Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, II. 21.

The choice of these concrete methods was influenced by the specific features of the selected sources. The main method of this study is source analysis, which was used in order to interpret and value the two main literary sources, both of which describe the same episode in the history of the northern Black Sea region. Next, we attempted to realize the connection of these two works and to critically verify them. Then, using available archaeological and epigraphic information, we drew conclusions based on the historical-reconstructive method.

Results

According to these two narratives, in the first case the war was waged on the territory of Empire, but in the second case also to the north of Roman lands. In fact, it seems obvious from the main plotline of *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος* that the narrator was referring to the passage of the Chersonite army from the north to the south coast of the River Ister. In other words, in this story the terrestrial route of the allies' advance and the war on the imperial lands is described. However, it is strange, to say the least, that the Chersonites chose such a long route along the northern Black Sea coast steppe just when Constantine needed help extremely quickly. It is likely that the details of the story, including the Chersonites' passage across the Ister, are of later origin and stray very far from historical reality. Probably the narrator knew only that a Chersonite troop took part in the emperor's struggle on Constantine's side and that a mutiny in Scythia was scotched. For this reason, we are unable to use the details given in this source to identify the place where the events we are interested in occurred.

However, the Chersonite troops were duty-bound to take part in operations in the Danube region as a condition of the process of the city's submission to the Prefect of the East.⁸ Moreover, it was this place in which the province of Scythia in the diocese of Thrace⁹ was situated, according to *Nomina provinciarum omnium* (an official list of Roman provinces of 297 AD). *Laterculus Polemii Silvii* by Ptolemy Silvius of 449 AD includes two provinces of the same name: no. 4 - Lower Scythia in Thrace and no. 6 - Scythia in Illyricum (near Pannonia).¹⁰ If the Scythia of *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος* is a Roman province,¹¹ then the military operations described in this source were held precisely on this territory. But in that case we encounter a discordance between the location of the battle in *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος* and that in Zosimus' narrative. The different type of military actions described in these two sources also suggests that they describe two completely separate events. Rausimodus' predatory incursion in Zosimus' narrative cannot be interpreted as the rebellion described in *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος*. Moreover, Zosimus tells of the emperor's participation in the battle, something which the author of *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος* definitely could not have avoided mentioning. For this reason, we believe that these two narratives tell of different occurrences which can only be indirectly connected with each other.

⁸ Budanova 2001, p. 140.

⁹ Zubar' 1998, p. 159.

¹⁰ SC II. 447.

¹¹ Strabo, *Geographica*, VII. 4, 5; 5, 12.

It is known that the Balkan Peninsula was an important issue between Constantine and Licinius.¹² In 317 AD, they finalised a truce and divided the empire. Constantine got the western part of the state, including Upper Moesia. However, Littoral Dacia, Thrace with Lower Moesia and Scythia passed to Licinius. Traditionally, governing the Chersonese was a prerogative of Lower Moesia's deputy.¹³ Consequently the Roman administration in Chersonese submitted to Licinius, but not Constantine.¹⁴ Therefore, on the one hand we have no proof against the possible participation of the Chersonese army in the struggle on Constantine's side. But on the other hand, it is essential to note that this could only have happened after the battles of Adrianople and Chrysopolis (324 AD) because before this Chersonese was administratively connected with the eastern part of Licinius' empire.¹⁵ Consequently, Constantine Porphyrogenitus' and Zosimus' narratives cannot describe the same historical event, but do describe the same historical period.

Moreover, from analysing the text it is obvious that Rausimodus' incursion to the Empire must have preceded the mutiny in Scythia chronologically. According to Zosimus, this incursion happened a short time prior to the final struggle for power between the two Augusts, but not specifically in 322 AD.¹⁶ The chronological proximity of the Maeotic incursion and the Goths' breakthrough into Thrace and Moesia in 323 AD raises the question of why Zosimus does not mention the Goths' invasion when describing Rausimodus' campaign in detail. This fact has caused many scholars to identify Azovian Sauromatus Rausimodus with the Goths.¹⁷ As we know from Zosimus' narrative, the Goths were defeated by Constantine and after returning his captives they asked the emperor for a truce.¹⁸ Moreover, it was the Goths' invasion which began the final combat between the two Augusts.¹⁹ Despite Constantine's victory over the Goths, his invasion of Licinius' territory became a cause for the latter to blame Constantine for penetrating the frontier and for declaring war.²⁰ In our opinion, it is impossible to equate all these events: the Sauromatus incursion headed by Rausimodus (shortly before 323 AD),²¹ the Goths' invasion in 323 AD and the mutiny against Constantine in Scythia (after 323 AD). But indubitably, all of them are links within the same chain of events connected with barbarian participation in the two Augusts' struggle for power.

In connection with the preceding information, at first glance the sequential historical reconstruction seems the most verisimilar. Shortly before the war between Constantine and Licinius, in the late 310s - early 320s, the Maeotic

¹² Ermatinger 2004, p. 62.

¹³ Van Dam 2008, p. 441, 452.

¹⁴ Sharov 2002, p. 211.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 212.

¹⁶ Zubar' 1998, p. 157.

¹⁷ Rappaport 1899, p. 110; Schmidt 1934, p. 81, 225; Stallknecht 1969, p. 34; Wolfram 1983, p. 62-63.

¹⁸ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, V. 21.

¹⁹ Southern 2001, p. 252.

²⁰ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, V. 21.

²¹ Kulikowski 2007, p. 81.

Sauromatus' campaign occurred. They had allied relationships with Licinius via Bosporan and Chersonese mediation. This is the reason why the barbarians ravaged only Constantine's territory and went so far west along the Roman state.²² The suggestion that this invasion was based on the confrontation between the two Augusts seems preferable to the hypothesis that the Sauromatus bypassed Dacia via the northern route because German tribes had settled in this region.²³ In response to the invasion, in 323 AD the Goths broke the defence of the limes in Thrace, which was now in Licinius' state.²⁴ The fact that they asked Constantine, not Licinius who owned the territory they invaded, for a truce²⁵ suggests, to the authors' minds, that they had a secret alliance with Constantine, who inspired them to invade with the aim of unsettling the situation.²⁶ Prima facie, this version is confirmed by the evidence that both Augusts actively used barbarian tribes in their confrontation.²⁷ According to certain sources, some Goths appeared on Constantine's side.²⁸ But in the other sources we can find information implying that the Goths fought for Licinius, for example, in the battle of Chrysopolis in 324 AD.²⁹ Henceforth, being locked up in Thessalonica, Licinius began negotiations with the Goths, relying on them in order to regain power. But the conspiracy was unveiled and the Quondam August was put to death.³⁰

Despite being very logical, this historical reconstruction certainly simplifies the real situation in the northern periphery of the ancient world.

Firstly, we should point out that the theory introduced here - that Constantine inspired the Goths' invasion in order to provoke conflict with Licinius and take Thrace - is quite hypothetical. It cannot be resolved with the murders and pillages committed by the Goths in Thrace and Moesia and real military action between Constantine and the Goths.³¹ We should remember that before this time, judging from epigraphic memorials, Constantine fought against the Goths more than once and even gained the title Gothicus Maximus.³² In 322 AD he finally defeated the Goths,³³ signed a treaty with them³⁴ and, as a result, completely changed his policy towards them.³⁵ After this, the Goths "furnished him forty thousand men to aid him against various people. This body of men, namely, the Allies, and the service they rendered in war are still spoken of in the land to this

²² Sharov 2002, p. 213.

²³ Ibid., p. 213-214.

²⁴ Kulikowski 2007, p. 82.

²⁵ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, V. 21.

²⁶ Sharov 2002, p. 213.

²⁷ Potter 2004, p. 378-379.

²⁸ Iordanes, *Getica*, 111.

²⁹ Burckhardt 1949, p. 80.

³⁰ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, V. 27.

³¹ Kulikowski 2007, p. 82.

³² CIL II. 481; VIII. 8477, 8412, 23116; *Articles* 2011, p. 76; Bardill 2012, p. 282.

³³ Orosius, *Histories*, VII. 28; Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus*, XLI, 12; Eusebius, *Chronicon*, 2348; Isidorus Hispalensis, *Historia de regibus Gotthorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum*, 5.

³⁴ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, VI. 31; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I. 18.

³⁵ Van Dam 2008, p. 92.

day.”³⁶ For this reason, we cannot believe that Constantine deliberately inspired the Gothic invasion of Thrace and Moesia; however there were a lot of individual Goths fighting against Licinius in his army.³⁷

Secondly, from analysing archaeological material from the hillfort of Belinskoe, we can infer that around the same time, Bosporan territory was attacked and a frontier city defending the western borders of the Bosporan kingdom was defeated. The hillfort of Belinskoe is situated in the northern part of the Kerch Peninsula, 30 km from Kerch and 4 km from the Azovian coast. The Belinskaya archaeological expedition, headed by V. G. Zubarev, has been working on the site since 1996. The authors of the excavation reports identify the hillfort in its later stage with one of the most powerful barbarian aggregations of the northern Black Sea region of that time: the Goths-Thetraxites-Trapesites.³⁸ For example, a hole relating to one of the destroyed houses was filled with the contemporaneous stratum of destruction from about 320-330 AD; however we cannot exclude the possibility that the hole could have already been filled up. At the bottom of this hole, 12 coins from within a narrow period of coinage were found, the last of them dating from 318 AD. (Also, in the upper ashen stratum overlapping the demolition, two Reskuporid coins from 322 and 326 AD were found.) Furthermore, the filling of the hole and the destruction of the house occurred between 318 and 322 AD.³⁹ Radiocarbon analysis of charcoal pieces originating from the stratum of fire from a time synchronous with the destruction of the building indicates the end of the first quarter of the 4th century is the most likely date.

Thus it becomes possible to correlate Zosimus’ written narrative about the barbarian campaign from Palus Maeotis to Pannonia with these archaeological artefacts. Evidently, at the end of the 310s the tribal community of Palus Maeotis was stirring to action, and before going west they decided to attack Bosporan territory.⁴⁰ The northern flank of the Usunlar rampart, where one of the main passages from the steppe to the territory of the European Bosphorus was situated, suffered very much.⁴¹ Therefore, those of the Palus Maeotis from the northern coasts of Azov at that moment must have been enemies of the Romans and could not have been allies with any of them.

Thirdly, a certain inconsistency in the plotline of fragments from the *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρον Χερσώνος* also provokes interest. In the first plot there is a statement about the extremely important strategic role of the Chersonese, whose duty was to fight from the rear with Bosporians and the Palus Maeotis barbarians, who decided to rise against the Romans. However, in the second war this duty was completely ignored, as we can see from the second plot: the Chersonite troop went in completely the opposite direction to the Danube, then some of the barbarians

³⁶ Iordanes, *Getica*, 112.

³⁷ Budanova 2001, p. 141.

³⁸ Zubarev, Yartsev 2008, p. 117-126.

³⁹ Yurochkin, Zubarev 2001, p. 464-465; Zubarev 2011, p. 244-247.

⁴⁰ Zubarev 2002, p. 123-125.

⁴¹ Yermolin 2006, p. 91.

who stayed in Maeotis and Bosphorus did not fight against Rome at that time. Nevertheless, the second plot tells us about the disagreement between the Chersonese, Bosphorus and Maeotic barbarians. So, while certain barbarians fought against the ancient states, others, on the contrary, maintained peaceful relationships with the antique world.

The contradiction between these facts might be explained by considering the circumstances of the last attempt of the Maeotae to migrate to Asia Minor in 276-284 AD, as a result of which they were completely defeated.⁴² This event made them realize that it was impossible to live only on the spoils of pillaging under these changed circumstances. Moreover, as a result of the restoration of Roman power in the provinces of Asia Minor, all these territories became inaccessible to the Maeotic tribes.⁴³ It was necessary for the survivors to choose new routes and find their place in the existing political systems of the nations of the Black Sea region. Therefore, they were forced to agree treaties with the Roman-Bosporan administrations in order to receive fertile parcels of land as military settlers. However, the period covered by these first agreements with antique centres would have been very unstable. This is why conflicts within barbarian society are reflected in the events we are interested in. Many of the Palus Maeotis, headed by Rausimodus, who supported the earlier practices of predatory campaigns and began to openly fight against antique world, set out against the segment of the Palus Maeotis who tried to maintain peaceful relationships with the Bosporan Kingdom.

Probably these internal conflicts were accompanied by deep controversies in the religious field connected with the expansion of Christianity into barbarian society.⁴⁴ As far as we know, the process of barbarian society's division into Christian and non-Christian segments took place later in the lands of Ermanaric, who forced everyone to worship his pagan laws,⁴⁵ and Athanaric who persecuted the Goths-Arians, who certainly were Christians. There were even Christian barbarians, headed by Ulfilas, who had to ask Emperor Constantius II (337-361 AD) to let them settle on imperial territory.⁴⁶ Certainly, this process of ideological destruction of barbarian society through the installation of Christian ideas was also taking place in the lands of the northern Azov coast, where many Christians lived (most of them were captured or came over to the barbarians' side voluntarily).

We cannot ignore the possibility that the aggressive Maeotic barbarians might have moved as far along Roman borders as Pannonia only because they wanted to attack Constantine's territories. It was this August who carried out a policy of supporting Christianity in the western part of the empire, whereas Licinius persecuted Christians and actively supported paganism in his eastern

⁴² Yartsev 2008, p. 320.

⁴³ Isaac 1990, p. 323.

⁴⁴ Van Dam 2008, p. 176-177.

⁴⁵ Iordanes, *Getica*, 123.

⁴⁶ Budanova 2001, p. 177-180.

territory.⁴⁷ He built a whole flotilla of 400 military ships in Bosphorus with the money he ravaged from churches.⁴⁸

Thus the two Augustus' confrontation altered the complicated political situation among barbarian societies within the Azov region. We should pay attention to the fact that Rausimodus, in order to sail his warriors across the Ister, could use only the ships of his own fleet, not vessels owned by local barbarians.⁴⁹ We suppose that the Palus Maeotae must have captured Bosphoran ships at this time. It can be inferred that their purpose would have been to attack Bosphorus. In other words, it might have been a new attempt to undertake a predatory naval campaign by barbarians who lived near Azov against Bosphorus. If this was true, the Maeotae did not care who they sacked.

However, when Rausimodus reached the Danube's outfall and approached Licinius' lands, he came into contact with the Augustus' representatives. By applying diplomatic skills and making use of intertribal rivalries, the military administration, relying upon their allies among the Danubian Goths (who helped to arrange new attacks), was able to redirect the barbarian fleet to the western lands of Constantine, so causing a new aggravation of the conflict between the two Augustus. So, Licinius used the Goths as a proxy to attack the Maeotans and forcibly redirect them towards Constantine's territory. Also, we consider that such a selective attack (only on Constantine's lands) could have been an obligatory condition for leasing the Bosphoran fleet to the Maeotae. In an attempt to get rid of their dangerous neighbours, the Bosphoran government expressly directed them as far as possible to the distant lands of the other Augustus, Constantine. We suspect that such a decision could not have been reached without Licinius' sanction. The reasons behind Rausimodus' barbarian incursion could have been the same as those driving the Goths' in 323 AD. It is possible that Licinius even agreed a secret treaty with Goths to allow them to pass through his lands. This could be the reason he moved his troops away from the Gothic coast.⁵⁰

Discussions

H. Wolfram believed that Licinius' allies among the Goths who helped him in his final battle for power were the same tribes that were at war with Constantine in 323 AD.⁵¹ It may have been they who helped Maximian, Licinius' predecessor as governor of the eastern provinces, in his war against the Persians:

The Goths had already returned home when they were summoned at the request of the Emperor Maximian to aid the Romans against the Parthians. They fought for him faithfully, serving as auxiliaries.⁵²

For this reason, we can assume that having already been arrested, Licinius tried to incite a rebellion against Constantine in 325 AD with their help. The

⁴⁷ Bardill 2012, p. 282.

⁴⁸ Vlasov 2001, p. 128.

⁴⁹ Lavrov 2000, p. 336.

⁵⁰ Wolfram 1983, p. 92.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁵² Iordanes, *Getica*, 110.

discovered plot, Licinius' attempt to escape, and his re-arrest and execution in Thessaloniki provide evidence that Constantine was very firm in his neutralization of the mutiny that menaced his power. The Danubian barbarians, including the remains of Rausimodus' army, may also have participated in the plot. We believe that it was these final throes of the two Augustus' battle for power - including the rebellion - that served as the historical basis for the second plotline in *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος*. If this is the case, then Chersonese warriors also took part in the conflict. However, the sources do not provide certainty when speaking of Licinius' last attempt to return himself to authority.⁵³ Some authors - for example, Zosimus - dissemble when it comes to providing facts about the rebellion,⁵⁴ others speak ambiguously about it. Moreover, we know nothing about the situation in the lands near the imperial frontier at that time, at least in the province of Scythia where, according to *Ιστορία περί τοῦ κάστρου Χερσώνος*, the Chersonese warriors distinguished themselves. In this connection, we should note that Scythia was at that point underneath Licinius who, in preparation for the battle against Constantine, "sent messengers to every nation, commanding them to prepare a sufficient number of men for the navy, besides horse and foot soldiers."⁵⁵ Therefore Scythia, which bordered the barbarian lands where the tribes supporting Licinius were located, would not have been able to remain detached from the main political events of that moment.

We should pay attention to the fact that the rebellion against Constantine in Scythia was raised after his arrival in Byzantium.⁵⁶ The evidence points directly to 324 AD, because in this year the emperor besieged Licinius, who found shelter in Byzantium after his defeat near Adrianople.⁵⁷ However Licinius left the besieged city very soon afterwards in order to recruit new soldiers.⁵⁸ It seems to us that at the time, Constantine, who had recruited plenty of ships,⁵⁹ promptly mobilized all his forces including troops from Chersonese. It is interesting that Chersonese had taken Constantine's side unconditionally even before Licinius was completely beaten. His main defeat took place near Chrysopolis in September 324 AD.⁶⁰ It may seem very tempting to suppose that Rausimodus' campaign also occurred in 324 and that its purpose was to help Emperor Licinius, and thus it was determined to be a mutiny.⁶¹ This would mean that around the same time as the Chersonese administration came over to Constantine's side, a group of Maeotae and maybe Bosporians decided to support Licinius, and so arranged a military incursion to the Danube. However, as well as the differences in details of the rebellion and the

⁵³ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, V. 28-29; Eutropius, *Eutropii Brevitarius*, X. 6; Aurelius Victor, *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 41.7; Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, 13.1; Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 1.7; Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 1.4.

⁵⁴ Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, II. 28.2.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, II. 22.

⁵⁶ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*, 53.125.

⁵⁷ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, 24; Aurelius Victor, *De Caesaribus*, 41.8.

⁵⁸ Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, II. 25.2.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, II. 26.1.

⁶⁰ Anonymus Valesianus, *Origo Constantini Imperatoris*, 27.

⁶¹ Sharov 2002, p. 212.

pillage described above, we also encounter a contradiction with Zosimus' chronology of Rausimodus' campaign. We should remember that this campaign occurred not long before the final battle for power between the two Augusts. The timing of the Palus Maeotis invasion of Bosphorus in 318-322 AD as confirmed by analysis of archaeological artefacts does not fit with the suggested new dating of the Maeotic campaign in 324 AD. So assuming the version about Chersonese warriors' participation in the final combat between the emperors and the suppression of the rebellion against Constantine is reliable, we must accept that it was not connected with the attack by Maeotic barbarians upon imperial territory. Rausimodus' campaign had to precede all these events. However, in any case this predatory raid was pronounced anti-Constantine in character. If Maeotic barbarians nevertheless were supported by Bosphorus and Licinius, then taking into consideration the close connections between Constantine and Chersonese, we can clarify why the conflict between two antique states on the Peninsula arose.

Conclusions

As a consequence of the situation described above, the systemic crisis of Azov barbarian society in 300-320th AD finished with the departure of the hostile elements of the Maeotic barbarians to the Danubian borders of empire. As a result, a complicated situation arose there because of the instability of the Danubian tribal society. Moreover, for many years the empire had been suffering from the conflict between the two emperors, in which both of them used different tribes for their own aims.

As we can see, Rausimodus' predatory incursion into the Roman Empire affected this conflict greatly. It seems likely that it was Licinius who arranged Rausimodus' attack against his enemy's lands, because such a selective barbarian raid could not have occurred by accident. Certainly, the Bosphoran kings also could have been one of the reasons for the conflict, as they directed the Maeotae attacking Bosphorus to Constantine's provinces. Nevertheless, the barbarians could not have ventured to undertake such an initiative without Licinius' permission. Apparently, Rausimodus' death and Constantine's defeat of his army may have triggered the final battle for power between the two Augusts. Licinius, who incited the Maeotic attack against Constantine's lands, received information about their defeat and had to let this group of Palus Maeotis pass through his territory, as this was his only opportunity to help the barbarians get to his adversary's lands. However, they were defeated by Constantine and very soon Licinius (the main provoker of the military conflict) was also beaten. The subsequent plot and rebellion led to his death. Finally, we should note that Chersonese warriors took part in all significant events of that time, as reflected in *Ιστορία περί τοῦ πόλεμου Χερσώνος*.

However, this is only one episode in the long period of struggle between the two Augusts. To give a broader perspective, a further study might examine the role of barbarians in other political conflicts in the northern Black Sea region in the 4th century AD as one of the main markers of the Great Migration.

**Barbarians of Black Sea Region in the Struggle between
Constantine I and Licinius**

(Abstract)

This article is dedicated to the complex question of the role and the significance of barbarians in the struggle between emperors Constantine I and Licinius I. Most of the available facts are from various written sources about the two Augustus' confrontation, and can be used to draw conclusions about the sequence of events. The most important of these events are the attack of the Sauromatus barbarians, led by King Rausimodus, against Constantine's estate (shortly before 323 AD) and the Gothic invasion in 323 AD. It is very likely that both these invasions were connected to plots hatched by Licinius. In the first case, war was waged on the territory of Empire, but in the second case territory to the north of Roman lands was also attacked by the barbarians. From analysing archaeological material from the hill fort of Belinskoe, we can infer that Bosporan territory was attacked in the same period and a frontier city defending the western borders of the Bosporan kingdom was defeated. Despite a number of treaties signed between barbarian tribes and the Romans, many barbarians, headed by Rausimodus, who supported the earlier practice of predatory campaigns and began to fight openly against antique world, set out against those barbarian tribes who tried to maintain peaceful relationships with the Bosporan Kingdom. It is possible that Rausimodus' march to the Empire's borders could have been related to the internal fights taking place within Roman state between Constantine and Licinius, and also to religious matters, as Licinius supported paganism and Constantine Christianity. It is even possible that Licinius agreed a secret treaty with the Goths to allow them to pass through his lands. The episode analysed here is only one in the long period of struggle between the two Augusts.

Bibliographical Abbreviations

- Aibabin 1999 - A. I. Aibabin, *Jetnicheskaja Istorija rannevizantijskogo Kryma*, Simferopol, 1999.
- Articles* 2011 - *Articles on Gothicus Maximus, Including: Constantine I, Justinian I, Marcus Claudius Tacitus, Aurelian, Claudius Gothicus, Probus*, New York, 2011.
- Bardill 2012 - Jonathan Bardill, *Constantine, Divine Emperor of the Christian Golden Age*, Cambridge, 2012.
- Bolgov 1996 - N. N. Bolgov, *Zakat antichnogo Bospora*, Belgorod, 1996.
- Budanova 2001 - V. P. Budanova, *Goty v Jepobu Velikogo Pereselenija Narodov*, Saint Petersburg, 2001.
- Burckhardt 1949 - Jacob Burckhardt, *The Age of Constantine the Great*, New York, 1949.
- CIL - *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.
- Ermatinger 2004 - J. W. Ermatinger, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Westport (Connecticut), 2004.
- Frolova 1989 - N. A. Frolova, *Vtorozhenija varvarskih plemen v goroda Severnogo Prichernomor'ja po numizmaticheskim dannym*, in *SA*, 4, 1989, p. 190-224.
- Isaac 1990 - Benjamin Isaac, *The Limits of Empire: The Roman Army in the East*, Oxford, 1990.
- Kulikowski 2007 - Michael Kulikowski, *Rome's Gothic Wars: From the Third Century to Alaric*, Cambridge, 2007.
- Lavrov 2000 - V. V. Lavrov, *Vostochnye germancy v Priazov'e v III-IV vv. n.je.*, in *SPACA*, 4, 2000, p. 331-341.
- Potter 2004 - David S. Potter, *The Roman Empire at Bay, AD 180-395*, London, New York, 2004.
- Rappaport 1899 - Bruno Rappaport, *Die Einfälle der Goten in das römische Reich bis auf Constantin*, Leipzig, 1899.

- SC - *Senatus Consulta*.
- Schmidt 1934 - L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum Ausgang der Völkerwanderung*, vol. 1, *Die Ostgermanen*, Munich, 1934.
- Sharov 2002 - O. V. Sharov, *Reskuporid V i Konstantin Velikij*, in *BF*, 1, 2002, p. 210-215.
- Southern 2001 - Patricia Southern, *The Roman Empire from Severus to Constantine*, London, 2001.
- Stallknecht 1969 - Bernt Stallknecht, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Aussenpolitik in der Spätantike (306-395 n. Cbr.)*, Bonn, 1969.
- Stephenson 2009 - Paul Stephenson, *Constantine: Unconquered Emperor, Christian Victor*, London, 2009.
- Van Dam 2008 - Raymond Van Dam, *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*, New York, 2008.
- Vasiliev 2002 - A. A. Vasiliev, *Bosporskij car' na Dunae (k interpretacii gruppy kochevnicheskikh podbojnyh pogrebenij nachala IV v. v Budz'bake)*, vol. II, *The Bosporan Phenomenon*, Saint Petersburg, 2002.
- Vlasov 2001 - S. M. Vlasov, *Konstantin Velikij*, Moscow, 2001.
- Wolfram 1983 - H. Wolfram, *Geschichte der Goten, von der Anfängen bis zur Mitte der sechsten Jahrhundert*, Munich, 1983.
- Yartsev 2008 - S. V. Yartsev, *'Bosporskikh skifov' s rimljanami 276 g. (novaja interpretacija neodnoznamennyh sobytij)*, in *BospChT*, 9, 2008, p. 319-323.
- Yermolin 2006 - A. L. Yermolin, *Lokalizacija mesta protivostojanija gunnov i gotov na Kerčenskome poluostrove*, in *DB*, 9, 2006, p. 87-102.
- Yurochkin 1999 - V. Yu. Yurochkin, *Jetno-političeskaja situacija v pozdneantichnoj Tavrike v sočinenii Konstantina Bagrijanorodnogo i arheologičeskie realii*, in *Problemy skifo-sarmatskoj arheologii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja (sbornik trudov k 100-letiju B. N. Grakova)*, Zaporizhja, 1999, p. 270-282.
- Yurochkin, Zubarev 2001 - V. Yu. Yurochkin, V. G. Zubarev, *Kompleks s monetami IV veka iz raskopok Belinskoe*, in *DB*, 4, 2001, p. 454-465.
- Zubar' 1998 - V. M. Zubar', *Severnyj Pont i Rimskaja imperija (seredina I v. do n.je. - pervaja polovina VI v. n.je.)*, Kiev, 1998.
- Zubarev 2002 - V. G. Zubarev, *Nekotorye voprosy pozdneantichnoj istorii Evropejskogo Bospora po rezul'tatam raskopok gorodishha u s. Belinskoe*, in *DB*, 5, 2002, p. 123-125.
- Zubarev 2011 - V. G. Zubarev, *K voprosu o zapadnoj granice Bospora vo vtoroj polovine IV - nachale V v. n.je.*, in *BF*, 2011, p. 244-247.
- Zubarev, Yartsev 2008 - V. G. Zubarev, S. V. Yartsev, *K voprosu o religioznoj zhizni i jeticneskoj identifikacii varvarov Severnogo Priezov'ja i Kryma pozdneantichnogo perioda*, in *BI*, XIX, 2008, p. 113-128.

Keywords: Northern Black Sea region, Roman Empire, barbarians, diplomacy, war, rebellion.

LISTA ABREVIERILOR

- AAR-SI** - Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice. Academia Română. București.
- AAust** - Archaeologia Austriaca, Beiträge zur Paläanthropologie, Ur- und Frühgeschichte Österreichs. Wien.
- AB** - Altarul Banatului. Arhiepiscopia Timișoarei și Caransebeșului și Episcopia Aradului. Timișoara.
- ActaArchCarp** - Acta Archaeologica Carpathica. Cracovia.
- ActaArchHung** - Acta Archaeologica. Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.
- ActaMN** - Acta Musei Napocensis. Cluj-Napoca.
- ActaMP** - Acta Musei Porolissensis. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă Zalău.
- ActaPal** - Acta Paleobotanica. Polish Academy of Sciences. Krakow.
- AÉ** - Archaeologiai Értesítő a Magyar régészeti, művészettörténeti és éremtani társulat tudományos folyóirata. Budapest.
- AHA** - Acta Historiae Artium. Akadémiai Kiadó. Budapest.
- AIIC(N)** - Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „George Bariț”. Cluj-Napoca.
- AIAC** - Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj. Cluj-Napoca (din 1990 Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „George Bariț”).
- AIIAI/AIIX** - Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași. (din 1990 Anuarul Institutului de Istorie „A. D. Xenopol” Iași).
- AISC** - Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice. Cluj.
- AJA** - American Journal of Archaeology. New York.
- AJPA** - American Journal of Physical Anthropology. The Official Journal of the American Association of Physical Anthropologist. Baltimore.
- Almanahul graficeii române** - Almanahul graficeii române. Craiova.
- Aluta** - Aluta. (Studii și comunicări - Tanulmányok és Közlemények). Sfântu Gheorghe.
- AnB** - Analele Banatului (serie nouă). Timișoara.
- Angustia** - Angustia. Muzeul Carpaților Răsăriteni. Sfântu Gheorghe.
- Antaeus** - Antaeus. Communicationes ex Instituto Archaeologico Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae. Budapest.
- AnthAnzeiger** - Anthropologischen Anzeiger. Journal of Biological and Clinical Anthropology.
- Antiquity** - Antiquity. A Quartely Review of World Archaeology. York.
- AnUB-LLS** - Analele Universității din București - Limba și literatura străină. Universitatea din București.
- AO** - Arhivele Olteniei. Craiova; serie nouă (Institutul de Cercetări Socio-Umane. Craiova).

AP	- Annales de Paléontologie. L'Association paléontologique française.
APR	- Acta Palaeontologica Romaniae. Romanian Society of Paleontologists. Bucharest.
Apulum	- Apulum. Acta Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii Alba Iulia.
Archaeologia Bulgarica	- Archaeologia Bulgarica. Sofia.
Archaeometry	- Archaeometry. Research Laboratory for Archaeology & the History of Art. Oxford.
ArchMühely	- Archeometriai Mühely. Budapest.
Arheologia	- Archeologia. Organ na Archeologičeskija Institut i Muzei pri Bulgarskata Akademija na Naukite. Sofia.
ArkhSb	- Arkheologičeskij sbornik. Muzey Ermitazh. Moskva.
AS	- American Studies. Mid-America American Studies Association. Cambridge (USA).
ASS	- Asian Social Science. Canadian Center of Science and Education. Toronto.
ASUAIC-L	- Analele Științifice ale Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași (serie nouă). Secțiunea IIIe. Lingvistică. Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași.
AT	- Ars Transilvaniae. Institutul de Istorie și Arheologie Cluj-Napoca. Cluj-Napoca
ATS	- Acta Terrae Septemcastrensis. Sibiu.
AUASH	- Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
AUASP	- Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica. Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918” din Alba Iulia.
AUCSI	- Analele Universității din Craiova. Seria Istorie. Universitatea din Craiova.
Australiada	- Australiada: A Russian Chronicle. New South Wales. Woy Woy (Australia).
AUVT	- Annales d'Université „Valahia” Târgoviște. Section d'Archéologie et d'Histoire. Universitatea Valahia din Târgoviște.
AVSL	- Archiv des Vereins für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Sibiu.
BA	- Biblioteca de arheologie. București.
Banatica	- Banatica. Muzeul de Istorie al județului Caraș-Severin. Reșița.
Balcanica	- Balcanica. Annuaire de l'Institut des Études Balkaniques. Belgrad.
BAMNH	- Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History. American Museum of Natural History. New York.
BAR	- British Archaeological Reports (International Series). Oxford.
BB	- Bibliotheca Brukenthal. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
BCMI	- Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice / Buletinul Comisiei Monumentelor istorice. București.

BerRGK	- Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Frankfurt am Main.
BF	- Bosporskij fenomen. Gosudarstvennyj Ermitazh Sankt-Peterburg.
BGSG	- Bulletin of the Geological Society of Greece. Geological Society of Greece. Patras.
BHAB	- Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Banatica. Muzeul Banatului Timișoara.
BI	- Bosporskie issledovanija. Krymskoe Otdelenie Instituta Vostokovedenija, Nacional'na akademija nauk Ukraini. Simferopol, Kerch.
BMA	- Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis. Muzeul Național al Unirii Alba Iulia.
BMAntiq	- Bibliotheca Memoriae Antiquitatis. Piatra Neamț.
BMN	- Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis. Muzeul de Istorie a Transilvaniei. Cluj-Napoca.
BMS	- Bibliotheca Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica”. Sebeș.
BOR	- Biserica Ortodoxă Română. Patriarhia Română. București.
BospCht	- Bosporskie chtenija. Bospor Kimmerijskij i varvarskij mir v period antichnosti i srednevekov'ja. Militaria. Krymskoe Otdelenie Instituta Vostokovedenija. Nacional'na akademija nauk Ukraini. Simferopol, Kerch.
Das Börsenblatt	- Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel-Frankfurter Ausgabe. Börsenverein des Deutschen Buchhandels. Frankfurt pe Main.
Br J Ind Med	- British Journal of Industrial Medicine. London.
Brukenthal	- Brukenthal. Acta Musei. Muzeul Național Brukenthal. Sibiu.
BTh	- Bibliotheca Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
București	- București. Materiale de istorie și muzeografie. București.
Bucureștii vechi	- Bucureștii vechi. Buletinul Societății Istorico-Arheologice. București.
BUS	- Birka Untersuchungen und Studien. Stockholm.
CA	- Current Anthropology. University of Chicago.
Caietele ASER	- Caietele ASER. Asociația de Științe Etnologice din România. București.
Carpica	- Carpica. Complexul Muzeal „Julian Antonescu” Bacău.
CCA	- Cronica cercetărilor arheologice. București.
CCJ	- Chemistry Central Journal. London.
Cele Trei Crișuri	- Cele Trei Crișuri. Oradea.
Cetatea Bihariei	- Cetatea Bihariei. Institutul de Istorie și Teorie Militară din București, Secția Teritorială Oradea.
CIRIR	- Cercetări istorice. Revistă de istorie românească. Iași.
CL	- Cercetări literare. Universitatea București.
Codrul Cosminului	- Codrul Cosminului, seria nouă. Analele Științifice de Istorie, Universitatea „Ștefan cel Mare” Suceava.
ComȘtMediaș	- Comunicări Științifice. Mediaș.
ConspNum	- Conspicte numismatice. Chișinău.

Conviețuirea-Együttélés	- Conviețuirea-Együttélés. Catedra de limbă și literatura română a Institutului Pedagogic „Juhász Gyula”, Szeged.
Corviniana	- Corviniana. Acta Musei Corvinensis. Hunedoara.
CPF	- Cahiers des Portes de Fer. Beograd.
CretaceousRes	- Cretaceous Research. Elsevier.
Crisia	- Crisia. Culegere de materiale și studii. Muzeul Țării Crișurilor. Oradea.
CRP	- Comptes Rendus Palevol. Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences France.
Cultura creștină	- Cultura creștină. Publicație apărută sub egida Mitropoliei Române Unite cu Roma Greco-Catolică și a Facultății de Teologie Greco-Catolice din Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca, Departamentul Blaj.
Dacia	- Dacia. Recherches et découvertes archéologiques en Roumanie. București, I, (1924) - XII (1948). Nouvelle série: Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne. București.
Dări de seamă	- Dări de seamă ale ședințelor. Paleontologie. Institutul Geologic al României. București.
DB	- Drevnosti Bospora. Rossiyskaya Akademiya Nauk. Moskva.
De Antiquitate	- De Antiquitate. Asociația Virtus Antiqua. Cluj-Napoca.
DFS	- Deutsche Forschung im Südosten. Sibiu.
DP	- Documenta Praehistorica. Poročilo o raziskovanju paleolitika, neolitika in eneolitika v sloveniji. Ljubljana.
Drevnosti Altaja	- Drevnosti Altaja. Gorno-Altajskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. Gorno-Altajsk (Respublika Altaj).
EHQ	- European History Quarterly. Sage Publications. New York.
EphNap	- Ephemeris Napocensis. Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei, Cluj-Napoca.
EVNE	- Etnokul'turnoe vzaimodeystvie narodov Evrazii. Institut Arheologii i Etnografii Sibirskogo otdeleniya Rossiyskoy Akademii Nauk. Novosibirsk.
FK	- Földtani közlöny. Magyarhoni földtani tarsulat folyóirata. Budapest.
FU	- Finno-Ugrika. Institut Istории imeni Sh. Mardzhani. Akademiya Nauk Tatarstana. Kasan'.
FVL	- Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde. Sibiu.
Geo-Eco-Marina	- Geo-Eco-Marina. Institutul Național de Cercetare-Dezvoltare pentru Geologie și Geoecologie Marină. București.
Glasnik	- Glasnik Srpskog arheološkog društva. Journal of the Serbian Archaeological Society. Beograd.
Glasul Bisericii	- Glasul Bisericii. Mitropolia Munteniei și Dobrogei. București.
Godišnjak	- Godišnjak. Jahrbuch Knjiga. Sarajevo-Heidelberg.
GR	- Gondwana Research. International Association for Gondwana Research, Journal Center, China University of Geosciences. Beijing.
HistArchaeol	- Historical Archaeology. Society for Historical Archaeology.
HistMet	- Historical Metallurgy, The Historical Metallurgy Society.

- HJ** - The Historical Journal. University of Cambridge (UK).
- HSCE** - History & Society in Central Europe. István Hajnal Society of Historians. Medium Ævum Quotidianum Society. Budapest. Krems.
- IJAM** - International Journal of Arts Management. École des Hautes Études Commerciales (HEC) in Montreal.
- IJO** - International Journal of Osteoarchaeology. United States.
- IPH** - Inventaria Præhistorica Hungarie. Budapest.
- Istros** - Istros. Muzeul Brăilei. Brăila.
- JACerS** - Journal of the American Ceramic Society. The American Ceramic Society, Ohio.
- JAS** - Journal of Archaeological Science. Academic Press. United States.
- JFA** - Journal of Field Archaeology. Boston University.
- JLS** - Journal of Lithic Studies. Edinburgh.
- JMH** - Journal of Modern History. University of Chicago.
- JOB** - Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik. Institut für Byzantinistik und Neogräzistik der Universität Wien.
- JPSP** - Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. American Psychological Association. Washington DC.
- JRGZM** - Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums zu Mainz. Mainz.
- JSP** - Journal of Systematic Palaeontology. British Natural History Museum. London.
- JSSR** - Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion. The Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. South-Carolina.
- JVP** - Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology. Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) in partnership with the Taylor & Francis Group. Abingdon, Oxfordshire (UK).
- Közlemények** - Közlemények az Erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum Érem - és Régiségtárából, Cluj.
- Le Glob** - Le Globe. Revue genevoise de géographie. Paris.
- LSJ** - Life Science Journal. Acta Zhengzhou University. Zhengzhou (China).
- LȘ** - Lucrări științifice. Institutul de Învățământ Superior Oradea.
- MA** - Mitropolia Ardealului. Revista oficială a Arhiepiscopiei Sibiului, Arhiepiscopiei Vadului, Feleacului și Clujului. Episcopiei Alba Iuliei și Episcopiei Oradiei. Sibiu (1956-1991). A continuat *Revista Teologică*, (1907-1947) și este continuată de aceeași revistă.
- Marisia** - Marisia. Studii și Materiale. Târgu Mureș.
- Marmatia** - Marmatia. Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Arheologie. Baia Mare.
- Materiale** - Materiale și cercetări arheologice. București.
- MBGAEU** - Mitteilungen der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte. Berlin.
- MCA** - Materiale și cercetări arheologice. București.

ME	- Memoria Ethnologica. Centrul Județean pentru Conservarea și Promovarea Culturii Tradiționale Maramureș. Baia Mare.
MEJSR	- Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research. International Digital Organization for Scientific Information. Deira, Dubai (United Arab Emirates).
MemAntiq	- Memoria Antiquitatis. Complexul Muzeal Județean Neamț. Piatra Neamț.
MIA	- Materialy i issledovaniya po arkheologii SSSR. Akademiya Nauk SSSR. Moskva.
MJSS	- Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. Mediterranean Center of Social and Educational Research. Rome.
Monumente Istorice	- Monumente Istorice. Studii și lucrări de restaurare. Direcția Monumentelor Istorice. București.
Monumente și muzee	- Monumente și muzee. Buletinul Comisiei Științifice a Muzeelor, Monumentelor Istorice și Artistice. București.
MPG	- Marine and Petroleum Geology. Elsevier.
MSIAR	- Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice a Academiei Române, seria a II-a. Academia Română. București.
MTE	- Magyar Történelmi Eletrajzok. Budapest.
Naturwissenschaften	- Naturwissenschaften. Springer-Verlag. Berlin, Heidelberg.
OlteniaȘtNat	- Oltenia. Studii și Comunicări. Științele Naturii. Muzeul Olteniei. Craiova.
ÓL	- Ósrégészeti Levelek. Prehistoric newsletter. Budapest.
PA	- Patrimonium Apulense. Direcția Județeană pentru Cultură Alba. Alba Iulia.
PAPS	- Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. American Philosophical Society. Philadelphia.
PAS	- Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa. Berlin.
PAT	- Patrimonium Archaeologicum Transylvanicum. Cluj-Napoca.
PBF	- Prähistorische Bronzefunde. München.
PLOS ONE	- PLOS ONE. International, peer-reviewed, open-access, online publication.
PM	- Publics et musées. Association Publics et Musées - PUL (Presses universitaires de Lyon). Lyon.
PNAUSA	- Proceedings of the National Academy of the United States of America. National Academy of the United States of America.
Pogrebal'nyj obrjad	- Pogrebal'nyj obrjad rannih kochevnikov Evrazii. Juzhnyj nauchnyj centr Rossijskoj Akademii nauk. Rostov-na-Donu.
Pontica	- Pontica. Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie Constanța.
PPP	- Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology ("Palaeo3"). An International Journal for the Geo-Sciences. Elsevier.
ProblemyArh	- Problemy arheologii, jetnografii, antropologii Sibiri i sopredel'nyh territorij. Institut arheologii i jetnografii Rossijskoj Akademii nauk. Novosibirsk.

Programm Mühlbach	- Programm des evaghelischen Untergymnasium in Mühlbach und der damit verbundenen Lehranstalten. Mühlbach (Sebeş).
PZ	- Prähistorische Zeitschrift. Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie. Berlin.
QG	- Quaternary Geochronology. The International Research and Review Journal on Advances in Quaternary Dating Techniques.
QSA	- Quaderni di Studi Arabi. Istituto per l'Oriente C. A. Nallino. Roma.
Quartär	- Quartär. International Yearbook for Ice Age and Stone Age Research.
RA	- Revista Arheologică. Institutul de Arheologie și Istorie Veche. Chișinău.
RArhiv	- Revista Arhivelor. Arhivele Naționale ale României. București.
Radiocarbon	- Radiocarbon. University of Arizona. Department of Geosciences.
RB	- Revista Bistriței. Complexul Muzeal Bistrița-Năsăud. Bistrița.
REF	- Revista de etnografie și folclor. Institutul de Etnografie și Folclor „Constantin Brăiloiu”. București.
RESEE	- Revue des études sud-est européennes. Academia Română. București.
RHMC	- Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine. Société d'histoire moderne et contemporaine. Paris.
RHSEE/RESEE	- Revue historique du sud-est européen. Academia Română. București, Paris (din 1963 Revue des études sud-est européennes).
RI	- Revista de Istorie (din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
RIR	- Revista istorică română. Institutul de Istorie Națională din București.
RJP	- Romanian Journal of Paleontology. Geological Institute of Romania. Bucharest.
RJS	- Romanian Journal of Stratigraphy. Geological Institute of Romania. Bucharest.
RM	- Revista Muzeelor. București.
RMMG	- Revista Muzeul Mineralogic-Geologic, al Universității din Cluj la Timișoara. Sibiu.
RMM-M	- Revista Muzeelor și Monumentelor. Muzeu. București.
RP	- Revista de Pedagogie. Institutul de Științe ale Educației. București.
RRH	- Revue Roumaine d'Histoire. Academia Română. București.
RT	- Revista Teologică. Sibiu.
SA	- Sovetskaya arkheologiya. Akademiya Nauk SSSR. Moskva.
SAI	- Studii și articole de istorie. Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice a RPR. București.

SAO	- Studia et Acta Orientalia. Société des Sciences Historiques et Philologiques de la RPR., Section d'Etudes Orientales. Bucarest.
Sargetia	- Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane Deva.
Sargetia Naturae	- Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis. Series Scientia Naturae. Muzeul Civilizației Dacice și Romane Deva.
SCE	- Studii și comunicări de etnologie. Institutul de Cercetări Socio-Umane Sibiu.
SCCI	- Studii, conferințe și comunicări istorice. Sibiu.
SCIA	- Studii și cercetări de istoria artei. Academia Română. București.
SciAm	- Scientific American. New York.
SCGG	- Studii și Cercetări. Geologie-Geografie. Complexul Muzeal Județean Bistrița-Năsăud. Bistrița.
SCIV(A)	- Studii și cercetări de istoria veche. București (din 1974, Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie).
SGJ	- Soobshhenija Gosudarstvennogo Jermitazha. Gosudarstvennyj Jermitazh. Leningrad.
SMIM	- Studii și materiale de istorie modernă. Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga” București.
SP	- Studii de Preistorie. București.
SPACA	- Stratum Plus: Archaeology and Cultural Anthropology. Superior Council on Science and Technical Development of Moldavian Academy of Sciences. Saint Petersburg, Kishinev, Odessa, Bucharest.
SPPF	- Società Preistoria Protostoria Friuli-V.G. Trieste.
SSK	- Studien zur Siebenbürgischen Kunstgeschichte, Köln. Wien.
Starinar	- Starinar, Treća Serija. Arheološki Institut. Beograd.
Stâna	- Stâna. Sibiu.
StComSibiu	- Studii și comunicări. Arheologie-istorie. Muzeul Brukenthal. Sibiu.
StComSM	- Studii și comunicări. Muzeul Județean Satu Mare.
StRI	- Studii. Revistă de istorie (din 1974 Revista de istorie și din 1990 Revista istorică). Academia Română. București.
StudiaUBBG	- Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Geologia. Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
StudiaUBBGG	- Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Geologia-Geographia. Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
StudiaUBBGM	- Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Geologia-Mineralogia. Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
StudiaUBBH	- Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai. Series Historia. Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai” Cluj-Napoca.
Suceava	- Anuarul Muzeului Județean Suceava.
SUCH	- Studia Universitatis Cibiniensis, Serie Historica. Universitatea „Lucian Blaga” Sibiu.
SUPMPh	- Studia Universitatis Petru Maior. Philologia. Târgu-Mureș.
SV	- Siebenbürgische Vierteljahrschrift. Hermannstadt (Sibiu).

SympThrac	- Symposia Thracologica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
TEA	- TEA. The European Archaeologist.
Terra Sebus	- Terra Sebus. Acta Musei Sabesiensis. Muzeul Municipal „Ioan Raica” Sebeș.
TESG	- Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie. Royal Dutch Geographical Society. Oxford (UK), Malden (USA).
Thracο-Dacica	- Thracο-Dacica. Institutul Român de Tracologie. București.
Transilvania	- Transilvania. Foaia Asociațiunii Transilvane pentru Literatura Română și Cultura Poporului Român. Brașov.
Transsylvania Nostra	- Transsylvania Nostra. Fundația Transsylvania Nostra. Cluj-Napoca.
Trudy nauchnogo	- Trudy nauchnogo Karel'skogo tsentra Rossiyskoy akademii nauk. Karel'skiy tsentr Rossiyskoy akademii Nauk. Moskva.
TT	- Történeti Tár. Akadémia történelmi bizottságának. Budapest.
Tyragetia	- Tyragetia. Muzeul Național de Arheologie și Istorie a Moldovei. Chișinău.
Țara Bârsei	- Țara Bârsei. Muzeul „Casa Mureșenilor” Brașov.
Ungarische Revue	- Ungarische Revue, Herausg. von P. Hunfalvy. Budapest.
UPA	- Universitätsforschungen zur Prähistorischen Archäologie. Berlin.
Vestnik arkheologii	- Vestnik arkheologii, antropologii i etnografii. Institute problem osvoyeniya Severa Sibirskogo otdeleniya Rossiyskoj akademii nauk. Tyumen.
Vestnik Novosibirskogo	- Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Serija: Istoriya, filologiya. Novosibirskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. Novosibirsk.
VLC	- Victorian Literature and Culture. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge (UK).
VPUI	- Vestnik permskogo universiteta. Istoriya. Permskiy Gosudarstvennyi Universitet. Perm'.
VR	- Victorian Review. Victorian Studies Association of Western Canada. Toronto.
WASJ	- World Applied Sciences Journal. International Digital Organization for Scientific Information. Deira, Dubai (United Arab Emirates).
WorldArch	- World Archaeology. London.
Xenopoliana	- Xenopoliana. Buletin al Fundației Academice „A. D. Xenopol” Iași.
Yearb. Phys. Anthropol.	- Yearbook of Physical Anthropology. New York.
Yezhegodnik gubernskogo	- Yezhegodnik gubernskogo muzeya Tobol'ska. Tobol'sk Khistori Muzeum. Tobol'sk.
ZfSL	- Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde. Gundelsheim.
Ziridava	- Ziridava. Muzeul Județean Arad.
ZooKeys	- ZooKeys. Sofia.