

Chapter III

PROVINCIA DACIA AUGUSTI:

165 years of Roman rule on the left bank of the Danube.

At the beginning of the 2nd century, in the Spring of 101AD, Roman Forces marched against the Kingdom of Decebal. We already know what the Roman's rationale was for starting this war and we also know that the real reason was likely to have been the personal ambition of the first Provincial Emperor, Trajan (he was born in Hispania a man of Macedonian background among Greeks). The Roman armies marched against a client-state of Rome, which was a subordinate ally of Rome. Decebal did not want to wage war against Rome and his recurring peace offers confirm this. It is unlikely that Trajan would only have decided on the total conquest of the Dacian Kingdom after he waged his first campaign in 101-102. After this, Roman garrisons were established in the Province - their ongoing presence is reflected by the Latin names of towns (as recorded by Ptolemy). At Dobreta they begin to build the stone bridge which will span the Danube. It was built in accordance with plans made by Apollodorus of Damascus to promote continuous traffic - it was an accomplishment unmatched - even by Rome. This vast project portends that Trajan began the expedition against Dacia in 101 with the intention of incorporating the Kingdom into the Roman Empire. The Emperor, who founded a city (Nicopolis) to commemorate his victory over Dacia, has embarked on this campaign not only for reasons of personal ambition. The

economic situation of the Empire was dismal at the beginning of Trajan's reign; by the end of the second Dacian War it has vastly improved. The writings of Kriton, the Emperor's physician, constituted the basis of a report by Johannes Lydus in the 6th century: he describes the amount as taken from the plunder as 5 million litra gold and 10 million litra silver (=1,637,500 and 3,275.000 kilograms respectively). If we assume that they overestimated the booty by 90 % - as is customary - the quantity is still tremendous. This phenomenal Dacian booty causes the value of gold to plunge on the markets of the Empire. The Emperor could afford to bestow lavish gifts upon his people and to finance games in the circus, which lasted 123 days. The gilded statues in the forum - which he had built along with other edifices - bear the inscription 'ex *manubiis*', or 'derived from the booty.' As we can see, there were many economic reasons for the expedition. Indirectly, Trajan alluded to this in the 'official' Roman explanation for the war; he felt offended by the Dacian's annual demand for money. The Emperor, who had been the Dacians' debtor, became their tax collector. The late-Roman Lactantius reports that Trajan taxed the Dacians (*censui subiugati fuerant*, Lactantius: *De mortibus persecutorum*, 23,5). This tax - census - could hardly be anything but a reference to Trajan's pillage of war.

Roman forces numbered about 50,000 men. The divisions took up their position along the Olt, Zsil and Karas rivers. Starting out at Viminacium, Trajan proceeds along the Karas river on his approach to Tapae, the Transylvanian Iron Gate. Only one sentence was left to posterity from his writing about the war: *inde Berzobim, deinde Aizi*

processimus (from here to Berzobis, then on to Aizi). This leads us to believe that this war was not meant to be a sudden attack, but rather a slow procession of troops. After all, the distance between Berzobis and Aizi is a mere 25 km-s and, as far as is known, there was no Dacian resistance. Decebal sent off several emissaries to ask for peace. So did the Burs and other allies of Decebal; according to Cassius Dio, the latter carried a message to the emperor, which was written in Latin - on a large mushroom. The lines are blurred between this story and the report of the vessel found at Sarmizegethusa which looked like a mushroomshaped headpiece which bore a Latin inscription.

Following failed attempts to secure peace Decebal's armies took a stand against the Romans at Tapae - and suffered bloody defeat. However, Trajan does not press forward. Winter is approaching and he reached the limit of his resources.

In 102 Decebal's army was defeated in several battles; the Dacians were unable to defend themselves against the Roman onslaught which threatened them from many sides. The Romans occupy Coste^oti Castle, which guarded the road leading to the capital and regain the martial emblems which the Dacians took from Cornelius Fuscus in 87. Decebal surrenders to Trajan as his army is at the point of total collapse. Trajan's terms are merciless: Decebal must surrender all arms and military equipment, all prisoners and all Roman master craftsmen residing in Dacia. Decebal must also dismantle his fortifications, evacuate all territory occupied by the Romans and relinquish his own, independent foreign policy. Dio

Cassius records that Trajan leaves garrisons in Sarmizegethusa and in other places before returning to Rome to celebrate his victory.

The Dacian Kingdom, which had been a client-state of Rome, becomes a country which lost its independence and which has become the prisoner of Rome. It is forced to dismantle its military installations in the Bánság (Rum. Banat) and in its small Trans-Carpathian territories. What is more, it also has to evacuate the population from those regions. Trajan's Column, which depicts the Dacian wars, shows in one scene (LXXVI) the migration of men, women, children and domestic animals from Roman-occupied territory toward the mountain region, over which Decebal retained sovereignty. The Romans have begun to cultivate the land which they won. We know that auxiliary Roman troops, the '*Cohors I. Hispana Veterana*' were entrusted with protecting from 103-106 the fields of wheat which they tended in Piroboridava (Barbo^oi - today: a suburb of Galați) and in Buridava (Ocnîța i.e. Stolniceni, along the Olt); on Trajan's Column one can make out the picture of soldiers harvesting grain. The occupation of the Bánság was even tougher. The area is held by the IV. Flavia legion, which took part in the campaign and stayed on in Berzobis (Zsidovin) to oversee the occupation and, no doubt, to provide security for the troops which were stationed in Decebal's Kingdom. The latter were to be found in at least 12 locations: based on Greek and Latin place names listed by Ptolemy which must have come from the soldiers of the garrisons. We presume there was a larger contingent - perhaps a legion - stationed at the site of what later became the capital of the Province (Várhely). According to Cassius Dio, Trajan left a garrison

also in Sarmizegethusa but we have no evidence of this at Újvárhely, the centrum of the Dacians and, therefore, we must attribute these data to the Sarmizegethusa of Roman times. The settlement became a 'colonia' around 110 and there is a presumption that it once was a military post.

Dacia has been utterly humiliated. Basically, they have only one option left: to fight the occupying power to the death. Decebal rearms, has his castle-fortifications repaired and overruns part of the land of the Jazigs in the Great Plains (today's Hungary). This conquest is usually placed in today's Bánság but, as we could see, this was an area occupied by the Romans and, probably, annexed to Moesia Superior. Therefore to pinpoint the area which Decebal took from the Sarmatians we need to look for the summer grazing-land of this population of ranchers, namely the region of springs between the Kraszna and Kőrös rivers. A confirmation of the above could also be found in the Jazig war of 117-119, after which a new province was established: Dacia Porolissensis; it was to have performed a defensive role. Let us note that one of the reasons for the outbreak of the war had to do with a territorial claim as the Romans did not return to the Jazigs the territory occupied by Decebal.

When news of preparations for war in Dacia reached the Roman Senate they dubbed Decebal an 'enemy of the State'. We cannot assess the accuracy of the rumors. They must have been exaggerated though. Trajan stated repeatedly that he intended to make Dacia into a Roman province (*Sic in provinciarum speciem redactam videam Daciam*, -Amm. Marc. 24, 3. 9). Besides, how intensive could these war preparations have been when all of this

would have had to happen under the noses of the Roman garrisons? The emperor must have decided already earlier that he will make a province out of the Dacian Kingdom. And the rumors about Dacian activities gave him a good pretext. He comes to Moesia at the end of 104 to prepare his campaign and during the next 1 1/2 years, from the Spring of 105 to the end of 106 he manages to break all resistance. We have few details about this war. Written sources have provided only scant information and depictions on Trajan's Column are hard to decipher; conclusions reached are frequently ambiguous and controversial. We do however, know that Decebal again asks for peace. His efforts fail, as do those of the assassins whom he sent to kill Trajan. Roman forces keep advancing and the Dacians suffer one defeat after another. Fleeing troops set fire to their own fortifications. One of the strongholds throws itself at Trajan's mercy, another's choice of a way out is suicide. Following the loss of all his citadels Decebal kills himself with his dagger before pursuing Roman mounted soldiers could reach him. The Dacian Kingdom has ceased to exist. The last two frames of Trajan's Column (CLIV-CLV) show men, women and children herding their domestic animals through a forest. We could observe a similar scene (LXXVI) in the representation of the end of the first Dacian war. There, people were leaving Roman occupied territories. At the end there was mass migration; crowds of people opting for the unknown (which held freedom) in lieu of certain captivity.

Universa Dacia devicta est - all of Dacia has been conquered. D. Terentius Scaurianus is the first governor of the province; its total annexation is beginning in 106. "Colonia Dacica", the first colony is,

established around 110. Road-building begins and the first road, which leads to Potaissa (present day Hung. Torda, Rum. Turda) and Napoca (present day Hung. Kolozsvár, Rum. Cluj) is completed in 109-110. We presume that the building of most of the network of roads began simultaneously. Along the new borders garrisons and guard towers are put in place which are connected by roads. Of course all this - as well as several additional developments - did not happen in a year or two. In 118-119 Hadrian assigns to Q. Marcius Turbo the governance of both Pannonia and Dacia. While this was wartime, it also suggests that Dacia's borders were still not finalized. The final organization of the Province (Dacia Inferior, Dacia Superior, Dacia Porolissensis) will take place after the conclusion of the Roxolan and Jazig wars (117-119). Following the Dacian war, IV. Flavia -a Roman Legion- was stationed in Berzobis (Zsidovin) until 118-119 when it was reassigned to Singidunum (Belgrade) in Moesia Superior. Dacia becomes a one-legion province up to the Markomann wars, i.e. 167. The Roman cantonment in Berzobis reflects not only the absence of well defined borders, but it shows us that, at the time, Roman forces also controlled a fairly large territory west of what later became Dacia's borders. (At the same time an auxiliary division is stationed at Versec - the Cohors II. Hispana.) Control extended to all of the Bánság, possibly including the southern area of the territory between the Danube and Theiss (Tisza) rivers, up to the Danubian border-region in Pannonia. This helps explain Marcius Turbo's dual governorship. In those days the reorganization of the province was in its beginning stages and we are told that Emperor Hadrian considered relinquishing Dacia. His

friends cautioned against it fearing for the safety of the Roman citizens in the Province. The Emperor did not want them to fall into the hands of Barbarians and decided to forego the plan (*ne multi cives Romani barbaris traderentur* - Entr. Brev. 8, 6, 2).

In addition to the occupation of today's Bánság and the southern area of the Great Plains, the question arises whether the territory South of the Carpathians and between the Danube and Siret (Hung. Szeret) rivers was under Roman jurisdiction before 119. If so, we have no proof. Military records reveal that mounted soldiers (Cohors I. Hispana Veterana) were stationed in Pirobaridava and Buridava. One of these (Buridava-Ocniþa) is located next to the Olt river and the other at the Danube- Szeret delta (Piroboridava-Barbo^oi). This negates the likelihood that the Romans also occupied the territory south and south-east of the Carpathians and that they may have annexed it to Moesia Inferior. Besides, the above mentioned record pertains to the years 102-106 when Trajan placed garrisons all over the Dacian Kingdom. We know that Pirobaridava was a Roman bulwark on the left bank of the Danube and an inscription found in Novae (Svištov, Bulgaria) also makes reference to a native of the locality, Aurelius Victor Perburdavensis et Buricodavensis. Even though we lack substantiating data we cannot exclude the possibility that Rome exercised some lax control over the territory between the Danube and the Carpathian Mountains. We refer to the period between 102-119 and before final adjustments were made regarding Dacia's borders. Control was guaranteed by the Roman troops stationed on the border of the Province but, to a significant extent, also by the annual stipend which Rome provided to the Barbarians. It

was the reduction of such a stipend which led to the outbreak of the 117-119 Sarmatian war (with the Jazigs of the Great Plains and the Roxolans of the Lower Danube region).

Thus, it was only in - or after - 119 that Dacia's final borders and internal structure came into being. Peace was made with the Jazigs but their summer pasture land - in the region of the upper Kraszna and Kőrös rivers - was not returned to them. As compensation they were given the Southern Plain (Hungary), after the Romans withdrew from the area. From here on, the borders of the Province run from the Karas-Danube delta up north through the western slope of the Bihar and Meszes mountains. The borders takes a turn along the bend of the Some^o (Szamos) and follows the Some^o-valley to the Carpathians. Along the inner slope of the Carpathians the border proceeds to the upper Olt and along the Olt, to the Danube. The Háromszék basin was part of the province for only a while - we do not have an exact time frame. However, we can tentatively identify the period: the era of Septimus Severus (193-211) at the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd centuries, inasmuch as this border modification took place at the time of the *Limes Transalutanus*. This was a limes (line) which was built about 30 km from the Olt and extends along the Olt to the Danube.

The Roman province by and large corresponds to pre - World War I. - Transylvania supplemented by Oltenia, bordered by the So. Carpathians, the Danube and the Olt (known in the Middle Ages as the Szörénység. The internal organization of the Province largely corresponds to the geographic setting. There was North-Transylvania, Dacia Porolissensis, with Napoca (Cluj, Hungarian

Kolozsvár): South-Transylvania, Dacia Superior with the Trajan-colonia, Sarmizegethusa and also, Apulum: the site of the garrison of XIII. Gemina, the only legion stationed in the province. Finally, Dacia Inferior with a portion of Oltenia and Capped by Drobeta (Turnu Severin) which was also one of Hadrian's municipia. A Hungarian writer, András Alföldi (1), wrote some 50 years ago. 'As a hydrocephalus wobbling on a thread-like neck, so swims this province in the sea of Barbarians'. In reality the territory of Dacia resembles a square, as do most provinces of the Empire. (Oh, but for the Roman passion for surveying land!) The Sarmatian Plain between Dacia and Pannonia was secured by roads, including those connecting Baja to Szeged (Hungary) which followed the Maros river, and which led from Aquincum to Porolissum (Mojgrád). The area differed from other provinces primarily in its absence of a waterway, which would serve as a border.'

This was the reason that prompted Hadrian to consider relinquishing this territory (in Asia he withdrew behind the Euphrates) and he had the bridge demolished which spanned the Danube at Drobeta. This was to have been the first step in re-shaping the borders of the Empire along the banks of the Danube. The reason he did not carry out this plan was due to his reluctance to abandon a large number of Roman citizens to the Barbarians. Barely ten years after Dacia became a Roman province a multitude of Romans could be found there (*multi cives Romani*) which does not frequently happen in new provinces. It is customary to create administrative entities under whose jurisdiction the natives are placed (*civitas peregrina*) and Roman citizens are normally found mainly in the settlements

(*canabae*) established in the vicinity of the legionnaires' encampments. Also, of course, in the 'colonias' created for migrants. At the time of Trajan's death in 117, Dacia already had a 'colonia' of Romans at Sarmizegethusa and, we can also find budding Roman settlements (of civilians) at Berzobis and Apulum. Their total number would be around 10,000 (excluding Roman troops - it was easy to eliminate them from the count). Was this the *multi cives Romani* whose fate could not be entrusted to the Barbarians? Especially, since those civilians who lived in the vicinity of Roman encampments could have been as easily evacuated as the newly resettled veterans (who still had military tasks to perform). To sum up: within a remarkably short time, a great many settlers took up residence in the newly established province. The reasons for this are substantiated by a source from antiquity: "...after conquering Dacia, Trajan resettled there a multitude from all over the Empire, who were to populate the cities and the countryside (*propterea quia Traianus victa Dacia ex toto orbe Romano infinitas eo copias hominum transtulerat ad agros et urbes colendas*, Eutr. Brev. 8, 6, 2). In other words, this was the result of a conscious and perhaps forcible resettlement policy, aimed at having a sizable Roman population within 10 years - *multi cives Romani* - in Dacia. Another clue to the involuntary aspects of resettlement has to do with names. We find many citizens called Ulpus and Aelius. These must have been new citizens, such as veterans of auxiliary troops who, according to custom, adopted the name of the emperor who granted them citizenship (M. Ulpus Traianus, P. Aelius Hadrianus). Thus, Trajan resettled in Dacia newly created citizens from many parts of the

spared the life of only 40 men (Russu notes with sarcasm Alföldi's failure to make use of this information). We have another source of reference in Pliny the Younger. He was encouraging Caninius Rufus to work on the epic poem about the Dacian war which he had in the planning stage. Pliny writes:.... "You will speak of new rivers crossing the plains and of new bridges spanning them, (you will speak of) two triumphant marches, one of them over a never-before-conquered people and the second which was the final one" (Plinius minor, Epistolae VIII, 4). It is apparent that Pliny also believed the Dacians had been annihilated if he considered the triumphant march of the Romans to be the final one in Dacia. Thus, there was a frame of reference in Roman literature about Dacia's destruction and, therefore, we do not have to discard or re-interpret Iulianus' text. However, there is still a contradiction to be cleared up between the text of Iulianus and Eutropius. Actually, there may never have been a divergence between the two because the critical sentence in Eutropius also exists in a different version: *Daciae (Dacia) enim diuturno bello Deceballi res fuerant exhaustae* (Eutr. Brev. 8, 6, 2, comm. Santini). In other words: "the wealth of Dacia was plundered due to Decebal's long lasting wars". "Res" has a much more comprehensive meaning than we can translate; we can consider it to mean destruction and that Dacia became a "desertum", a barren wasteland, subsequent to Trajan's onslaught. This image would correspond with the words Iulianus makes Trajan say in his play: "I annihilated the people of Dacia".

Even if this did happen, we know the statement to be an exaggeration. We have scores of historical examples of reports on the destruction and extermination of nations which turn out to be untrue. What happened in these cases was mostly the cessation of a tribal entity of a nation-state or of the status quo - nothing more. Therefore, we do not have to take ancient reports about the destruction of the Dacians at face value, although there are many who do - especially among those who belong to the camp which disputes the theory of Daco-Roman continuity. Oddly enough, the earliest proponents of this belief (in modern times) were the members of the "Transylvanian School" (S. Micu-Klein, P. Maior) professing Transylvanian Roman continuity. They could only perceive the survival of pure Romanism.

Let us consider the reasons behind the resettlement effort which brought large numbers of people into the new Dacian province from other parts of the Empire. We know Eutropius' explanation: Dacia became a wasteland. We also know of the representations of the Dacian war on Trajan's Column, where Roman soldiers are portrayed as killing masses of Dacians. However, we should remember that these images were born of triumph and, naturally, depict murdered and dying Dacians. Undoubtedly, there were many suicides among the upper strata of Dacian society, the pileati-tarabostes, but it is doubtful that there would have been mass-suicide - although, some think so. The scene of Trajan's Column which depicts the suicides (CXL) shows men who kill themselves with a weapon and also a group dipping liquid from a bowl and drinking it. According to one

theory: they are drinking poison. It is, however, more probable that we see a water-distribution system in action in a castle under siege. (The castles in the mountains of Szászváros [Oră⁰tie] must, indeed, have been short of water during the siege.) There are scenes on the column which portray surrendering Dacians. These do not establish the survival of the Dacian population. Prisoners of war, who are carried away as slaves diminish the population just as do those who are killed in battle. Earlier we have spoken about the last scene on the Trajan Column: men, women and children marching off with their domestic animals. One could argue about - but not establish - their destination. There is a parallel scene on the column which depicts the end of the first war (LXXVI) eliminating the possibility that these would be Dacians returning to their abandoned homes. Nor can we assume that this would be the population from the central region of the Kingdom which was being resettled, because we do not see anyone in charge of carrying out the resettlement process. These are then emigrating Dacians, whose departure contributes to the depopulation of Dacia. Another reason why they could not have been returning emigrants: it was public knowledge in Rome that Trajan "annihilated" the Dacians. Under these circumstances they could not have been portrayed on the column as returnees.

There is no written text accompanying the representations on the Trajan Column; our analysis of the story-line will be supported by what literary parallel we can find. Data from another source can help us define the fate of the indigenous Dacian population after the conquest. One of these has to do with Dacians recruited to serve as

Roman soldiers. According to Roman custom, when the natives of a province rose up, their warriors were made to join auxiliary units. These were *ale* and cohorts of 500 to 1000 men, respectively, whose ranks were supplemented by men from local tribes. In post-Trajan times it became more frequent and - eventually - the rule that the replacement came from the same province where the auxiliary troops were stationed (this was also the situation in Dacia where local men were serving in the *ala* Gallium, Illyricorum and Hispanorum Campagonum). Dacian auxiliary units were called *Ulpia*, *Aelia* and *Aurelia*. This would suggest that auxiliary troops were being organized from Trajan to Commodus in 192, because their name corresponds to the names of emperors during this period. Since only peregrines (aliens, i.e. natives of the province) were recruited in the auxiliary troops, there had to be a significant native population left, otherwise it could not be explained how Hadrian, Antonius Pius (*Aelii*) and Marcus Aurelius Commodus (*Aurelii*) could have manned the auxiliary troops in the province. On closer examination we find that these auxiliary troops do not provide unequivocal proof of the survival of Dacia's native population. We know of only two auxiliary troops which were created during Trajan's reign: the *ala* I. *Ulpia Dacorum* and the cohort I. *Ulpia Dacorum*. Both are stationed in the east; in Cappadocia, i.e. Syria. The existence of the *ala*, the Dacian cavalry, is open to question because Dacians were infantrymen. On Trajan's Column we see only one portrayal of a Dacian on horseback (and that in fording a river!). *Ala* I. *Ulpia Dacorum* was probably an *ala* which Arrianos called a *Geta* - in the 2nd century there were *Geta* units next to Dacians (Hyginus

Gromaticus, *De munitione castrorum* 9) and we may be looking at auxiliary troops made up of Getae from Dobruja. (Romans frequently used Dacus - Dacia - interchangeably with Geta). There was nothing unusual during Trajan's reign about the creation of auxiliary units. First, because this was in accordance with Roman custom. Second, because we know from Johannes Lydus - whose information came from Kriton - that Rome 'took' 500,000 Dacians and their weapons. In other words: 500,000 Dacians were pressed into Roman service. This number must have been overstated (Russu maintains there were only a few thousand). Still, a substantial number of Dacians were taken prisoner and the two Dacian auxiliary units established by Trajan could not have absorbed them all. We surmise that the majority were attached to Roman forces as *symmachiarii* (as allies); we find Dacians listed among the "nationes" (Cantabri, Gaetali, Palmyreni, Daci, Brittones) in Ps. Hyginus' listing. After these 'nations' became more trustworthy - and somewhat Romanized - they achieved the status of regular troops. This is the explanation for the existence of Dacian auxiliaries under Hadrian (*cohors I. Aelia Dacorum miliaria*) - naturally, they came from among the *symmachiarii*. The largest number of relics we have come from this cohort, stationed in Britain. One inscription portrays the 'sica', a unique Dacian weapon.

There is some uncertainty regarding auxiliaries under Marcus Aurelius' rule. A mosaic inscription from Poetovio (Ptuj, Slovenia) reads: *Iustus optio cohortis II. Aur Dacorum*. This is the only reference on which we can rely and is not sufficient to give serious

consideration to cohorts II. Aurelia Dacorum troops. On these inscriptions we frequently come across missing letters; here only the modifier, Aurelia, appears to have been shortened. Dacian troops were, without exception, sent to distant provinces (Cappadocia, Syria, Britannia). We know of only one Dacian unit in Pannonia: cohort II. Augusta Dacorum - it is most unlikely that there would have been more. I. Russu also brought up the matter of the two cohorts' (reversed) identity. His reading of the inscription in Poetovio would read Aug instead of Aur and it would become unlikely that Dacian auxiliaries would have been established under Marcus Aurelius. Nevertheless had they been in existence, they would have been recruited during the Markomann wars from among local peregrines - only as a last resort and whether or not they were Dacians. Let us remember that at the time, the inhabitants of Dacia were called Daci whatever their ethnicity and that we have countless examples of the same process in other provinces. 'The Dacian Battalion' (*Vexillatio Dacorum Parthica*) which participated in the Parthian-campaign of Septimius Severus, belongs to the same category. C. Iulius took part in the campaign with this "Dacian Battalion". He was the tribune of cohort I. Brittonum which was stationed in Samum (Alsókosály), Dacia. Thus, the Dacian Battalion-the *Vexillatio Dacorum*- was made up of Dacian regulars and not of new Dacian recruits. We must also note that, in this context, Dacus does not denote Dacian nationality but residence in the Roman province of Dacia.

Those Dacians who were attached to Roman troops had been carried off by Trajan's army at an earlier time (thus contributing to the extermination of their peoples). We have no evidence to show that these troops were recruited in their place of residence. In truth, beginning with Hadrian's era, the custom was to do recruiting wherever the troops were stationed. It is remarkable that none of the veterans of the auxiliary troops returned to their native habitation, as was customary. Was there none to whom to return? In short: the Dacian soldiers of the Roman army do not substantiate the survival of the native population. The only thing certain is that Trajan carried off young warriors from Dacia and that soldiers from the Roman province of Dacia ended up in other parts of the Empire, as well.

One of the most weighty counter-arguments against the survival of Dacian natives is the lack of *civitates peregrinae*: native communities organized by the Romans. We do not have sufficient data to dispute the issue. Another possibility inherent in the discussion: there were simply not enough native communities to organize into civitae. This premise is sometimes countered by the theory that the Dacian tribes described by Ptolemy were a "particular type of civitas" (Russu: *un fel de "civitates peregrinae"*). However, the Ptolemy-narration from 103-104 cannot be applied to the first decade of the province (106-117); the designation of the occupying legions is missing, Sarmizegethusa is still the 'Royal seat', etc. Under Roman rule we should also be coming across the nation-names listed by Ptolemy - but we do not see them. The only exception is a milestone which was found at Nagyalmás near

Bánffyhunjad. The inscription reads: R [ESC]VL(o) VICO AN[ARtorum]. Based on this, we assume that the name of nearby Sebesvárálja was Resculum Vicus Anartorum. This place-name holds the seat of the "civitas" of the Celt Anartii - at any rate, an independent peregrinus area. This tells us there was evidence of the survival of the native population in the border-area of Dacia - even if the indigenous population was Celtic and not Dacian.

Following in the steps of A. Domaszewski and V. Pârvan, one additional area along the northern border of Dacia needs to be mentioned. During the era of Severus Alexander (222-235) a military post has been established at the delta of the two Szamos rivers at Samum. The commander of the post (the *beneficiarius consularis*) has a new assignment under Gordianus (238-244). He will become *agens sub signis Samum cum regione Ans*, as is revealed by inscriptions attributed to the years 239 and 243. We learn that the commander of the guard post also becomes the constable of a town (Samum) and of a territory (*regio Ans.*). This area was to have been the territory of Ansamenses, a Dacian tribe. Well, we know of no such Dacian tribe. In any event, their appearance would have come too late to be viewed as an original Dacian tribe, given the migration patterns of the intermediate period. Besides, the abbreviated *Ans.* can be given different meanings. The Latin name *regio Ansamensium* may be a variant of *Assamensium* - *Asamensium*, from an earlier *Ad-samensium*. Here the - n - is a phenomenon of over-correction; in Latin the - n - is lost from the - ns - consonant group, resulting in "n" preceding "s" in "correct spelling" (*thensaurus* -

thesaurus, etc.). Thus, the expression might simply mean "a territory in the Samum region" in which case the region is a border-area under the military jurisdiction of Ansamensium. (This is the theory of Á. Dobó). If we wish to read a tribal or national designation into the expression, we can posit two theories. Either of these will have greater plausibility than the sudden appearance of an unknown, Dacian Ansamenses tribe. The inscription we have been discussing was thought by K. Torma to read ANSVL... M. Domaszewski modified it to: ANS V S L M. The deviation between the two versions is much too pronounced to be credible. (Domaszewski's is more in line with epigraphic history - but he may have been influenced by this very fact). Unfortunately, the (mile) stone from Kaplyon no longer exists and the ancient inscription on it cannot be verified. However, if we contemplate Torma's reading it is possible to assume that the original epigraph was ANSALORVM since the v.s.l.m. abbreviation would not have been an integral part of it. Ancient Ansalorum would be the territory of a well-known Pannonian tribe, the Azali (or Asali). (Their coins bear the ANSALI inscription). This tribe migrated to or was made to resettle in Dacia which would be understandable in view of the Pannonian connection; archeological material from Roman times reveals that the Porolissum region had close links with Pannonia.

There is another possible explanation, as well. When S. Cornelius Clemens was governor (170-172 - the period of the Markomann Wars), the Asdings attack Dacia, i.e. they request "receptio" -permission to resettle within the Empire. They hand over

their families to the governor who sends them against the Kostoboks. After they are defeated he instigates an attack upon them by way of the Lakringos. Again they are subjugated and they ask the Empire for money and asylum. The historian of the Goths, Jordanes, assumes that they continued to live in the region of the Mure^o and Samos rivers (Miliare, Gilpil) but this area is actually Gepida territory from way back. The Asdings must have been living in the valley of the Samos, near Samum. Inscriptions from this region were found, with epigraphs showing Regio Ans. - in this case regio Ans(dingorum). An additional piece of reference: the tombstone of Julius Crescens (a typical soldier's name). He was portrayed in a sheepskin cape; this was considered to be suggestive of native influence. Yet, we have never seen Dacians portrayed in this fashion. However, the Germans, Getae, Celts and Illyrians did wear such cloaks - there is plenty of evidence to substantiate this. If Julius Crescens cloak had been a typical local garment, then this could have been German. It may have been what the Asdings wore - we have already come across their name as Ansdingi. The Roman commander of Samum must have been overseeing an area in the Szamos valley which was tribal territory. In all probability it was the territory of a German people who found admission there. (Possibly, vicus Ansdingorum was also inscribed on the milestone of Nagyalmás, as well. We lack data in Roman Dacia about the regional native infrastructure and, perhaps, natives did not live there in large numbers. We can substantiate this further. As we have mentioned earlier, it was the Celtic Catini in the Dacian Kingdom who did the mining and metal-work. (Tacitus writes about their

relatives who lived in the G6m6r mining-area: "to their shame, they dig for iron ore...") We do not lack data about the mining areas of Ampelum and the vicinity of Alburnus Maior in the days of Roman hegemony. Without exception, the miners were relocated from Dalmacia: Pirustae, Baridustae, Sardeasi - along with people from Asia-Minor and those who did forced-labor. The Dalmatians lived in tribal communities under a ruling prince and a tribal chief. (Vicus Pirustarum, etc.). There are no Celt Kotini among them. After Trajan's war, not only do all Dacian miners and smiths disappear but, so do the other nationalities as well. In order to sustain the mining operation, different nationality groups - with specialized skills in mining - had to be brought in. It seems very clear that the Dacia of Roman antiquity lacks the regional structures which native populations are maintaining elsewhere. Yet, a system of self-government can be found among resettled Dalmatian miners or immigrant Germanic Asdings. This points to the absence of a native population in Dacia which could have been organized into a 'civitas' and from whose ranks a 'princeps' could have been elected.

The survival of the indigenous Dacian population is substantiated by the existence of a Dacian toponymy in the Roman province; the Romans must have had contact with this population - why else would they have continued to use Dacian place names? Without going into the rules of the adoption of toponyms and for the benefit of those who would attach importance to this premise, we would like to mention an example of a situation which occurred within much the same time-frame. In his geographical studies

Ptolemy mentions many names of towns outside the Roman Empire's borders. In order to be familiar with the toponyms of a given locality, there did not have to be communication with its population, following occupation of the territory. Actually, Romans must have had contact with Dacians for an extended time period, starting with the war of 85-86 through the peace of 89, when Dacia was a client-kingdom. Let us further recall that Roman garrisons are stationed in the Kingdom from 102 on. Given the extent of contact between the two nations and the opportunity of borrowing of names, it is surprising that we have so little data about Dacian localities in later times in the region (Tapae, Boutae, Ranisstorum, Darnithith).

Our awareness of the ethnic relations in Roman Dacia also brings into question the survival of the local Dacian population. We can define those relationships by way of surnames on inscriptions; the etymology or geographical characteristics of these names connects them with specific natives or territories of the Roman Empire. We need to remember that the custom of inscribing objects (altars, tombstones, etc.) is already a sign of Romanization. For that reason Roman citizens (with three names) are a lot more evident than peregrini (aliens) with one or two names. In the case of Roman citizens the third name (cognomen) indicates the origin of the individual, although not always; veterans who served 25 years or more and who were given Roman citizenship, usually changed their cognomen. A Dacian reference exemplifies this process: Aurelius Vales qui et Esbenus (CIL III. 80-40); (the Thracian name of this individual is Esbenus.) Marcus Aurelius Eptacentus is the cognomen

of a legionnaire from Aquincum. His third name is a typical Thracian name, which identifies his pre-Romanization nationality. The number of personal names in Roman Dacia, known by 1977, was around 3000. Out of these 2000 (73%) are Latin, 420 (14%) Greek, 120 (4%) Illyrian, 70 Celtic (2,3%), 60 (2%) so-called Daco-Moesian-Thracian and 70 (2,3%) from the middle East and/or Eastern Semi. Let us note that there is no Daco-Moesian-Thracian language. We have seen earlier that Dacian and Thracian are two separate languages. These names are actually Thracian. Therefore, they cannot be the names of the native population. There is much uncertainty here. In looking at I. I. Russu's statistics C. Daicoviciu notes that, at best, no more than 38 names can be attributed to the Daco-Moesian-Thracian grouping. A. Mócsy is right in claiming: "no names that are local - and definitely not Thracian or Moesian-Thracian - can be identified..." If Dacian and Thracian were not the same languages then the bearers of (these) names must have come here as soldiers - with their families - from Thrace or Moesia... If the two languages are basically the same, it would still be odd to find analogous names only South of the Danube (2). However, we know that the two languages are not the same and we can only conclude that, to the best of our knowledge, there are - statistically and numerically - 0(%) Dacian surnames in Roman-Dacia's roster of names.

K140

For additional analyses let us examine the last 50 years' statistics on Dacian surname data. In 1944 there were 2600 Dacian surnames known to us. Latin-1836 (70%), Greek-350 (13%), Illyrian-

120 (4.6%), Celtic-60 (2,4%). Dacian, i.e. Thracian-67 (2,5%), Semi-60 (2,4%). Numerically, Illyrian and Dacian, i.e. Thracian names remained unchanged - the others increased. There was not much change statistically; the Illyrian and the Daco-Thracian group diminished by 1/2 %. In the case of the Illyrians there is a logical explanation: a significant number of these names (43) came to light on a wax tablet found at Alburnus Maior creating a statistical imbalance as early as 1944.

Another figure worth noting is the low ratio of Celtic names, especially since Celts in Dacia came from the west; from Pannonia, Noricum and from even further away. We have no reliable data on Celtic names in Dacia, although we know the Celts played a significant role in the Dacian Kingdom. To quote A. Mócsy: the presence of Dacian Celtic names approach - 0 - as do the Dacians. It is also noticeable, that there is no trace on the inscriptions of the Iranian-speaking nationality in the Dacian Kingdom. This suggests that all ethnic groups within the Kingdom: Dacians, Celts and Iranians, were effected the same way during Roman rule; they became invisible. This really means that they are simply not there. Proponents of large-scale survival of the natives use a unique type of reasoning. Their theory assumes that Dacians feared Roman revenge and persecution and immediately adopted Roman names, which accounts for these names recurring: Ulpus, Aelius, Aurelianus. True, the roster of Dacian surnames looks nearly monochromatic; compared to other provinces there are a great many empire-bestowed 'gentilicia'. The number of Ulpii exceeds 100, Aelii:

250 and Aurelii: 300. In a way, the Aurelii should not be part of the list, in view of Caracalla's (212) edict. This gave citizenship to the provincials. Additionally, the right to be called Aurelius - if not belonging to the clan - could be claimed by anyone after 161, when Marcus Aurelius took power. If we adopt the above-mentioned survival theory, we have to explain why there would have been Dacians who began to fear Rome's revenge 50 years later? However, if we stick to facts we shall conclude that the large number of Ulpia and Aelia were in the province on account of Trajan's and Hadrian's policy of forced resettlement - as we had seen earlier.

Another part of the theory under dispute attributes the absence of Dacian names on the inscriptions to social and economic causes. Accordingly, Dacians were to have continued their patriarchal, peasant-shepherding lifestyle, and lacked the means of rich city-folk to erect stone tablets and leave inscriptions behind. Besides, these forms of expression would be uncharacteristic. Prior to the Roman conquest they were not in the habit of erecting monuments(!) and would be even less likely to do so subsequently, as they have been living under greater duress than natives in the other provinces, etc. Such an illusory explanation does not require a response but there are some discrepancies here which merit further clarification. - On one hand, Dacians are rushing to adopt Roman names with "lightning speed", on the other: their socio-economic status prevents them from erecting tombstones or altars. These actions are not congruent and would require a determination: which of the two types are the truly Dacian? It is true that inscriptions are not reflective of

the whole the population of the province, but erecting markers was a sign of Romanization in every province - perhaps this becomes clear even if we do not present a list of examples. As to oppression: the duress suffered by Dacian natives could not have been so much greater than that of others who were natives of different provinces. After all, native presence in Noricum accounted for 24 % and 33 % in Pannonia, while in Dacia - Zero. If Dacian natives do not make inscriptions on altars, reliefs, then we should be allowed to conclude that they did not conform, learn Latin, adopt Roman customs and that they retained a Dacian lifestyle. However, if they remained Dacians, then we cannot promote the concept of Daco-Roman continuity.

The surname-data we have regarding Roman Dacia provides visible proof that there was no numerically significant native population. Had there been such natives, nevertheless, their language would not have been Latin but Dacian and they would not have had a "cultural, linguistic and ethnic symbiosis" with the Romans. We find further validation of this premise if we study Roman sculpture of the period. They do not portray native symbols. This corresponds to the absence of native gods in Dacia. This has been an accepted line of reasoning dating back to Hirschfeld - but it should not be taken at face value. On the basis of data we have about the Dacian religion it is apparent it had no feature which could be equated with the Roman religious belief-system. (Of course, it was not a polytheistic khtonik religion as Russu believes). It would be futile for us to search for Dacian gods in the context of "*interpretatio*

Romana" because there were none, although N. Gostar has lately been proposing that Dea Placida, Diana Mellifica or Liber-Libera, etc. are Dacian gods.

Those who support a Daco-Roman continuity theory have insisted that "archeological research of the last 2-3 decades has proven - without question - Dacian survival under the Romans". Were this true, then we could not doubt the survival of the indigenous population, a population which did not assimilate, did not 'Romanize'. And if native cemeteries in Dacia differ from those of the Romans - the former lacking tombstones and memorial objects with inscriptions (D. Protase) - then this could only have been a non-Romanized population which retained its language, its customs. Once we give it a close look, however, this 'archeological proof' is nowhere near as self-evident. In reference, it is customary to present a long list of sites where findings were made. While we cannot examine each, let us name at least a few.

In Soporu de Cîmpie, Obreja and Locu^oteni (in Oltenia) cemeteries were found with crematoria. We also know of a cemetery connected to a settlement at Obreja. Those who reported the findings believe them to be cemeteries of the indigenous population. Instead of detailed analyses and response we refer to K. Horedt, who writes: 'There is such great similarity between Karp cemeteries and the cemetery at Soporu de Cîmpie in their rites (graves with urns and a scattering of ashes, children's graves and skeletons), accessories (Dacian ceramics and silver jewelry), and the

similarities so far-reaching, that in the Soporu de Cîmpie cemetery 'Karps must have been buried'. (3) The same would apply to Obreja and Locu^oteni. All three cemeteries were burial grounds for the Karps who migrated to the area from Moldavia (and who were speaking a language related to Dacian). They were known for their repeated forays into the territory from 240 AD on. The mother of the later Emperor Galerius fled Dacia during the reign of Philippus (244-249) on account of Karps attacks. The three cemeteries mentioned above date from the middle of the 3rd century to the beginning of the 4th; (written) sources attest that Dacia was lost to the Empire during the reign of the late Gallienus (253-268). (*Dacia... amissa est* Eutr. Brev. 9, 8, 2). This period coincides with the timing of the Karps' in-migration. There were other sporadic discoveries which fit the picture, such as the grave for cremated remains at Medgyes, with its characteristic amphora - shaped Karp vessels, because "there were no Dacian graves in the province in the 2nd century." (K.Horedt, *Siebenbürgen in spätrömischer Zeit*, 1982, 55.)

Findings of other "native Dacian" cemeteries are also based on error. In Hermány (Ca^oolb) a great many burial mounds were excavated. Even A. Alföldi was inclined to attribute them to Dacians. Three-legged urns came to light and lids which bore the characteristics of late Celtic pottery. The perpetuation of the characteristics of these urns leaves no doubt that we are contemplating the relics of a particular ethnic group. In this case they are most likely to have migrated from - or been resettled from - Noricum or Pannonia. A cemetery of an indigenous population was

also reported from Segesvár. However, here there are tombstones with inscriptions and the names on it are not Dacian but Illyrian. To repeat the earlier observation of Horedt: if there are no 2nd century Dacian graves in Dacia, then we cannot claim the existence of Dacian continuity.

We have pretty much the same situation with regard to village-settlements presumed to be Dacian (provided, we utilize reliable data). The cemetery at Obreja substantiates that this was a settlement of Karps' as further shown by the platter with a tubal base and the large, egg-shaped utensils found there. The Ca^olp settlement was also the habitation of the community interred in its cemetery, as archeological findings revealed. As we have seen, that points to settlers from Noricum Pannonia. In the Roman settlements of antiquity, there were several which had once been Dacian; these Roman habitations naturally incorporate earlier Dacian shards - as we have seen at Szelindek or Maroslekence.

We find it even more incomprehensible that ceramics not made on a wheel which were unearthed at Roman camps at Sebesváralja and Vérmező are claimed as evidence of native survival. As long as the Roman fortifications stood - with Roman soldiers or auxiliary troops guarding them - under no circumstances could there have been natives, except when the Roman fortifications were overrun by Barbarians, who came from outside the province. (Among these there might have been Dacians). For now we must conclude that there is no archeological evidence of Dacian continuity (the

allegedly Dacian shards of the *castrum* at Vérmező cannot be linked to any known Dacian artifact). Now, there may be some settlements with a Dacian legacy as a result of 12,000 "free" Dacians being brought to the province by Sabinianus around 180. These do not, of course, prove the continued existence of the indigenous population in the province.

There is nothing ambiguous about the above; we hold to our references from antiquity. Following Trajan's Wars, writes Eutropius and we paraphrase: *Dacia... res fuerat exhausta* (Eutr. Brev. 8, 6, 2, comm. Santini). This writer worked hard and without success to find evidence of a surviving Dacian population. In spite of the lack of evidence we found it is hard to believe that at least a segment of the Dacian population would not have remained in the Roman province. However, facts are facts. Therefore, we must emphasize that, within the borders of the Roman province of Dacia, we cannot account for a surviving indigenous population - and this applies not only to Dacians, but to Celts, Scythians, Sarmatae and Bastarnae, as well. We simply cannot identify any data to support the theory of Daco-Roman continuity. This theory has its place only in a work about the history of science, in the same way as the theory about Scythian-Hungarian and Hun-Hungarian Kinship.

Lack of substantiation of the Daco-Roman theory, (*continuitatea daco-romană*) does not mean that we should discard the existence of a Romanized, Roman, Latin speaking population in the region. In Dacia, Latin was the language used. Both Trajan and Hadrian impelled tens of thousands to resettle in the Province. The number

of Roman citizens called Ulpia and Aelia who left a legacy of inscriptions is approximately (100+250) 400, perhaps as high as 500. Let us remember, that a majority of these newly-made Roman citizens had earlier been members of the auxiliary troops, and that they spoke a native language in addition to Latin. However, side by side, we can find also the Latin-speaking Apulum Legion (XIII. Gemina). Under ideal circumstances they would number 6000 soldiers, but we cannot rely on this figure as it was not constant. We must also take into consideration the civilian population residing in settlements next to military camps. They, too, spoke Latin. The population of Apulum (there were two of this town, - more about this later) was said to have been around 40,000 in its hey day. We cannot count on more than 10,000 during the middle of the 2nd century in the civilian settlements near the Legion's camp. Dacia's first city, colonia Dacica, (Sarmizegethusa) was a community of veterans. Its amphitheater seated 5-6000 people, on the basis of which (as is customary) we can project a population of 20,000. Accordingly, around the middle of the 2nd century - and including Napoca and Drobeta -(two municipalities founded by Hadrian whose population must have been close to Sarmizegethusa's) - there must have been at least 100,000 people there whose everyday language was Latin. We can be certain that the language of communication was Latin for the peregrini settlers (Dalmatians, Pannonians, those from Noricum). It is surprising that even Greeks posted Latin inscriptions in Dacia and in an environment on which no resident peoples and languages impacted, Latin being the exclusive means of communication. Next to Italy, Dacia was one of those province in

the Roman Empire during the 2nd century in which the Latin language was spoken by almost the entire population. In this context A. Mócsy's statistics are worthy of note. He found that 66 % of East-Dacian family names are so-called 'general' Latin names. We have to consider this a unique Dacian characteristic; in other parts of the Empire such names do not appear at such a high percentage. The uniqueness of these features is further demonstrated by a 57 % ratio of the Roman names being that of one of the emperors. This means that the majority who bear these names are provincials who were granted Roman citizenship. What is especially noteworthy here is language - the mother tongue, independent of tribal background. Thus, we cannot speak about 'semi-Romanization' as applicable to Dacia's whole history about some type of Greek Dacia (*Dacia graeca*) nor possibly about 'Dacia peregrina' (inhabited by non Latin population).

Dacia's history can be divided into two, sharply different eras, similar to the development of other Roman provinces in the Danubian region. The tremendous destruction brought on by the Markomann Wars (167-180) did not vanish without trace. The invading Barbarians carried away a large number of people from Dacia - just as they did in Pannonia. The situation was critical. V. Macedonia, the Legion stationed earlier in Troesmis, is sent to Potaissa; in 168 M. Claudius Fronto, the governor of Moesia Superior, was also entrusted with the governance of Dacia Apulensis (the former Dacia Superior). Soon, he will take charge of all three Dacias (Apulensis, Porolissensis and Malvensis). Fronto's armies are defeated by

"Germanics and Jazigs", he is also killed in battle. Thereupon Moesia Superior is annexed to Dacia. The interior of the province is also being affected by the fighting. In Alburnus Maior (Verespatak) their owners hid the wax-tablets with the written contracts. The last date which came to light was May 29, 167. Sarmitzegethusa was also in danger. In the East, Moesia Inferior was devastated by the Costoboci and Sarmatians; the invasion extended to the Greek peninsula. We have already made reference to the forays of the Asdings who attack Dacia after defeating the Costoboci. This occurred during Cornelius Clemen's governorship (170-172). The Asdings were led by Rhaos and Rhaptos into Dacia - they were eventually chased out by the Lacrings, who had been in the province earlier. Tarbus, the chief of an unknown tribe, also threatened with war unless he was given annual compensation. Around 180 Commodus, son of Marcus Aurelius, was fighting against the Burs on Dacia's northern border. After they were defeated, they were bound - by contract - not to graze their herds within 7.5 km (40 stadions) of the border and would not settle there. At the same time, Sabinianus settled some 12,000 Dacians from across the border. The devastation of war and the insecure conditions of their immediate environment became catalysts for an uprising around 180 by the provincials in Dacia. The legions involved in defeating the uprising were rewarded by the titles "loyal" and "steadfast" - most likely not only for having been faithful but for their cruel suppression of the uprising.

As it happened in Pannonia, the population of the Province might have been diminished by the Barbarians' destructive raids and in the aftermath of the defeat of the provincial's uprising. Those who hid their wax-tablets in Alburnus Maior never returned to their homes and Sabinianus' large-scale resettlement effort also suggests that the original population had perished. On the northern border of Dacia, inscriptions pertaining to the Amartii and Asdings date from the 3rd century (those from Samum are dated 239 and 243). It was during Septimius Severus' rule (193-211) that normalcy returned to the province. During his reign the number of cities in Dacia doubled: Dierna, Tibiscum, Apulum II., Potaissa and Porolissum become municipalities during this period. Five other towns are granted '*ius Italicum*' - exemption from paying property tax in the province. These privileges and other opportunities in Dacia must have served as a magnet. It follows that, by the beginning of the 3rd century, we find an unusual rise in the prosperity of the ruling class. Huge tracts of land are being leased to individuals and they become *conductores pascui et salinarum*, leasing all the grazing land or all the mines in the province. - The tax benefits and the opportunities for acquiring wealth brought a large number of new settlers to the province; this influx changes the ethnic and linguistic composition of the province. The change is evident: this is the era of the decline of Latin and the advance of the Greek language. During the reign of Alexander Severus (222-235), the last Emperor of the Severus-dynasty, Sarmizegethusa bears the Greek designation of metropolis, M. Antonius Valestinus (238-244) high priest of the province, had the title *coronatus Daciarum trium*, 'the crowned one of the three

Dacias', a word not used in Latin at the time, a calque of Greek *stephanéphoros*. New migrants from Asia Minor may have helped Greek to forge ahead; in 235 there existed in Napoca a *collegium Asianorum* - an Asian burial society.

It will be quite interesting to observe in this context the case of the two Apula which is such a unique phenomenon in the Roman Empire that even A. Alföldi was doubtful about it. The *canabae* (settlement near a military camp) of XIII. Gemina was stationed there. Apulum becomes a township under Marcus Aurelius (*municipium Aurelium Apulense* - first reference dates from 180; Gyulafehérvár-Portus) and a *colonia* under Commodus. Septimius Severus creates a new municipium near the camp and next to the existing *colonia* (*municipium Septimium Apulense* - Gyulafehérvár-Lumea-Nouă). In 250 Decius grants *colonia* status to this municipality or - as P. Király and B. Kuzsinszky believe - he unifies the two towns creating a new city (Colonia Nova Apulensis). It was most unusual to have two towns on the same land-grant right next to each other. Perhaps less so, once we realize that the *colonia Aurelia Apulensis* was called (251-253) 'the golden city' (Chrysopolis) and that five Greek inscriptions - one fifth of all in the province - were found in Apulum. It seems that in Apulum there were Greek and Roman town-sections and this may signal a near-equal use of the two languages in the province following the Markomann Wars.

We also have other indications of the increased importance of the Greek language in the region. Earlier, as we reviewed the Dacian

language, there was mention of the Dacian herbal glossary of Dioskorides and Pseudo-Apuleius. These sources list some herbal names as Dacian when they were actually Latin and Greek! D. Deèev had an explanation: the Dacian names of herbs were listed after 271, in the two new Dacian provinces south of the Danube (Ripensis and Mediterranea). As we have seen earlier, Deèev's explanation does not hold up, we can take it for granted that Latin and Greek words were intermixed with Dacian herbal names, simply because the listing was generated in the Roman province. In terms of the chronology of Dioskorides' and Pseudo-Apuleius' glossary (2nd and 3rd, 4th centuries, respectively) we find that the Latin or Greek names of herbs which Dioskorides attributed to Dacian were probably generated in the 2nd century. However, Pseudo-Apuleus' list was apparently compiled in the 3rd century. If so, a comparison of the words on the two lists must mirror the changes in the language-ratio of Latin and Greek after the Markomann Wars. Deèev's statistics reflect this. Before we look at them, it is worth noting that the names of herbs include many hapaxes (erroneous writings) which only appear once. Consequently, their explanation frequently lacks clarity. Therefore, these statistics give us only an approximate understanding of the issue. (I cannot give serious consideration to C. Váczy's statistics as they were developed without sufficient proficiency in linguistics.)

According to Deèev, the herbal names listed by Dioskorides read as follows:

Dacian (26 words) 62 %

Latin (10 ") 24 %

Greek (7 ") 14 %

In this survey, the ratio of Latin to Greek names is 5/8 to 3/8. However, if we look only at the relationship of Latin to Greek, we find a ratio of 59% to 41%. In contrast to the situation of family names in all of Dacia, the list of Dioskorides are more similar to the situation in Dacia Inferior or Malvensis, where there are 69.5% Latin and 20.6% Greek personal names.

Deèevs' statistics on Pseudo-Apuleius's collection of names give us the following:

Dacian (14 names) 45 %

Latin (9 names) 29 %

Greek (8 names) 26 %

Here the ratio is 6/11 Latin to 5/11 Greek; a significant shift from the ratio calculated from Dioskorides' list. If we compare the Latin-Greek components, then we find (rounding up) 53 % vs. 47 %: a strong increase of the Greek names. In reality, we could consider the ratio of Greek to Latin names as 1:1, partly, on account of an uncertain etymology, partly due to the chance-factor in the name-selection process. The result reflects what we have seen earlier; after the Markomann wars, Latin and Greek usage in Dacia reached equal levels. Another way of putting it: this part of the empire became half-Latin, half-Greek. Accordingly, prior to the Markomann wars there was the possibility that a Neo-Latin language would emerge. After the Markomann wars (from 180) - at best - a semi-Grecian, Neo-Latin language could have developed. Possibly, its opposite: a middle-Grecian language, enriched by Latin words. This

process does not support a theory of Roman continuity on Dacian territory. Based on the laws of linguistics the Rumanian language(s) cannot be successor to the Grecianized-Latin which was spoken in Dacia.

It would be difficult to describe the Latin which was used in Dacia, although the question is by no means insignificant. It is no longer a matter of understanding Daco-Roman continuity; as we look at the continuity of Romanism in Dacia we have to ask ourselves whether or not the Rumanian language could have developed in Roman Dacia. This writer concurs with the eminent Rumanian Latinist, H. Mihăescu, who pointed out that the Rumanian vocabulary (and the Latin borrowings in Albanian) are mostly concrete and primitive (peasant-like), while the written, inscriptive legacy from the Roman times of South-Eastern Europe reflects an urban, literate and abstract language. Contrary to linguists of Latin, he holds with the Romanists (specializing in the new, Neo-Latin languages) that the modification of Latin must have begun during the existence of the Imperium Romanum. In spite of the paucity of sources in this regard, he is inclined to believe that this linguistic differentiation began with the first year of the Provinces's annexation to the Empire. Mihăescu has compiled a formidable amount of data (based on textual samples). However, the inscriptive material known to us does not reflect this theory. In Dacia there could really be no such reflection: the population came *ex toto orbe Romano*, - from the whole Empire - and it would have been very difficult to retain dialectal characteristics they may have brought with them. - We can find no

validation for Romanist efforts attempting to prove that the Latin language in Dacia was inseparable; this premise fails to take into consideration that Dacia cannot be compared to the other provinces of the Roman Empire, due to a relatively short period of occupation (106-271). During this period the development of dialectal differentiation was much weaker than in later years.

In spite of these difficulties, we can still access the Latin spoken in Dacia. Not from inscriptions, of course, but due to the fortunate circumstance that the Dacian names of medicinal herbs had been recorded - at times in Latin or Greek. In the glossaries of Dioskorides and Pseudo-Apuleius there are herbs attributed to the Dacians, but given Latin names; others require no explanation. Pseudo-Apuleius lists *aurimetellum*, which is identical with Latin *aurimetallum* ('gold coin' this is what the petals resemble). There are names which are given in "vulgar" - instead of classical - Latin. One of these is the Dacian word for gladiolus. Dioskorides writes it as ὤδῆϊόδ (haprus) and it can be identified in its vulgar-Latin form as *aprus*, which derives from the Latin *aper* "wild boar" (*aper non aprus* - says the book of correct Latin from the 3rd century - *Appendix Probi* 139). Gladiolus means 'little sword', exemplifying the pointed leaves. This is also where 'wild boar' must be coming from, its tusks being associated with the shape of the leaf. However, there are those Dacian herbal names which can only be described in local (ergo: Dacian) Latin. Example: Dioskorides' *sikupnux* (óéêĩō ðĩĩý æ. One of its Greek names is êÛñõĩĩ i.e. 'nut'. The 'nux' of the "Dacian" (here, Dacian Latin) word means of course 'nut' (Rumanian *nucă*).

The *sikup*- syllables are an unidentifiable hapax, but we may be close to the mark in assuming that it is a misspelling of one of the words for *sicca* (Lat. 'dry').

The following two names should take their place among local Dacian herbal names: *âĩõäÜ äëá* (*budathla*), *budama*, *budalla*, *buclama* (*Carduus spec.?*). According to V. Pisani this plant would be *âĩý äëùóóĩí* in Greek, *lingua bovim* in Latin and probably of Idg. derivation: *g^uou-dngh (u-e) la*; V. Georgiev concurs. We believe this to be erroneous. The equivalent of Idg. *g^u* is a *g* in Dacian (and Albanian). The first part of the word suggests *bos*- "ox" in Latin. (cf. this plant's Lat. name: *lingua bubula*). If so, the second part of the name can only be a variation on the Lat. *lingua*, the misspelling of which makes it appear as *lama*, (*budama*). The Neo-Latin forms of *lingua* (Lat.) are *limbã* (Rum.), *langa* (Dalm.) *lingua* (Italian), *limba* (Sard) *leungua* (Rheto-Romance Engadin), *leng*e (Friauli), *langue* (lengue) (French), *lenga* (Prov.), *llengua* (Catalan), *lengua* (Span.), *lingoa* (Port.). Vowel-transformation occurs only in Dalmatian - *i* > -*a* -, (the French version is a later development). The Latin - *ngu* turns into - *ng* - in Dalmatian. We have examples of the - *g* - being dropped: *sanguisuga* (leech - Lat.) becomes *sansoike* (plural). *Bu-lama* (Greek) may be the equivalent of the Dacian-Latin *bu-laça* (perhaps *bu-l̥ça*) which could derive from the Latin *bu-lingua*. Given the Dalmatian *langa* (tongue) the word can be traced to its Dalmatian origins; -*ç* - becoming - *m* - is not uncommon (- *ç* - *n* - *m*).

'*Laça*' (?*h* *ça*) can also be found in another Dacian - i.e. Dacian Latin - herbal name: *kĩáëÜiá* (koalama), *koadama* 'water-spike'. One of the Greek names of this aquatic plant means "dog's tongue". It is more likely that the word's original meaning was *aquâ-lingua* or water-(tongue). Thus, Dioskorides' description would mirror *kuâ - laça*. When there is no stress on - a - at the beginning of a word, the dropped - a - is not uncommon in the eastern part of Neo-Latin territory: Latin *apicula*, Italian *pecchia* 'little bee'; it does not appear in Rumanian, (but it is characteristic of Albanian which was closely related to Dalmatian), in which water is called *apã*, systematically evolving from *aqua*. The second part of the word is undisputedly Dalmatian-related (*laça*, cf. Dalmatian *langa*).

The following, Dacian Latin herbal name from the 3rd century is less clear in its origin: *Sipoax*, *scinpoax*, *scinplax*, *simpotax* 'plantain': one of its Latin names is *septenervia* and one of its Greek names means 'seven-ribbed'. This word is an almost unrecognizable compound of the Latin *septem* (seven) and *axis*. Its regular form would be *septem-axes*. Notable Neo-Latin variants of *septem* are: *apte* (Rum.), *sapto* (Dalm.), *sette* (Italian), etc., while *axis* left no trace in either Rumanian or Dalmatian. When the word is reconstructed into *siptoax*, it suggests Dalmatian roots, to - *ks-* (*x*) - corresponds Rumanian -*ps-*, while in Dalmatian, it would have two representations: -*is-* and -*ps-*. - In the case of the Dacian Latin name - *ps-* is more likely; there is no evidence of -*ks-*->-*ps-* in the word. *Sipto* is irregular, having processed from the Dalmatian *sapto* *siepto*> *siapto*.

These are meager pickings of the provincial Daco-Latin language and burdened by quite a few hypotheses. Still, we can state unequivocally that Rumanian did not originate from this (provincial) Latin. Let us compare *laça* with the Dalmatian *langa* in contrast to the Rumanian *limbã < lê ngua*. It could be considered a precursor of Dalmatian and, thus, in linguistic kinship with it. In provincial Daco-Latin this was to be expected. There was a large number of Dalmatian settlers, who must have been speaking this type of Latin, as did the numerically significant Pannonians (for example the settlement and cemetery of Hermány). The Latin spoken in Dalmatia and in Pannonia were closely linked under the Empire, as demonstrated by J. Herman. If we were to expect to see a continuity of Dacian Romanism (and not in its 3rd. century semi-Greek form, following the Markomann wars), then we would have to identify in the region a Neo-Latin language related to Dalmatian. We have no such data.

The last half-century in the history of the province is marked by evidences of intermittent prosperity, but what dominates the era are the repeated attacks by Barbarians. Concurrently, the population declines; first by way of individual and sporadic emigration and, later, through a mass exodus. The peaceful conditions, enjoyed during Severus' reign become rare exceptions to the rule after his death in 235. Emperor Maximius (235-238), who came from Thracian peasant-stock, takes the title of *Dacicus Maximus* in 236. Lacking additional information, we surmise the title alludes to the

successful outcome (for Rome) of battles waged against Dacians who lived outside Dacia and the borders of the Empire. In 238 Karpis and Goths ravage Moesia Inferior, the Imperial province at the lower-Danube, and raze Histria at the Danube-Delta. The raids were wide-ranging and resulted in strengthened fortifications at Marcianopolis (Devnja, Bulgaria). A citizen of Durostorum (Silistra, Bulgaria) gives thanks to the gods, having escaped Barbarian imprisonment. Karpis attacks are renewed a few years later, or so we assume, knowing that, during Gordianus' era the enemies of the Empire (*hostes*) are devastating Thracia and Moesia. While Dacia was not untouched by the fighting, during Gordianus' reign (238-244) there is peace and calm in the province (and inscriptions dedicated the Emperor). The above suggests the population experienced no violent disturbance.

(160)

All this constituted a period of only transitory peace. After the Markomann wars the artificial European border of the Imperium Romanum managed to block for more than half a century the flow of migration of tribes living beyond its borders. However, the mechanisms employed to prevent the incursion repeatedly proved to be inadequate. These included diplomatic manipulation, punitive military action or periodic settlement of various groups of Barbarians within the Empire. At the same time, there was a marked increase among populations living beyond the borders of the Empire attributed in part to contacts with the Empire. Not only did they create overpopulation in the territory they were inhabiting, the area became densely settled and their desire for material possessions has

also increased. Subsequent to the Markomann wars (turn of the 2nd/3rd Century) a large number of Goths settled along the northern banks of the Black Sea. They established farms and villages which cut off the movement of the nomadic shepherds of the steppes. Their constant - and natural - movements could not be curbed for long. Thus, so the Goths were forced to keep moving in search of other arable lands, shifting others in the process. Their neighbors along the eastern borders of Dacia were the Karps; they tried again (245-247) to take possession of Roman territory. The effect of this fighting was felt all over Dacia as we can see from coins (which were hidden at the time) and which were later found in many localities (Săpată de Jos in Muntenia; Dobridor, Vîrtopu, etc. in Oltenia. Ecel, Vîzakna, etc. in Transylvania. The Karps' attacks forced the Romans to relinquish a line of defense established under Septimius Severus, east of the Olt, the *limes Transalutanus*. They also gave up so.- east Transylvania which must have depended on this defense-line. We believe they gave up other areas, as well. 120 years after K. Torma wrote about the period we can only reiterate that, at the northern border of Dacia, during the reign of Philippus Arabs (244-249) and at the encampment of Alsó-Ilosva, the usage of Roman medals has ceased. The emperor adopts the title of *Carpicus Maximus* and defeats the Karps but the province beyond the water-border of the Roman Empire cannot escape destruction. Equally vulnerable is the territory beyond the Rhine and the Danube (annexed during the reign of Domitian (by Traianus, the *agri decumates*), which frees itself from the grasp of the Empire, although - at this time - not permanently. Emperor Trajan Decius (249-251) is shown on an

inscription in Apulum as *restitutor Daciarum* i.e. the "restorer of Dacia", but takes the title of *Dacicus Maximus* in 250, which indicates another war. In retrospect the gains he has achieved must have been minuscule.

These gains consisted of the ability of larger garrisons to continue and maintain Romanism. The Roman border-defense of Dacia along the Lower-Danube is in its last throes. A new mint had to be established in Viminacium (Kostolac, Serbia) to pay the military; it ceases to operate between 257-258. There must be a connection between this event and Emperor Gallienus becoming *Dacicus Maximus*. Accepting the title and the discontinuity of minting operations suggest that rewards (propaganda) and reality were not always congruent. A large segment of the population fled the province during the reign of Philippus Arabs (244-249). G. Val. Sarapio, (an Egyptian!), builds a shrine in Apulum to Jupiter, "the mightiest", in gratitude for having been saved from the Karpis (*a Carpis liberatus*). The mother of a later Emperor, Galerius, flees during this period to the area of today's Sofia and it wasn't even from the Transylvanian part of Dacia, but from Dacia Malvensis, which is currently Oltenia. Some of the refugees - perhaps most - did not flee south to Moesia but, probably, to Pannonia. Our assumption is based on the inscription made in Intercisa (today Dunaújváros, in Hungary), to the memory of Publius Aelius Proculinus, which tells us that he was killed at the "castle of the Karpis" (*castellum Carporum*).

Contrary to most opinions expressed on the subject, we believe that Dacia was lost to the Roman Empire already at the time Philippus Arabs gave himself a decoration for his victory over the Karpis in 247. Archeological evidence seems to corroborate this; it cannot be coincidental that, dating from the middle of the 3rd century, we are finding Karpis relics all over Transylvania. What is more, they are different. The cemeteries at Septér, Medgyes, Sepsiszentgyörgy are unlike those in Soporul de Câmpie, Obreja and Locu^oteni (the latter in Dacia Malvensis, Oltenia). The relics from the cemeteries in Septér and Soporul de Câmpie cannot be dated "post - 250"; there is a correlation between the appearance of Karpis relics and the collapse of the North-Dacian line of defense (re. Alsó-Ilosva, Vármező). In Apulum and Potaissa only garrisons and the camps of legionaries remained and Decus' title - *restitutor Daciae* - implies that Dacia was lost prior to 249-251 - otherwise, there would have been no need for restoration. The exodus, which took place during Philippus' reign is conclusive - the flights occurred neither before, nor after. Yet the province still exists - even if only through the continued presence of its garrisons and city-renovation efforts. Our sources from antiquity imply that Dacia was lost during the reign of Emperor Dacius Gallienus (253-268). Reports on this question are unanimous: *Dacia amissa est* (Eutr. Brev. 9, 8, 2) *et amissa trans Istrum, quae Traianus quaesiverat* (Aur. Vict. Caes. 22-23), *sub Gallieno amissa est*. (Ruf. Festus Brev. 8). Thus: Dacia was lost in the Gallienus era. The loss of Dacia is commonly attributed to Emperor Aurelian. It is true that it was he who also *officially* relinquished Dacia. Sources dating from antiquity (Eutropius etc.)

inform us that Dacia was lost under and because of Gallienus (*Dacia, quae a Traiano ultra Danubium fuerat adiecta, tum amissa est*, Eutr. Brev. 9, 8, 2) but they also report that it was Aurelian who put an end to Dacia, transferring it to Moesia (*provinciam Daciam... intermisit...* Eutr. Brev. 9, 15, 1). In the 260's (from 262?) Dacian legions (XIII. Gemina, V. Macedonia) are stationed in Poetovio, Pannonia. Although, one of the officers leaves an inscription in 260 Mehadia (Herkulesfürdő), this may very well be a memento of the effort to recover Dacia at the time of Aurelianus - or before him. The same effort is also reflected by the coins bearing the inscription of DACIA FELIX (as stated by A. Alföldi). To claim the "*Dacia felix*" coins belong to the founding of the Dacia south of the Danube remains unsubstantiated; Aurelianus only took his legions there: XIII. Gemina into Ratiaria and I. Macedonia into Oescus. Residents being taken from cities and the countryside (*ex urbibus et ex agris* - Eutr. Brev. 9, 15, 1) annotates only the end result, otherwise it has little substance, as our Rumanian colleagues often note.

We believe that the analysis of this chain of events in the matter of Daco- Roman, i.e. Daco-Roman-Rumanian continuity is not essential; although many, who deal with this question, consider it important. It is not essential, because the history of a 20 - year period has little significance within the context of centuries, but the withdrawal of Roman forces from this territory is substantiated by Karp cemeteries and graves (the latter evidenced by an accidental burial find) in the area. The history of the Roman Empire provides us with extensive data pertaining to the settlement of Barbarians but nothing to show that, in any one province, there should only be

immigrating Barbarians. Besides, all specialists who have studied this period know that the immigrating barbarians are usually impossible to detect by archaeological methods. The Barbarians are unrecognizable due to their diverse legacy of objects. If the Karps are recognizable on Dacian territory, that means that the Romans are no longer there and, by the middle of the 3rd century, we can take this for granted. Thus, we may point to the era of Philippus Arabs, i.e. 247-248 as the time when Roman presence in Dacia ceased to exist. This was the time when they withdrew from the *limes Transalutanus*, their line of defense and the northern defense positions relinquish in the province as the immigration of the Karps begins. The process is given an additional impetus during the wars under Trajan Decius. The death of the Emperor - the "*restitutor Daciarum*" - in a battle against the Goths at Arbittus (Razgrad, Bulgaria) has an effect on the future fate of the province. We can infer there was a continuing exodus on the part of the provincial population; the probability of their staying put was most likely in areas where the military was stationed. We know of no Roman inscriptions dated after 258 and, after 260, no more large contingent of troops are stationed here. By 271, prior to his eastern wars, Emperor Aurelianus had to withdraw only the remnants of his troops. The evacuation was done under military auspices (*abductosque Romanos ex urbibus et agris Daciae*), "and the Romans who were displaced from Dacia's cities and land", Eur. Brev. 9, 15, 1) makes it evident that Aurelianus removed everybody from Dacia still under Roman rule. (At the time Dacia's eastern border flanked the Olt river the road led across Apulum, Napoca to Porolissum, as reflected by

the Tabula Peutingeriana. The evacuation is further substantiated by the establishment of these new provinces for the displaced population: Dacia Ripensis and Mediterranea. Nevertheless, it is sometimes claimed that, in the evacuated areas, there were Latin-speaking, Romanized groups left behind. However, none of our sources identify a Romanized population that would have remained in Dacia and it explains why D. Protase would write: "... antique writers speak of only migrating peoples in Dacia and do not pay attention to the local population. We have direct sources of information: archeology, numismatics and (in the 4th Century) epigraphy which indicate that our written sources may not be accurate". Accordingly, there would have to be findings to establish the survival of the local population during the period following the surrender of the Province. If this were so, then this population would continue to use the buildings in the Roman cities and there would have to be burials in local cemeteries - even if not on the same scale as when the territory was part of the Roman Empire. Let us then examine what traces of survival we might find.

There are supposed to be many late-Roman findings in Sarmizegethusa, the former capital of the province dating from the 4th and 5th centuries. These would include the walled-in entrance of the amphitheatrum, roof tiles, bricks, statues and stones with inscriptions - re-used after the Roman era - and dwellings which were reconstructed with Barbarian-technique. Also, a small fibula (onion-shaped and decorated with buttons), the initials of Christ etched into a shard and a candlestick. The survival of the population

would be further substantiated by the finding of medals, the last pieces of which date from the time of Valentinian I. (Valens) and another 9 misc. pieces spanning the eras of Diocletian to Gratianus.

The above would constitute the evidence, which, in contrast to written sources, would serve to prove the survival of the local population. In regard to Roman continuity Sarmizegethusa is, indeed, important. In the Middle Ages towns sprung up in the place of Roman cities (Apulum, Potaissa, Napoca, today's Alba Iulia, Turda and Cluj) but only an insignificant village developed in the place of Sarmizegethusa. If we were to look for sites that remained undisturbed and, therefore, survived the post-Aurelian evacuation without being scattered - this was the place. Yet, findings from the late capitol of the province are "still sporadic", as K. Horedt remarks. We cannot attribute the paucity of findings to the absence of urban-type construction which would have excavated buried relics. The "late-Roman" findings from Alba Iulia, Turda and Cluj - including those in the possession of collectors - are often of indeterminate origin. Thus, the situation is the opposite of what K. Horedt would assume with hard-to-follow logic. Let us take another look at the "traces" in Sarmizegethusa, which would be evidence of the presence of the then-local population. The entrance of the amphitheatrum is, indeed, obstructed - with pebbles from the river. This could not have been the work of Romans - neither the earlier, nor the "survivor"- kind. We have a clear indication of that in the fortification of camp-entrances, from the period immediately preceding the abandonment of the province (the Dacia-Felix era

during the reign of Aurelian when - temporarily - East-Transylvania had been regained.) We can deduce from the erection of fortified twin-castles that the Romans were also attempting to rebuild the "limes Transalutanus" - their defense line. In erecting walls, they employ always Roman masonry-techniques and they make use of earlier stone remnants (tablets with inscriptions, columns, etc.) as could be seen in Porolissum (Mojgrad), Marosvécs and Énlaka. The entrance of the *amphitheatrum* in Sarmitzegethusa was walled in with large pebbles. This could have happened at any time but has probably occurred during the Middle Ages when Roman amphitheatres have been used as castles (defenses) in the Carpathian basin. Such was also the case with the military amphitheatrum in Old-Buda (Castrum Kurchan). In the absence of other chronological data we cannot deduce Roman continuity from the use of Roman relics (bricks, statues, etc.) in subsequent (building) construction. If we were to make this deduction we would have to attribute Roman continuity to any edifice - including those built in modern times - which incorporate such items (i.e. bricks, statues, etc.). The dry wall of the western wing of Aedes Augustalium, (which was not built with Roman technique) could be the work of any nation. During the Great Migration settlers in territories which had earlier been Roman, frequently made use of Roman edifices which were left standing (Sopron, Aquincum). The small button-embellished, onionhead - topped fibula must have been made in mid-third century, in view of the medals which paralleled the find. This is also what K. Horedt believes. In other words: it is not a relic from continuing Romanism. The monogram of

Christ on the shard to which we referred earlier, could well be a Christian relic post-dating the surrender of Dacia (we have no specific information of Christianity in Dacia prior to 271). Even so, it would not be an identifier of a Romanized population, because it could just as well be Gothic, Gepida or Christian from Avar times. (There is an Avar-age relic from Sarmizegethusa, the so-called 'Slav-fibula'. It is more likely, however, that the inscription is a characteristic example of the kind of forgery of which we have seen several. The candlestick is not a Christian relic. It has the customary cross-shaped embellishment which dates it as prior to 271. We do not understand how the treasure of bronze-coins from the age of Valentinian I, could be considered to be a vestige of a surviving population. After all, the owner of these coins came into their possession during the reign of the Emperor, (364-375) and not in the era of Gallienus or Aurelian. Besides, it is peculiar that these coins would be used as proof of continuity in the Dacia of late; after 271, traffic in Roman coins show similarities to the Eastern Great Plains and contemporary Slovakia. The above reasoning would suggest Roman continuity in Slovakia, too. The little treasure from Sarmizegethusa can easily be evaluated. Athanaric and his Goths are defeated by Huns at the Dniester; in 376 he withdraws to the hilly Caucalanda region and he gives chase to the Sarmatians. The treasure of Sarmizegethusa is connected to this event geographically and chronologically; it also reveals who the inhabitants of the region were at the time. The eight coins spanning the eras from Diocletian (284-305) to Gratianus (367-383), do not indicate that there was a Romanized population at Sarmizegethusa

in close connection with the Roman Empire, but it does point to the one-time provincial capital being overrun by the Barbarians. After the appearance of the Huns, a period begins during which the site remains uninhabited for a long period.

Three additional brick-graves were identified in the era subsequent to the surrender of the Province. One of the graves found among the ruins of a villa East of the city must, however, be attributed to the period falling between the reign of Philippus Arabs and Aurelian. Also, we possess data regarding both 2nd and 3rd century brick graves from Dacia; thus they do not have to have originated subsequent to 271. The same holds true for the brown-glazed shard of a vessel found in a brick-grave near the amphitheatrum. We do not have to assume a late date, as glazed vessels go back to the 2nd century - although they were rare in Dacia.

These then would be the "direct sources" telling us about the survival of Romanism, following the surrender of the Province. They speak for themselves - even if they do not substantiate that a Roman population stayed on in Sarmizegethusa. By and large, late relics found in other areas are similar. An undoubtedly Christian gemma has been found (but the circumstances of the find are murky) in Potaissa (Turda); also two clay candlesticks. These cannot prove the survival of the Roman population and the golden ring with the inscription: UTERE FELIX is not a Christian relic; the inscription is a good luck wish which was in general use. One of the difficulties with

the Christian relics is that they belong to collections; several pieces attributed to finds at Mojgrád were actually purchased from antique dealers. In Turda bricks were found out of which a sarcophagus was reconstructed. That can also not be dated post-271; graves unearthed near the garrison (and hydraulic works) are accurately dated - mid-3rd century - by the onion-shaped, silverbutton - embellished fibula and a Commodus-coin. A similar fibula came to light during bridge-construction at the Aranyos river. Once again: dating from no later than mid-3rd century.

Most of the findings at Porolissum (Mojgrád), attributed to the 4th century, are of unknown origin. The graves found here are from the period of Árpád (Magyar Chieftain - 9th century - Transl.) and, therefore, cannot prove the survival of Romanism. A Roman platter from the same area is especially noteworthy. On the bottom there are the initials of Christ and this partial inscription: *EGO ... VIUS VOTum Posui*. We believe the engraving was made subsequently and is a forgery: it copies the donarium at Berethalom, which was re-discovered in 1941. A. Mócsy and E. Tóth reached the same conclusion. It is not unusual to find inscriptions etched into shards at a later date; we know of this practice in Rumania outside the province, too (ex. Socetu in Muntenia). Many findings and memorabilia presented as proof of survival fall into this category; we have to give up the attempt to prove that a more significant segment of the Roman population stayed put after the province was relinquished. In Dacia, there is no evidence of continuity of the settlements, such as the characteristic burial sites of the 4th century,

even though they could be found close by, along the banks of the Danube. This is easy to substantiate, as Roman rule remains continuous in certain areas of Southern Dacia for some time. After they withdrew, Roman bridgeheads were left behind on the left bank of the Danube, as in Sucidava (Celei, opposite the encampment of the Legion V. Macedonia at Oescus), in Drobeta (Turnu Severin), and at Desa (opposite Ratiaria, the camp of the Legion XIII. Gemina). The characteristic of the cemetery at Sucidava helped us in identifying the findings of the period. Coins found here are from 324-361. There are simple earthen graves - no trace of burials in brick graves or sarcophagi. The graves contain large numbers of utensils, jewelry, glasses, iron knives, etc. These are relics which were not found in other areas of the Province. There is a hiatus even in Sucidava as shown by the coins found at the cemetery. At the end of the 3rd and beginning of the 4th century, the citizens apparently did not inhabit the town. At any rate, the history of the Danubian Plain differs from other areas of the former province. Constantin the Great (306-337) has a bridge built across the Danube in 328 between Oescus and Sucidava and rebuilds the Roman bridgeheads along the left bank of the Danube (Dierna, Drobeta, Sucidava, Turris, Constantiniana-Daphne, Dinogetia-Barbo^oi). After 332 his Goth allies construct trenches from Turnu Severin to Brăila, known as the *Brazda lui Novac de Nord*, or the "Wallachian Devils Trench". These provide for the defense of Rome's Barbarian allies in the same manner as its equivalent on the Hungarian Plain. Along the trenches, there are also Roman encampments (ex. Pietroasele); the troops are mostly allied, "foederati" soldiers. There are also Roman posts

further away from the Danube; thus, a road is being built between Sucidava and Romula (Re^oca). There are references to building going on in Romula, as well. These are transitory activities, as is the rebuilding of the castle at Mehadia. There are only sporadic signs of the Roman life-style and population we found prior to 271. We can no longer speak of Neo-Romanization of the territory; the findings in Sucidava seem to establish that this "Romanism" was mostly Greek by then. If so, it could not have supported the survival of Latin-speaking groups.

In spite of the above, in the late territory of Dacia there can be found vestiges of the Roman presence beyond the 3rd century. Moreover: not only near the bridge-heads along the Danube or on the Plain of the Lower-Danube which was under the supervision of Constantin the Great. Traces could also be found in Transylvania. We are not referring to pieces of chain on the bronze candlesticks, embossed with a monogram of Christ and the good wishes of Zenovius (found at Berethalom). It features similar findings from Aquileia, Emona, Poetovio, Bonyhád and Sziszek. There is a strong likelihood, this artifact originated in Southern Pannonia and reached the region of the Nagy-Küküllő (Tárna Mare) river in the 4th century, or later. This is seen as a relic of Gothic settlers of the Christian faith of the time; other memorabilia which were used to substantiate 'continuity' are probably also theirs (such as onion-shaped fibulae). During excavations of spas at Gyulafehérvár (Alba Iulia) at the beginning of the century, graves were found embedded in the Roman edifices. A significant number dated from the 10th

century (Árpád-period), but among these there must have been Roman graves, as well. Out of these came nine bracelets with the characteristic late-Roman design of a snake's head. We cannot attribute them to a pre-4th century period - given the many similarities to Pannonia- the brick grave unearthed here also suggests Roman burial rites.

In 1927 a sarcophagus came to light in the so-called south-east cemetery in Cluj (Kolozsvár) which was reconstructed from a "cippus" (gravestone). It became the subject of an ongoing dispute: the earlier inscription had an O with a cross-shaped etching. This prompted P. Protase to assume that the marker was erected by a 'secret Christian' of the 3th century. We maintain that the cross or 'X', which was chiseled into the bottom of the coffin, preceded the - O - and we reject the supposition that the inscription was belatedly 'Christianized'. It is more likely that the etching may have chiseled out a supportive line scratched in earlier - we find other misapplied lines. However, the grave is important beyond its inscription: it revealed four Roman hairpins neither of which could pre-date the 4th century. Based on this finding, we can attribute other graves to Roman times which were found in Cluj. These were graves incorporating Roman stone tablets which post-date the surrender of the province.

However, these Romans were not successors of the Roman population once living in Dacia. Their legacy - burial rites and bracelets - parallel Pannonian relics and suggest a connection with

Pannonia. It is probably no coincidence that they resettled on the site of former Roman towns. If so, then we must consider the new residents of Apulum and Napoca as a voluntary (or planned) settlement. The projected chronology: the second half of the 4th, or the first half of the 5th century - this is what we glimpse from archeological finds. Actually, it is more appropriate to consider the 5th century. As it can be established that a large number of Roman provincials lived in Hun-controlled territory, such as Orestes of Pannonia, (the best-known example) who was Attila's scribe! It would be a mistake to assume that this Roman provincial population (which must have been resettled in Transylvania to work at salt and ore-mining) was the formulator of some kind of Romanism in the territory. No geographical names survived in Dacia in a form which would indicate the continuity of their use in Latin; and no trace is left of the names of towns or other localities. Romanism left no trace in Pannonia either, but we know of quite a few Roman towns (Sirmium-Szerém, Srijem, Siscia-Sziszek, Sisak, Poetovio-Ptuj, Pettau etc.). In Dacia, on the other hand, no vestige is found of the names of Apulum, Napoca, Potaiassa. They could have been known to the Pannonian provincials who were resettled here at the time of the Huns. It is also possible that they simply called these localities *civitas* or 'town'. Neither one, left any trace. It is quite remarkable that the rivers which do not penetrate the mountain-range encircling Transylvania bear late Slavic, Hungarian and Turkish names. The most characteristic example of this is the name of the river *Küküllő*, which derives from Turkish in the 10th century, and its Rumanian name, *Tîrnava*, is of Slavic origin. The possibility has been raised

that the Ompoly river, which joins the Maros at Gyulafehérvár, would be derived from Roman Ampelum. G. Schramm has concurred with this view until recently; we disagree.

In 1271 the name of the river is *Onpoy*, in 1299, *Ompey*, *Ompay* and *Ompay* also in 1400. The - *ly* - ending of Ompoly gains ground in the 18th 19th century as a result of the explanation by the period's scientists that the word derives from *Apulum*. We believe that the name of Roman Ampelum would, at best, emerge as (early Hungarian) *Ampel*. This is not the only reason why the two names cannot be linked. Originally Ompoly was not the name of a river but of some land (1271: *Onpoy terra*, 1299: *terrae Ompey*, *nemus Ompey*). This would be the possessive case of the Hungarian (personal) name of *Omp* (cf. *Ompud*), which means "Ompé's", [something which] belongs to Omp. This is a common Hungarian construction of place names, the name of the river was a secondary derivative, thus, Ompoly is not of Roman origin.

It has also been assumed that *Abrud* is of Roman legacy because of *obrud*, a presumed Dacian word meaning 'gold'. The previous names of *Abrud* are: 1271: *Obruth*; 1320: *Obrudbania*, 1366 - *Obrugh*; 1366-70: *Obrugh*. - The varying writings of the last sound, d - gh (=Hungarian gy) th (=ty) possibly ch (= c or cs), suggests that an attempt was made to produce a sound for which there was no Hungarian equivalent. It might have been South-Slavic (Serbian). If so, then the word's derivation must have been closer to **obritji*, from So. Slav **obriæ .i* This, in turn, comes from *obrú* 'dry allen leaves and parched grass', also a personal name, affixed with the

patronym - *itjo* ('the successors of' Obrú). The original name of a locality and a nearby brook is *Zlatna (Zalatna)*, as shown by its German name, *Gross-Schlatten*. *Abrud*, then, cannot be said to be a legacy of old.

On the territory of former Dacia there is no geographical designation which would have preserved names from the Roman era in any shape or form. This indicates the same as was explained above: after the evacuation of Dacia no Latin groups remained who could have passed on the place names to other peoples. Moreover, the names of rivers in the Transylvanian basin are of a relatively recent origin, which indicates frequent migratory population exchanges. Thus, even if some Romanized provincials remained in post-271 Dacia, they have later disappeared without a trace. The same fate befell Pannonian provincials who were resettled during the Hun era, - they disappeared without a trace. We need to note, though, that they must have spoken a Latin which was similar to pre-Dalmatian but that would not have been a direct link to the origin of Rumanians.

The history of Roman Dacia makes it clear that we cannot speak about the Romanization of the Dacians in the province and, therefore, we cannot promulgate Daco-Roman continuity. Nowadays we frequently encounter the totally illogical premise - that Dacians outside the border (of the province) also became Romanized. There are two separate civilizations within and outside the frontiers of the Empire and this difference is not wiped out by Roman export-goods. (To cite a distant example: Northern Barbarians who resettled in

China became Chinese after a while, but not those who lived outside China.) In Dacia, we cannot talk about a foothold of Romanism and, after Aurelian withdrew, we have no evidence that provincials continued to live in the territory. We do not dispute that there could have been individuals who remained in the province but we have no proof to sustain this theory; not even in regard to those who lived outside the law. What we know of the Latin spoken in Dacia implies that the language must have been similar to what was spoken in 2nd century Pannonia and Dalmatia and that, in the 3rd century, there was a strong Greek influence in the Province. Therefore, the Rumanian language does not originate in Dacian Latin; had it survived, modern Rumanian would not be its successor. There were only a few Latin-speaking provincials who settled here during the time of Hun rule. The paucity of their numbers would have prevented them from determining later linguistic processes. Besides, the language had characteristics which set it apart from the innings of Rumanian.

In short, our data do not uphold Daco-Roman continuity, it does not support the survival in Dacia of Latin-speaking nationality groups, either. The absence of geographical designations provides an irrefutable argument in support of the position we hold.

Footnotes:

(1) *Alföldi, A.*, "Dacians and Romans in Transylvania". (*Századok*, 1940 p. 166)

(2) *A. Mócsy* - Roman names as resources for social history. Budapest, 1985, p. 54-56. Cf. *Acta Arch. Hung.* 36 (1984) 212.

(3) *K. Horedt – Siebenbürgen in spätrömischer Zeit.* Bukarest 1982. 55.

(4) *K. Horedt – Siebenbürgen in spätrömischer Zeit.* Bukarest 1982. 55.

(5) *D. Protase:* Die Dakisch-Römische Bevölkerung nördlich der Donau in der Periode von Aurelian bis zu den Slaven (7 Jh.) im Lichte der aktuellen Dokumente, in: *Die Völker Südosteuropas im 6 bis 8 Jahrhundert. Südosteuropa Jahrbuch* Bd. 17. München.