



## BUREBISTA, THE DEFENDER AND UNIFIER OF THE DACIANS

Lect. Habil. Mădălina STRECHIE, PhD\*

Burebista was the founder of a genuine empire of the Dacians north of the Danube, not only the first unifier of the Dacians who coagulated them in a state, with a centre of power, with laws and a common religion, but more than that, Burebista was the first of all Thracians to succeed in founding a true regional power in the vast world of European antiquity. The brilliant statesman is a model of European leader, being even equal to Caesar, because he defeated the Celts/Gauls like the great Roman general and politician. Burebista defended the borders of all Dacians by stopping the great Celtic/Gallic migration, transforming the Dacian territories into a Dacian Island, strong and unitary, the Celtic/Gallic wave flowing far south of the Danube, far from the border of Burebista's Dacia. The Dacian state of Burebista was created by the military and reforming capacity of the creator, who bequeathed the ideal of unity to this Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic space, proving by his deeds and his imperial creation that power and defence always stand in unity.

**Keywords:** Northern Dacians; military leaders; conflict; monarchy; empire; unification of tribes; reforms; militarized state.

This study aims to bring back to the attention of historiography the remarkable personality of Burebista, the first unifier of the Thracian tribes, the creator of the first Dacian unitary state. Unjustly ignored by researchers at present, Burebista was a visionary and a true framer of the country, even of the nation, proving that the state is superior, precisely by uniting its nation, to any tribal unions, no matter how numerous they might be. In the context of classical antiquity, Burebista successfully fits into the gallery of the great leaders of Europe, a strategist as talented as Pericles (especially since his Dacia was much more important territorially and militarily, compared to the thalassocracy of the first of the strategists of Athens), a politician as ambitious as Caesar (the conqueror of all Gaul, but especially the visionary of an international Rome), he was also a pioneer who had never existed before his times (like Alexander the Great, the conqueror of the world), and as a reformer and founder of nation he was like Darius I, (the greatest of ancient leaders), especially since they both offered their nation a monotheistic religion, thus unifying the spirits of their subjects too.

Therefore, taking into account all the above-mentioned considerations, the subject concerning

Burebista is very generous for scientific research, relying on a generous bibliography, even if, to an overwhelming extent, it dates from the last century and is exclusively Romanian. Just as Caesar is given what is Caesar's, so too, because of the similarities of the deeds of the two political and military leaders, it is necessary to give Burebista the attention he deserves, as he is unmatched in his deeds by any Dacian, or by a descendant of the Dacians.

We dedicate this study *to the memory* of the special warrior PAVEL CORUȚ, a great admirer of the Dacians, a gifted writer, a true patriot, and a model for his readers, who is now writing the adventures of his heroes, the angels. We express our deep regret for his passing away, as he has gone to the world of the stars.

### The name of the unifier and its significance

*Nomen est omen*, (*The name is predestination* – our transl.) is an old Latin saying that fully applies to the great leader of all Thracians, Burebista, the only one of all the Thracians who managed to unify some Thracian tribes (the Dacians) in one state.

According to most Romanian historians, especially the specialist in Burebista, Ion Horațiu Crișan, Burebista was "a great personality" (Crișan 1975: 58), the name of the Dacian leader announced his great deeds. Thus, according to Strabo, who mentions in his *Geographia* the name of the illustrious political and military leader:

\*University of Craiova

e-mail: [madalinastrechie@gmail.com](mailto:madalinastrechie@gmail.com);  
[madalina.strechie@edu.ucv.ro](mailto:madalina.strechie@edu.ucv.ro)

"Boerebistas, a Getic man, taking the leadership of his people, raised these wicked men in endless wars and directed them by abstinence and sobriety and obedience to commands (laws), so that in a few years he founded a great kingdom and subjugated most of the neighbouring populations to the Getae..." (Crişan 1975: 61)

The historian quoted above, and not only him, carries out detailed and relevant research on the name, giving the following interpretations to the meaning of the name of Burebista:

a. "the brilliant one"; b. "the noble one"; c. "the strong one", achieving comparative linguistics studies, also using Sanskrit, where there is the word *bhuri-h = abundant, strong, much* and *bho-s-k* (like *bostes* of the Dacians - our emphasis) which meant *brilliant, noble, well known* (Crişan 1975: 62). All the historians who dealt with Burebista reached the same conclusion as Ion Horaţiu Crişan with regard to the name (Berciu 1979: 7-10) (Vulpe 1968: 33-55) (Petolescu 2010: 43-58), which seemed to mean: "the strong and brilliant one", also demonstrated by the deeds of Burebista who was the greatest and most brilliant of all Thracians, not only of all Dacians.

We consider that the fourth significance added to the three meanings is correct and obvious, that is why it might have been ignored, because it was the simplest translation of the name, d. "the leader of the Boers" or "the most brilliant of all Boers", especially since the Boers were one of the Dacian tribes. The argument for this significance is the Indo-European warrior tradition of names. It is well known that the Aryans had the name *bharata* for tribal chiefs, always with military duties. This is demonstrated by the longest epic of mankind, *Mahabharata*, also translated as the *great war*.

So, the military qualities were a *sine qua non* condition for the ancient leaders, which was also demonstrated by the Celts with whom Burebista had numerous campaigns. Thus, almost every Celtic tribal leader was also called *rix*, which is more a military commander, less a *king*, given that the Celts never had a unitary kingdom. The Dacians had the rank of *tarabostes* (similar to the *bharati* of the Aryans), i.e. the nobles of the Dacians, who, like the *rix* of the Celts, had the status of military commanders, noble warriors and political leaders.

Burebista was, to paraphrase a famous series, the first by his name, even the first of all Thracians

who imposed his name in eternity by his energy and ambitions, offering through himself the meaning of the *most brilliant* of all Thracians and Dacians together.

### **Burebista, the Get or the Dacian?**

There are many controversies about the core of Burebista's power, namely where the kingdom of Dacia began, if Burebista was a Get, that is, beyond the Carpathian arch, or a Dacian, inside the Carpathian arch. The conclusion is not clear. We consider that Burebista was from outside the Carpathian arch, namely a Get from Muntenia, but from Northern Muntenia, from the Curvature Carpathians, not from the Muntenia Plain.

Hadrian Daicoviciu and other prominent historians do not reach a clear conclusion regarding the branch to which Burebista belonged, whether he was a Get or a Dacian.

However, it seems that the base of his power was somewhere in the plain of Southeastern Muntenia (Daicoviciu 1968: 112), but there was also an important power in Transylvania at that time, the cradle of Decebal's Dacia. (Daicoviciu 1968: 114-115)

These two hypotheses about whether Burebista was a Get or a Dacian (Vulpe 1968, 33-55) (Berciu 1979, 7-10) (Petolescu 2019, 43-58) (Crişan 1979, 103-119) (Cicoare 1977-1979, 503-506) (Crişan 1975) (Valea şi Nistor 1995-1996, 253-256) were discussed by most of those who studied the Burebista phenomenon, but none states a certainty due to the lack of written sources from that time.

As mentioned above, we argue in favour of the Getic origin of the great Burebista, but from the branch of the Getae in Northern Muntenia, more precisely the Curvature Carpathians, possibly the Buzău Mountains for the following reasons:

- The geographical position of the Curvature Carpathians allowed Burebista to rapidly enter Transylvania, but also get access to the Danube and the Black Sea where he cooperated with the Greek colonies (hence the Decree of Acornion) (Crişan 1975) (Daicoviciu 1968); at the same time, he had an open path to the region of today's Moldova, both to the region of Romanian Moldova and to that of the Republic of Moldova, to the Dniester;

- In the Curvature Carpathians there are many Thracian traces, so prior to the Dacian state founded by Burebista, which demonstrates that the founding



of a state had mandatorily a tradition of organizing political and military power;

- In the Buzău Mountains there are many Thracian and Dacian religious constructions, which explains the religious reform that Burebista imposed along with his state. The worship of Zamolxis began with Burebista, so we can assume that the Sacred Mountain or *Kogaionon* also began to be worshiped during this period by the Dacians. The cult of Zamolxis presupposed the existence of some caves, or nests in the mountains, a requirement of the cult, which exists in the Buzău Mountains, some caves not being fully explored even today.

Along the same line, the naming of a Sacred Mountain for the Dacians meant some impressive phenomena for the common people, which would give it the epithet of sacred. These phenomena still exist today in the Buzău Mountains and in the Curvature Carpathians and we will mention a few: the Berca Muddy Volcanoes, the Living Fire of Lopătari, the Salt Hill, the Bozioru landscape, the amber of Colți, the seismic region of Vrancea and others. From the current Buzău region you can go both to Transylvania through Gura Teghii and to Vrancea and Moldova through Bisoca. Moreover, the salt deposits of the Salt Hill located in the communes of Mânzălești, Lopătari, but also along the villages of Sări, Sărulești, Meledic offered the Dacians an extremely important economic resource, with which they most certainly traded with the Greeks from the Black Sea and not only. Economically, the area was very generous because a state needed economic resources to support itself. The trade with the Greek colonies was much more favourable for the Dacians from this side of the Carpathians than for the Dacians beyond the Carpathians;

- In the whole region of the Curvature Carpathians there are still vines today, which Strabo mentions: "the Getae ... were persuaded to destroy their vineyards and live their lives without wine." (Crișan 1975: 151) The destruction of the vineyards was necessary in order to destroy the habit of the Thracians, implicitly of the Dacians, to drink wine, a habit called by the Romans *mos Tracicum*, which involved that wine was drunk in large quantities, without any water or honey, according to the Roman habit. This Thracian habit was everywhere in the Balkans, even Alexander the Great borrowed it, so the Greeks also embraced it.

Moreover, the wine god Dionysos himself, although from the Greek pantheon, was of Thracian origin, as was Orpheus.

So, the destruction of the vineyards began on the territory of Burebista, after which it spread wherever his power spread. The soil of the Curvature Carpathians is still very suitable for the cultivation of vines, we can mention the viticultural area of Vrancea, but also that of Pietroasele, Merei, Istrița in Buzău County, etc.

- The proximity of Buzău to the Prahova area, especially to the Bucegi Mountains where many Thracian and Dacian artifacts were discovered;

- The plot for the assassination of the most brilliant Dacian was possible because of the tarabostes from Transylvania, who profited the most after the death of Burebista, considered an outsider, because he might have been a Get, because the nucleus of the next Dacian state would appear in Transylvania, which would not coagulate the free Dacians located in the region of the Curvature Carpathians and Moldova and beyond. *Cui profuit?* (To whom was Burebista's death a benefit?) The centre of Transylvania (the center of the Orăștiei Mountains) (Daicoviciu 1968, 110) is the only political centre of the Dacians out of the four or five that broke away from Burebista's empire after the assassination of the extraordinary leader, which became a kingdom.

So for all these reasons it is not wrong to consider Burebista a Get, from the branch of the Dacians outside the Carpathians, that is why he had such a great vision of his power, which was not closed in the Carpathian arch, on the contrary his power encompassed the entire Carpathian arch, bordering the Sea, the Tisza, the Dniester, the Danube as a whole, because he controlled its sources (river that had a sacred role in the Dacian mentality) and the mountains beyond it. Burebista was the one who saw the borders of Dacia beyond the estates of the Dacian tarabostes, who unfortunately did not share his great vision.

### The empire of Burebista

#### *Reforms for the foundations of the state of all Dacians*

Burebista achieved the first union of the Geto-Dacians, very quickly, reaching the creation of the first and "greatest barbarian power in Europe."

(Crişan 1975, 62) For the creation of a power which had never existed before in the world of all Thracians, not only Dacians, but an institutional model was also needed. Therefore, Burebista's model was, according to Hadrian Daicoviciu, "the model of the states that arose on the ruins of the Empire of Alexander the Great." (Daicoviciu 1968, 97) So Burebista's state was a military monarchy, with a strong military imprint, just like the Hellenistic kingdoms, ruled by *diadochi*, former generals in the phalanxes of Alexander the Great.

Every state need institutions and reforms (laws) to mark its existence. That is why Burebista carried out four great reforms, like Darius I the Great, the titan of the Persians who organized the most efficient empire, which was surpassed as a political organization only by the Roman Empire.

The most important of Burebista's reforms, as in the case of Darius I, was the *religious reform*, because he needed to be followed by the Dacians he wanted to unite, both leaders imposed a monotheistic religion in essence: Darius the Zoroastrianism, and Burebista the cult of Zamolxis. Strabo describes that Deceneu was with Burebista and "made predictions" (Crişan 1975, 149). This was the closest collaborator of the Dacian unifier, he was "the high priest, with the duties of a true viceroy." (Daicoviciu 1968, 98) So, the architect of the religious reform was certainly Deceneu, the high priest, and also a true prime minister, who offered advice to the king. He embodied the Dacian intellectual, just as the Druids were to the Celts, there was a striking resemblance in terms of the role of Deceneu to the role and duties of the Druids. In all Indo-European civilizations there was a chief of the religious cult (*Zoroaster*, magician = priest for the Persians, *Druids* for the Celts, *Ephorians* for the Spartans, *Pontifex Maximus* for the Romans, a quality that the emperor himself would exercise, etc.) who had a decision-making role in the politics of the states of these Indo-European civilizations. Strabo calls him a *sorcerer*, but Deceneu certainly was like the Great Druid of the Celts, as described by Caesar, who was a physician, astronomer, astrologer, counsellor to the king and educator of the people, interpreter of the will of the gods and source of wisdom. Darius I the Great reformed Mazdaism through Zoroaster, thus imposing Zoroastrianism, a monotheistic religion, but also a standard of Persian education. Similarly, Burebista,

with the wisdom of Deceneu, imposed the cult of Zamolxis to the Dacians, so that they would follow him, and he would offer a common point to all Dacian tribes. At this point the main Dacian totems were established, especially the institutional totem - the wolf. The spirits had to be united first, and religion was the most effective means. We support this through the social symbolism of the wolf, which alone is not a feared predator, but in the pack it is a leading predator in the food chain. Burebista was the alpha wolf, due to the religious reform, so he was followed by the Dacians everywhere, being invincible, until the pack revolted.

The laws that Strabo tells us about are most likely the creation of Deceneu, the reformer and one of the institutional founders of Dacia. He is the one who convinced the Dacians "to destroy their vineyards and live their lives without wine" (Crişan 1975, 151), because a nation needs organization to make a state, and an army needs discipline, hierarchy, and solidarity, just like a pack of wolves (Strechie 2017b, 369-375). Certainly, the unification of the Dacians was done not only voluntarily, but also by force since a plot to assassinate Burebista was successful. However, we consider the religious reform to be the key reform, without which the other reforms would not have been successful. This religious reform is the one that lasted, even after the disappearance of Burebista. At the time of Decebal, there was the cult of Zamolxis, even Deceneu, which proves that the High Priest of the Dacians was not a name, but a function, as we demonstrated above.

Another very important reform was the *economic reform*. All the great Romanian historians who dealt with the research of the Dacians consider that the accomplishment of Burebista's state was due first of all to the economic unification and at the same time to the unprecedented economic development (Crişan 1975, 7-10) (Daicoviciu 1968, 33-55) (Pârvan 1982) (Valea, Nistor 1995-1996, 253-256) (Berciu 1979, 7-10) (Petolescu 2010, 43-58) (Vulpe 1968). The Dacians had innumerable resources and very good trade relations, especially with the Greeks, but through the Greeks with other nations. A very important resource was salt, but also precious metals. Precious metals were the main resource of the Dacians in the Carpathian arch, so it seems that they were the ones who organized the plot to assassinate the brilliant king, because



*Auri sacra fames*, (*Hunger for gold is cursed* – our transl.) as Vergilius said, and they did not want to share this resource with all Dacians, and especially this resource to be available to Burebista, an outsider. Although this reform was very important for the achievement of the great power of all Dacians, it was a short-term one, because after the assassination of Burebista, but also long after that, there was no economic unity of all Dacians, during the reign of Decebal, the free Dacians had economic ties with Dacia, but one cannot speak of an economic unity. It was one of the reforms that gave way very quickly after the death of the unifier of the Dacians, being most likely one of the causes of his assassination.

*The political reform* was another basic reform that involved two components: a. *the reform of foreign policy* and b. *the reform of internal policy*. This reform, even when Burebista was alive, was incomplete and showed weakness, because there were no institutions and administration, at least no written or archaeological sources have been preserved. If we compare the empire of Burebista with the Persian Empire of Darius I the Great, in the case of the Persian titan, the administrative reform was the best implemented reform, it had the same vigour as the religious and the economic reforms. Moreover, in the implementation of the political reform, in its administrative and institutional components, Darius I associated his army, militarizing the administration and the institutions, which ensured the full success of his military reform. In the case of Burebista, the political reform (as well as the economic and military ones) was the weakest, due to the multitude of privileges of the Dacian tarabostes, regardless of their geographical position, privileges which were only partially renounced, a renunciation for a common interest rather than out of conviction.

The only successful component of Burebista's political reform was *foreign policy*. His power relations with the Greeks, who were a kind of allies of his, offered him opportunities for the international trade. He also had diplomatic agreements with the Greeks if we consider Acornion (Crişan 1975). Also, through the Greek allies, Burebista had diplomatic relations with Rome during the triumvirate, even negotiating with Pompeius, nicknamed the Great, promising him Dacian help in the civil war in which he confronted Caesar (Daicoviciu 1968: 108).

*The success of foreign policy* is due exclusively to the charisma and intelligence of the most brilliant of the Dacians, Burebista, because he knew how to make a great policy at regional level and not only, being on an equal footing with the greatest of the ancient world at that time, the Romans, those who mattered especially in the European world. After Rome, Burebista's Dacia was the most important power structure in Europe because it was a state.

The relationship with Rome was one of mutual surveillance, however, the fact that he was one of the negotiators who chose Pompeius' camp (Daicoviciu 1968) demonstrates Burebista's qualities as the strongest regional leader, who also had the military force to intervene in the conflict between the two former triumvirs, Pompeius and Caesar. We think that Burebista did not make the wrong choice between Caesar and Pompeius, by choosing the latter, because in Rome all power was concentrated in the hands of Pompeius, so Pompeius would have had every chance of winning. No one inferred or expected General Caesar to show his genius and charisma on the occasion of this civil war. He had the vision of open borders like Burebista. And, like Burebista, he was an outsider, and if at Pharsalus Pompeius had resorted to Burebista's help, Caesar would probably have been defeated, for he won by a brilliant artifice. So, from a diplomatic, military and political point of view Burebista chose the camp well, the alliance with Rome was not available to everyone, usually it was Rome that allied with someone, the reciprocal being an exception, as Burebista was an exception.

How was the negotiation with Rome possible? Even a negotiation at the highest level, we would say, because Pompeius represented the Roman state, he was not a natural person in conflict with someone. The answer would be that due to the military force, the Dacians often robbed Moesia long before the two leaders, a direct witness being the unfortunate Ovid, who in his work refers to the multiple expeditions of the Dacians across the Danube and beyond (Strechie 2017a, 199-216), thus proving that in the Balkan region the Dacians were the ones who mattered.

*The military reform* did not have a longer life, than the one of the founder of the Dacians' united power. It functioned during the Celtic campaigns more as a consequence of religious reform, and less as a result of comradeship in arms or fighting



unity. We will describe the Celtic campaigns below, they were a common point of alliance and not of fusion between Burebista's troops and the troops of the Dacian tarabostes. Burebista's army, which was the spearhead of the Celtic campaigns and not only, was the "personal army" made up of "national elements" and "Thracian mercenaries", therefore the leader of such an army could decide a lot in the region where he exercised power (Crişan 1975, 163-171).

Strabo appreciated that Burebista's army amounted to 200,000 soldiers, which some historians consider exaggerated (Daicoviciu 1968, 107), but Vasile Pârvan considered it an adequate number, especially since the renowned scientist believed that Burebista's Dacia had about a million people (Crişan 1975, 168). We consider that the number of 200,000 people for Burebista's troops, in their entirety, including those of the Dacian tarabostes from all over the territory, is not at all exaggerated, because it was a time and society of warriors, and the military occupation was the main occupation, especially in the case of Indo-European civilizations. In addition, troops were needed both for campaigns and for the security of the borders of the Dacian empire and for the royal court.

The royal authority of Burebista was not complete due to the military factor, which most likely was not a unitary one, ie all armed troops be subordinate to the king, the tarabostes had their own troops, which was the biggest mistake of Burebista's management. For the unity and for the royal authority, the unique command of the troops was necessary, it needed to be exercised by the king and the tarabostes should have been subject to him. We consider that the failure of Burebista's empire was caused by the lack of control of the army of all Dacians. Burebista should have forbidden the tarabostes from holding personal troops, because power lies in unity, as demonstrated by the Romans, who clashed three times for the sole command of the army. Again, it is highlighted that the Transylvanian group of the Dacians, which had most of the precious metal resources, could afford to buy mercenaries and privileges, which led to the betrayal of Burebista's royalty, possibly organizing the plot to assassinate the visionary Dacian king.

#### *Campaigns to found the power of all Dacians*

During Burebista's reign, the international situation in European Antiquity was troubled by

numerous conflicts, migrations, and tribal clashes. It was a turbulent political century for everyone, a confrontation for taking power, for revolutionizing it or for preserving it. The Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic region was at a crossroads in the context of the great migration of the Celts/Gauls, who were a sure threat to all Dacians, especially since they were not united. Burebista emerged as king in this context, he was truly the unifier and defender of the Dacians, before the Celtic danger, which in their migration and with their military technology (the Celts/Gauls are the founders of the Iron Civilization, being the best craftsmen of innovative weapons for those times, made of iron, very resistant) could have occupied all the territories of the Dacians. The Celtic threat was real (Daicoviciu 1968, 103).

Since the best defence is the attack, Burebista started the campaign against the Celts who were migrating from their homeland, which was fighting against Caesar, to the Balkan Peninsula, so the territory of the Dacians was very advantageous for the settlement of the Celts. But the Dacian wolves acted like a pack and the Celts were crushed by Burebista in 60 BC (Marin 2010, 23-32). Bohemia was set free from the Celts, Burebista reaching as far as Moravia of today (Daicoviciu 1968, 103). In this context, the Dacians came to be neighbours to the Germanic tribes which Burebista neither confronted nor allied with, because he did not need these tribes to consolidate his power. Thus, the power of Burebista extended in the north to the Forest Carpathians and to the sources of the Danube (Daicoviciu 19968, 104-107), the territory of the Dacians, as confirmed by archaeological discoveries. The North was thus secured, the defeat of the Celts by Burebista was the greatest success in the south-eastern European region, being as important as Caesar's campaign, of course *mutatis mutandis*

After the North, the West was secured, being bordered by the Danube and the Tisza, the South was guarded by the Haemus Mountains and the Danube, the East was controlled by the Greek colonies.

Five years after the Celtic campaign, Burebista began his campaign to conquer the Greek colonies of the Black Sea, colonies also wanted by Rome. Thus, from 55 BC to 48 BC, Burebista conquered the Greek colonies of the Black Sea, reaching Illirya, leaving only Dionyssopolis unconquered, with which he had an old diplomatic and commercial alliance. Thus Olbia, Tyras, Histria, Tomis, Callatis,



Odessos, Messembria, Apollonia and Olbia fell one by one and Burebista was recognized as their master, which led him to rule to the Dniester in the East and to have the Black Sea as neighbour in the South East. (Daicoviciu 1968, 106-107) (Daicoviciu 1971, 89-95)

By subjugating the Greek colonies, Burebista ensured the exit of Dacia to the sea and at the same time a natural frontier of his empire. Also, the economic factor was very important, the sea trade was now directly under the control of the Dacians, and the Dacian territory was diversified including all forms of landscape: mountains, forests, plains, flowing waters and the sea, just like any empire.

The success of Burebista's campaigns is also due to information. The fact that he knew the situation in Rome, namely the confrontation between the two triumvirs, indicates that he had infiltrated people to keep him informed of what was happening in Rome, which makes him a true regional leader and not only, because his Dacia was not below Pompeius' Rome. It was different from the Rome dreamed of by Caesar, but it was about the same as the old, Italic Rome represented by Pompeius.

The campaigns were for the consolidation of his Dacia, his plan of power was carried out, unfortunately the traitors with narrow vision, subject to greed and personal interests, ended his life and thus the dream of the united Dacians. The assassination of the great Burebista was the work of his own tarabostes, most certainly not of his Getae from outside the Carpathians, but those beyond them. Most likely, the Transylvanian faction, which had the most to benefit from the death of the most brilliant of the Dacians, committed the heinous crime. History has harshly paid back for this betrayal because Decebal's Dacia (the betrayal being repeated to some extent) was only part of Burebista's power, which never included all Dacians and because of the lack of unity of the Dacian pack of wolves, it was only a matter of time and tactics to be conquered by the Romans. Dacia, which once negotiated with Rome, became just a province a century later due to its betrayal and the cursed hunger for gold, thus a shadow of the great Dacian empire. The rift that was thus formed by the betrayal of the tarabostes, between the Dacians from Transylvania and the free Dacians, was of gigantic proportions, and the

elimination of the one who, uniting all Dacians, thus defended them, (first from their assimilation by the Celts, Burebista also intuiting the Roman danger, therefore he positioned himself as an ally of Pompeius' ancient, Italic Rome, because allies do not attack each other) was the beginning of the end for independent Dacia. The lack of a unionist faction among the tarabostes, all Getae and Dacians, completed the monstrous crime of eliminating the union of the tribes of all Dacians, in an empire. The most daring and successful dream of all Dacians, the union, died with Burebista.

This criminal betrayal was paid for by Decebal's Dacia, more than 100 years later, when the free Dacians did not intervene in the Dacian conflict with the Romans in Transylvania, because the binder, the alpha wolf of the Dacian wolves, Burebista, had disappeared. Genius attracts more envy than followers, this was also the case with Burebista.

History does not tell what it would have been like if Decebal's Dacia in the wars with the Romans had been the same as Burebista's Dacia. But an answer is certain in the case of this speculation: Burebista's Dacia would have resisted Rome, at least for a longer time, and if there had been no betrayals for the same gold and for the petty interests of narrow-minded leaders, Imperial Dacia would have been an ally of Rome of the type *socius et amicus* (ally as equal and friend – our transl.) and not a client state or province.

### Conclusions

Burebista was the man of his time, he was not only contemporary with Caesar, Pompeius and others, he was their equal. By his energy and will, he created an empire, as important as Italic republican Rome. He was the unifier and defender of the Dacians, the first of all Thracians to show that the most important, after the Persians, of the Indo-European nations were a force that had to be taken into account in the European region. Unjustly minimized by the current Romanian historiography, Burebista was, is and will remain *the most brilliant, strongest, and most important* of all Thracians and Dacians together, like his name, a model of political and military leader regardless of time. His legacy left to the Dacians, and descendants is unity, an ideal put into practice by himself through his deeds and his vision.



REFERENCES

- Berciu, Dumitru. 1979. „Statul geto-dac făurit de Burebista.” *Buridava. Studii și materiale*, no. 3: 7-10.
- Cicoare, Traian. 1977-1979. „Figura lui Burebista în Getica lui Vasile Pârvan.” *Memoria Antiquitatis, Acta Musei Petrodavensis*, No. IX-XI: 503-506.
- Crișan, Ion Horațiu. 1975. *Burebista și epoca sa*. Bucharest: Publishing House for Literature.
- Crișan, Ion Horațiu. 1979. „Statul dac centralizat și independent condus de Burebista.” *Acta Musei Porolisensis*, no. III: 103-119.
- Daicoviciu, Hadrian. 1971. „Burebista și Drobogea.” *Pontica*, No. 4: 89-95.
- . 1972. *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană*. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia Publishing House.
- . 1968. *Dacii*. Bucharest: Publishing House for Literature.
- Marin, Valentin. 2010. „Campania lui Burebista din anul 60 împotriva celților. Scurte considerații de ordin militar.” *Acta Moldaviae Meridionalis* XXXI: 23-32.
- Pârvan, Vasile. 1937. *Dacia. Civilizații străvechi din regiunile carpato-danubiene*. Traducere de Radu Vulpe după textul original francez. Bucharest: Academic Association „Vasile Pârvan”.
- . 1982. *Getica, o protoistorie a Daciei*. Edition, notes, comentaries and afterword by Radu Florescu. Bucharest: Meridiane Publishing House.
- Petolescu, Constantin C. 2010. *Dacia. Un mileniu de istorie*. Bucharest: Publishing House of the Romanian Academy.
- . 1995. *Scurtă istorie a Daciei romane*. Bucharest: Didactical and Pedagogic A.R. Publishing House.
- Strechie, Mădălina. 2017a. „Dacii și lumea lor în Tristia și Pontica ale lui Ovidiu.” *Ovidiu, 2000 de ani de metamorfoze, Lucrările colocviului internațional, Receptarea Antichității greco-latine în culturile europene, IXth Edition, 26-27 May 2017*. Craiova: Universitaria Publishing House.
- . 2017b. „The Dacians, the Wolf Warriors.” Editor „Nicolae Bălcescu” Land Forces Academy. *The 23rd International Conference The Knowledge-Based Organisation*. Sibiu: „Nicolae Bălcescu” Land Forces Academy Publishing House. 369-375. <https://www.degruyter/view/j/kbo>.
- Valea, Mircea, și Anghel Nistor. 1995-1996. „Succinte considerații privind diferențierea socială în societatea geto-dacică în perioada Burebista-Decebal.” *Sargetia. Acta Musei Devensis* XXVI-1: 253-256.
- Vulpe, Radu. 1968. „Getul Burebista, conducătorul întregului neam geto-dac.” *Argesis. Studii și comunicări*. Argeș County Muzeum.